

## NEFERTITI REDIVIVA

BY

J. R. HARRIS

University of Copenhagen.

The little unfinished stela of the marine Pase, discovered at el-Amarna and now in Berlin (no. 17813),<sup>1</sup> is so well known as to need no formal description (Pl. I). When first discussed,<sup>2</sup> it was presumed to depict Akhenaten and Nefertiti, but this was later opposed by Newberry under the influence of Carter,<sup>3</sup> since when it has been accepted<sup>4</sup> that the two persons are Akhenaten and Smenkhkarē.<sup>5</sup> The basis of Newberry's argument was that the figures are both portrayed with crowns appropriate only to

For their kindness in answering questions, providing some references, and suggesting possible lines of enquiry, I am indebted to J. R. Baines, Dr J. D. Cooney, E. Iversen, Dr J. Málek, Dr P. R. S. Moorey, and Mrs Julia Samson. John Baines in particular has been constantly helpful and critically stimulating, but no one except myself bears any responsibility for the conclusions expressed or implied in the present article.

<sup>1</sup> Porter & Moss, *Top. Bibl.*, IV, p. 232.

<sup>2</sup> e.g., by Schäfer, *Ämliche Berichte*, XXXIV (1912-13), pp. 136-7; ZÄS, LII (1915), pp. 76-7; Borchardt, *Porträts der Königin Nofretete* (1923), p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Newberry, *JEA*, XIV (1928), p. 7; cf. Carter, *Tomb of Tut. ankh. Amen*, III (1933), p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> References are superfluous: so far as I am aware, the Carter/Newberry attribution has never been questioned in any discussion of the Amarna period, or in connection with Smenkhkarē.

<sup>5</sup> The use of this name is misleading, and has resulted in much confusion. Not only was it the latest (and final) variant of the nomen, as intimated by Petrie (*Tell el Amarna*, p. 29) and recently stated again (Munro, ZÄS, XCV (1969), pp. 113, 114-5; Helck, *CdE*, XLIV (1969), pp. 206-7), but, with accompanying variants of the prenomen, it is less common than forms of the earlier name Ankhkheprurē mry X: Nefernefruten mry Y (cf. Harris, *GM*, IV (1973), p. 15). No reference to 'Smenkhkarē' that cannot be verified is of any value, since more often than not the name is used carelessly where the cartouche is actually Nefernefruten or the prenomen Ankhkheprurē.

kings; this is not in itself conclusive evidence, and can in the present instance be shown to have been misleading.

Of greater significance are the number and disposition of the cartouches, which, although empty, admit of only one logical reconstruction. In the arc of the stela, on either side of the Aten, there stand two pairs of cartouches with lines beside and below for further inscriptions, while to the right of the figures, above the table of food, there are three slightly larger cartouches, with a line beneath them. The upper cartouches can scarcely relate to the figures, since in this case the other three would be superfluous, and indeed it is fairly clear, both from their position<sup>6</sup> and from the adjacent columns, that they were intended for those of the Aten, with its accompanying epithets.<sup>7</sup> If so, the cartouches below to the right were meant to contain the names of the persons depicted (with *di 'nh* etc. below), and this can only imply that they were a king and a queen, for whom the three cartouches would be appropriate—whereas two kings would require four. In fact, no other interpretation of the cartouches as grouped on the stela is feasible, since in any event the three standing together cannot be explained except as those of a king and queen, and reference to other Amarna monuments, notably stelae from private altars, scenes with the 'window of appearances', lintels in houses, and the boundary stelae, will show that the duplication of the double cartouche of the Aten is usual.<sup>8</sup>

On the evidence of the cartouches alone, it is therefore apparent that the two figures are those of a king and a queen—presumably Akhenaten and Nefertiti, and, if the slight separation of one of the rings is intentional, it may possibly indicate that the queen is placed to the left. This is in fact confirmed by a number of iconographic details, which together assume a certain significance.

<sup>6</sup> Not only do the cartouches and lines form a close group with the Aten, but the former are placed so close to the upper margin that there is no room above for *nb lawy*, *nb h'w*, or whatever alternative titles might have preceded a king's prenominal and nomen.

<sup>7</sup> cf. Perepelkin, *Perevorot Amen-holpa IV*, sect. 1, p. 107.

<sup>8</sup> The present arrangement of seven cartouches (two pairs + three) is reproduced, for example, on the two well-known stelae showing the king and queen with their older daughters: Cairo JE 44865 (*Top. Bibl.*, IV, p. 204) and Berlin 14145 (*ibid.*, p. 232).

Of the two figures, the one on the right, with the double crown, is slightly larger,<sup>9</sup> and wears a king's pectoral,<sup>10</sup> while that on the left (i.e., at the other's right hand)<sup>11</sup> has rather more obvious breasts, and extends an arm in what is conventionally a woman's embrace.<sup>12</sup> More importantly, the necks of the pair exhibit a curious feature, first noted, apparently, by Schäfer,<sup>13</sup> and cited most recently by Cooney,<sup>14</sup> which seems indeed to be an inflexible rule of Amarna representation, at least in the case of the king and queen.<sup>15</sup> This is that the line of the back of the neck will curve in a convex arc for a male, with a definite angle where the neck joins the head, whereas for a female the curve is essentially concave, and smoothly articulated into the base of the skull. The value of this criterion is that it offers an independent means of determining that the left-hand figure is that of a woman, and that it can be applied as well to other examples, provided the line of the neck is entirely visible, unimpeded by any wig.

One such is a second stela or plaque, also from el-Amarna and now in Berlin (no. 20716),<sup>16</sup> the half-cut figures on which were taken at first to be those of Akhenaten and Nefertiti,<sup>17</sup> though following Newberry they have again been interpreted as Akhenaten and Smenkhkarē. Here there are no cartouches, but

<sup>9</sup> This observation I owe to J. R. Baines.

<sup>10</sup> A similar pectoral is worn, e.g., by the king on the small gilded shrine from the tomb of Tutankhamūn (Carter obj. no. 108; British Museum, *Treasures of Tutankhamun*, back cover), by the two life-size statues from the Antechamber of the tomb (Carter obj. nos. 22, 29), and by the Osiriform figure of Tutankhamūn on the wall of the Burial Chamber.

<sup>11</sup> cf. below, p. 9, n. 27.

<sup>12</sup> cf. Spiegelberg, *JEA*, XV (1929), p. 199, n. 4 – though in Amarna art this is not always the case.

<sup>13</sup> Schäfer, *Amarna in Religion und Kunst*, text to pl. 28; cf. *ZÄS*, LV (1918), p. 13.

<sup>14</sup> Cooney, *Amarna Reliefs from Hermopolis*, p. 22.

<sup>15</sup> There are apparent anomalies among representations of the princesses, though these will require some further consideration. Two of the clearest exceptions, on blocks from Hermopolis, are unidentified otherwise, and could even be male. The mention of prince Tutankhaten among the Hermopolis fragments suggests that he may have appeared in the scenes as well.

<sup>16</sup> *Mitt. deutsch. Orient-Gesellschaft*, no. 50 (1912), pp. 27–9; *Top. Bibl.*, IV, p. 205.

<sup>17</sup> e.g., by Schäfer, *Ämliche Berichte*, XXXIV (1912–13), p. 142; *ZÄS*, LII (1915), pp. 83–4; Borchardt, *Porträts der K. Nofret-ele* (1923), p. 9.

the right-hand person has a quite clearly 'concave' neck, and is therefore a queen, in spite of the crown, the group being otherwise parallel to a scene in the tomb of Meryrē II at el-Amarna.<sup>18</sup> The queen in question cannot, of course, be identified with absolute certainty, but will surely be Nefertiti.

The re-attribution of these small stelae is of importance in two respects: first, in connection with the co-regency of Akhenaten and Nefernefruatē/Smenkhkārē, and second, as evidence for the unusual status of an Amarna queen, presumably Nefertiti.

The question of the co-regency cannot be treated exhaustively in the present context. The essential point to be made is that, without the two stelae under discussion, the whole of the representational evidence cited by Roeder<sup>19</sup> and others ceases to have any real significance, since none of the items remaining is independently valid.<sup>20</sup> Even a piece as unequivocal as the block from Hermopolis showing the lower limbs of two kingly persons<sup>21</sup> could equally well refer to Akhenaten and Nefertiti, and this applies also to the one other instance in which two figures, each wearing a crown and holding a *hḫt* sceptre, are grouped together.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Davies, *Rock Tombs of El Amarna*, II, pl. 32 = pl. 46, right.

<sup>19</sup> Roeder, *ZÄS*, LXXXIII (1958), pp. 43f.

<sup>20</sup> cf. Redford, *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty*, pp. 171–2, though even the critical short-list (p. 172, n. 15) includes some dubious items. The very convincing attribution to Nefertiti (Aldred, *Akhenaten*, text to pl. 8) of the quartzite head from Memphis (Cairo JE 45547) formerly taken as Smenkhkārē is a timely reminder of the uncertainty of identifications based on subjective impressions of facial characteristics.

<sup>21</sup> Roeder, *Amarna-Reliefs aus Hermopolis*, pl. 16 (406–VIIA). This also applies to another Hermopolis block (*ibid.*, pl. 5 (461–VII)), where the surviving head would seem in any case to be that of a queen, wearing, perhaps, the typical crown of Nefertiti.

<sup>22</sup> Peet & Woolley, *City of Akhenaten*, I, pl. 10 (6): two complementary impressions of the same seal, one of which (lower left) is now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford: 1921.1149. The figures, one seated and wearing the red crown, the other wearing the blue crown and possibly standing, were described originally as Akhenaten and Nefertiti (*ibid.*, p. 14), and, strangely enough, this sealing does not appear since to have been included in any discussion of Smenkhkārē. The sealing cited by Roeder, *ZÄS*, LXXXIII (1958), p. 48 (C III 5) is of doubtful interpretation: the figures may equally well be Akhenaten with Nefertiti (standing) and Meritaten. In the absence of any adequate information, one cannot assess the fragment referred to in Pendlebury, *CoA*, III, p. 18 (32/50).

Effectively, therefore, an independent co-regency<sup>23</sup> of Akhenaten and Nefernefruaten/Smenkhkarē must rest on the juxtaposition of their cartouches (of which, as yet, there are only two certain examples, with two others open to doubt),<sup>24</sup> and, at the least, there should now be a moratorium on all homosexual fantasies.

The prominence given to Nefertiti at el-Amarna, and even at Karnak, need scarcely be emphasised, but certain conventional modifications that point towards a degree of formal equality are of particular relevance. Apart from the colouring of her flesh<sup>25</sup> and her use of the military Nubian wig<sup>26</sup> (both of which also apply to the princesses and to other court ladies), the queen appears on the right of the king in statuary,<sup>27</sup> reversing the normal position, and, when standing, is shown with a similar placing of the feet.<sup>28</sup> Once she is even depicted assuming a dominant masculine role in smiting a captured enemy.<sup>29</sup> Of her numerous crowns and headdresses, several are properly those of a king, among them the short, round-bottomed wig with diadem,<sup>30</sup> the multiple *atef*

<sup>23</sup> If in fact Nefertiti was also Nefernefruaten/Smenkhkarē (Harris, *GM*, IV (1973), pp. 15–17), then the co-regency evidence is, of course, cumulative.

<sup>24</sup> In such a case there would be even less evidence than for the alleged co-regency between Amenhotpe III and Akhenaten.

<sup>25</sup> The conventional use of yellow for women, as against red for men, was abandoned in the Amarna period, reddish-brown tints being common to both.

<sup>26</sup> cf. Aldred, *Bull. MMA*, XV (1957), pp. 141–7. The Nubian wig is apparently worn by Akhenaten: Davies, *El Amarna*, I, pl. 30.

<sup>27</sup> cf. Davies, *El Amarna*, V, pls. 41/43; Engelbach, *ASAE*, XXXVIII (1938), pp. 95–107 – to which may be added, e.g., Louvre E 15593; University College London UC004.

<sup>28</sup> e.g., Louvre E 15593; U.C.L. UC004; and cf. Engelbach, *ASAE*, XXXVIII (1938), p. 107.

<sup>29</sup> Cooney, *Amarna Reliefs*, pp. 82–5 (no. 51 a).

<sup>30</sup> e.g., Cooney, *Amarna Reliefs*, pp. 20–22 (no. 12) = Roeder, *Amarna-Reliefs*, pl. 172 (PC 28); and cf. Roeder, *op. cit.*, pl. 12 (323–VIIID). The same is worn by Akhenaten: Roeder, *op. cit.*, pl. 37 (108–VIIIA); Brit. Mus., *Hieroglyphic Texts from Eg. Stelae, etc.*, VIII, pl. 23, by Amenhotpe III: Cleveland Mus. of Art, *Egyptian Art*, p. 9, by (?) Tutankhamūn on the back of the throne (Carter obj. no. 91) and twice on the small gilded shrine (Carter obj. no. 108), in each case with valancing at the front edge, and later by Sety I: Calverley, *Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos*, I, pl. 3 (south: below); III, pl. 21 (north-west); IV, pl. 33 (A: south); IV, pl. 76 (10B: east), as well as by the queen of Ramesses I: Winlock, *Bas-Reliefs from the Temple of Ramses I at Abydos*, pl. 7. I have not listed instances where the wig has a

crown,<sup>31</sup> the flat-topped cap with tall feathers, horns, and solar disc,<sup>32</sup> and the close-fitting, rounded cap or helmet,<sup>33</sup> often confused with the blue crown.<sup>34</sup> This latter cap would appear to be plain, but elsewhere<sup>35</sup> it is covered with rings or discs such as are

straight edge below, since this is probably quite distinct; cf. Calverley, *op. cit.*, I, pl. 3 (south); Cairo 34026: Lacau, *Stèles du nouvel empire*, I, pl. 20.

<sup>31</sup> e.g., Davies, *El Amarna*, II, pl. 8; VI, pl. 26. In the former instance the crown has only two elements, whereas that of Akhenaten has three. It is uncertain whether the later name *hmhm* is also applicable at this period.

<sup>32</sup> e.g., Davies, *El Amarna*, V, pls. 33, 41/43; Prisse, *Monuments égyptiens*, pl. 11 (3). This is in essence the cap of Amūn, and is worn also by Akhenaten: Pendlebury, *CoA*, III, pl. 69 (4).

<sup>33</sup> Davies, *El Amarna*, I, pl. 30; VI, pl. 14; Berlin 19781: [Kaiser], *Äg. Museum Berlin*, no. 756; Brooklyn 16.48: [Cooney], *Eg. Art in the Brooklyn Museum Collection*, no. 37; Berlin 21263: Schäfer, *Amarna in Rel. u. Kunst*, pl. 21; cf. also Berlin 15000: Schäfer, *op. cit.*, pl. 33. The close-fitting cap (with rings) is worn by the queen in three of the details on the small gilded shrine of Tutankhamūn (Carter obj. no. 108), though apparently not by any Amarna king; but cf. below, n. 42. In the nineteenth dynasty it is worn frequently by Sety I (e.g., at Abydos; cf. the following notes) and by Ramesses II, and in the twentieth dynasty by Ramesses III and IV, and by Herihor. It seems to have priestly connotations, and the cap of the Nubian kings (cf. Müller, *ZÄS*, LXXX (1955), p. 53 & n. 1; Leclant, *Recherches sur les monuments thébains*, pp. 323–4; Russmann, *Brooklyn Mus. Annual*, XI (1969–70), p. 145, n. 3) may well be related.

<sup>34</sup> The four volumes of Calverley, *Temple of King Sethos I at Abydos*, provide 82 (possibly 83) representations of the king wearing the close-fitting cap or helmet – excluding instances where what are clearly *statuettes* are incorporated in stands for divine barks. The cap is distinguished absolutely from the blue crown, *a*) by the fact that the two occur in the same composition on 10 occasions, and in adjacent scenes or registers on a further 19 occasions, and *b*) by its colour. In every case where this is indicated (I, pl. 5\*; I, pl. 14\*; II, pl. 6; II, pl. 7; III, pl. 6; III, pl. 32; and cf. the miniature figures in II, pl. 11\*), the cap, whether ringed or plain (cf. the following note), is painted *yellow* – with, in the instances asterisked\*, a blue crown adjacent and painted *blue*. Coloured examples of Ramesses II and III are also yellow, and so are those of the Nubian cap (cf. Leclant, *op. cit.*, p. 324, n. 3). Of the Amarna examples cited in the previous note, one only is coloured (Berlin 15000), and this, strangely, is blue.

<sup>35</sup> Of the 82 (or 83) representations referred to in the previous note, 32 show the cap with rings on it, while 42 (possibly 45) show it without – the remaining 6 being insufficiently detailed, though perhaps plain. Of the 32 ringed examples, no fewer than 28 occur in lower registers, and the 4 others in unitary scenes. On 12 occasions (possibly 13), the ringed examples have plain counterparts in the corresponding upper scenes, and, where the round cap and the blue crown occur in the same composition, they are, with only one possible exception (III, pl. 14), either both

usual on the blue crown, and which also occur on the characteristic flat-topped crown of Nefertiti,<sup>36</sup> perhaps with deliberate significance.<sup>37</sup>

Moreover, her use of the blue crown itself is not confined to the two small stelae already reviewed. A block from Hermopolis<sup>38</sup> shows a figure in feminine drapery, and with a female curve of the neck, but wearing a cap or crown (broken away at the top) which at first sight would appear to be that affected by Nefertiti, but which, in fact, has a clearly indented diagonal line appropriate only to the blue crown.<sup>39</sup> The blue crown may also, perhaps, be inferred in a scene in the tomb of Meryrē II at el-Amarna,<sup>40</sup> where Akhenaten and Nefertiti are represented by the device of a single figure with duplicate outline. This method of drafting is found in two other instances where the royal couple appear together, one in the tomb of Huya,<sup>41</sup> the other in that of Panehesy,<sup>42</sup>

ringed or both plain. In 5 cases, the register over a ringed cap has a plain blue crown. This would seem to suggest that the presence or absence of rings reflects nothing more esoteric than ease of access, i.e., that the sculptors carved detail on crowns within reach at ground level, but not where a ladder or scaffold was needed. How far this sort of consideration may also apply to the decoration of crowns in Amarna work is a matter for speculation, but it is worth noting that rings are usual on falence fragments of both the blue crown and the flat-topped crown of Nefertiti (cf. Samson, *JEA*, LIX (1973), pp. 45–57), and that the close-fitting cap on the gilded shrine of Tutankhamūn (Carter obj. no. 108) has rings.

<sup>36</sup> cf. Engelbach, *ASAE*, XXXVIII (1938), pp. 95–107; Samson, *JEA*, LIX (1973), pp. 45–57.

<sup>37</sup> The rings may possibly indicate some essential connection between the blue crown, the close-fitting cap or helmet, and the flat-topped crown of Nefertiti (cf. Borchardt, *ZÄS*, XLII (1905), p. 82 – wrongly *identifying* the three; Schäfer, *ZÄS*, LXX (1934), p. 14). One may also notice the unique decoration with (?) curls: Borchardt, *Porträts der K. Nofretete*, p. 36, fig. 33 = Schäfer, *ZÄS*, LXX (1934), p. 18, fig. 17, which occurs again on the lappets of one of the several headdresses of the Karnak colossi of Akhenaten (Cairo JE 49529: Schäfer, *loc. cit.*), and on that of the outermost coffin of Tutankhamūn (Carter obj. no. 253).

<sup>38</sup> Roeder, *Amarna-Reliefs*, pl. 6 (777–VIII A).

<sup>39</sup> The angle at which the crown rises behind precludes its being the close-fitting cap or helmet, since in Amarna examples this is inclined less steeply and has an irregular contour.

<sup>40</sup> Davies, *El Amarna*, II, pls. 37/38. The couple clasp hands, and the queen has her other arm round the king. Apart from this, only the legs of their thrones are distinguished.

<sup>41</sup> Davies, *El Amarna*, III, pl. 13, and cf. p. 10. The king holds the *ḥkaṯ* and

and is wholly exceptional in that it is applied to two major figures.<sup>43</sup> In the case of animals, and the grouping of persons of minor importance, the implication is that the bodies supplied in outline do not in substance differ from that presented in full,<sup>44</sup> and a similar meaning is therefore most probable here.<sup>45</sup> Essentially, then, the three scenes will indicate that Akhenaten and Nefertiti were at the time of virtually equal status, and, if their assimilation is to be taken as valid in terms of appearance, then Nefertiti is shown not only with the blue crown, but also with the red.<sup>46</sup>

The significance of the blue crown is unmistakable. During the eighteenth dynasty it appears to have been symbolic of coronation,<sup>47</sup> and so became the royal crown *par excellence*, being used

---

*nḥḥw*, one in each hand, and wears the red crown. The queen has one arm around him, and may in the other have held the two sceptres together. This would account for the broken line of the *ḥkꜣt*, and for the traces interpreted as a sleeve (p. 10) which seem to correspond closely to those of the king's *nḥḥw*.

<sup>43</sup> Davies, *El Amarna*, II, pl. 18. The crown in this instance appears to have been the close-fitting cap or helmet, and it is indeed possible that the queen stood to the front.

<sup>44</sup> The part overlapping of a king's head with that of a (?) princess on a fragmentary block from Hermopolis (Roeder, *Amarna-Reliefs*, pl. 198 (PC 189)) is of a somewhat different order.

<sup>45</sup> Schäfer, *Von ägyptischer Kunst*, 4th ed., pp. 184–91 (cf. 3rd ed., pp. 189–93). It is clearly necessary to make a distinction between the patterned overlapping of objects exemplified in figs. 169–71, the 'naturalistic' superposition of figures (as in figs. 172, 176), and the multiplication in outline of a row of identical figures, which is a systematised convention.

<sup>46</sup> In the first of the three examples (above, n. 40), the fact that the legs of the seats alone were distinguished is in itself an indication that the two figures were deemed otherwise to be similar.

<sup>47</sup> See above, p. 11, nn. 40–41. There does not appear to be any parallel in the case of the red crown, unless one is to be found among the series of gilded statuettes from the tomb of Tutankhamūn. This possibility may be sustained by the presence of duplicates (cf. Noblecourt, *Toutankhamon*, p. 249, figs. 158–9), one of which, though with the white crown (Carter obj. no. 289b), is suggestively feminine (cf. MMA neg. TAA 728; Riesterer, *Das äg. Museum Kairo*, II: *Grabschatz des Tut-ench-Amun*, pl. 24, right). Apart from the very obvious breasts, more shapely and prominent than on even the most effeminate figure of Akhenaten, there is again the criterion of the neck, the line of which follows a slightly concave arc to the base of the skull, without a marked angle.

<sup>48</sup> cf. Gardiner, *JEA*, XXXIX (1953), p. 27; Simpson, *JEA*, XLI (1955), p. 112. Whether the various representations are meant to portray a specific act is open to question (cf. Simpson, *ibid.*, n. 1). In the case of the M.M.A. head in particular there



eventually as the determinative of the word *h'w*.<sup>48</sup> At el-Amarna it is depicted as worn by Akhenaten more ordinarily than other crowns or headdresses, replacing in this respect the *nemes* and double crown<sup>49</sup>—just as the closely related crown favoured by Nefertiti may be seen to have superseded the commoner queenly wigs and diadems. If, then, it can be shown that Nefertiti assumed the blue crown (for which Hatshepsut offers an obvious precedent),<sup>50</sup> it follows inevitably that she had attained to the status of kingship, and this may be further confirmed by the otherwise unexplained duplication of her cartouche,<sup>51</sup> as though, like a king, she possessed a prenomen and nomen.

There is no necessity to pursue the argument further, though I have suggested already<sup>52</sup> that Nefernefruaten-Nefertiti became Ankhkheprurē:Nefernefruaten.<sup>53</sup> It may, however, be pointed out that the supposed 'disgrace' and replacement of Nefertiti, recently stigmatised as implausible,<sup>54</sup> is even more difficult to allow if in fact she had occupied a position of such extraordinary prestige.

---

is a definite problem, since one can hardly suppose that on his accession at el-Amarna Tutankhamūn, then bearing the name Tutankhaten, was thought to be crowned by Amūn.

<sup>48</sup> *Wb.* III. 241. 17. The earliest instance would seem to be that on the bow-case from the tomb of Tutankhamūn (Carter obj. no. 335); cf. *Urk.* IV. 2058. 7, where, however, the sign is misrepresented.

<sup>49</sup> The extreme rarity of the *nemes* at el-Amarna may be of crucial importance, and the meaning of its occurrences (e.g., in the case of the (?) Theban statuette Louvre N 831) deserves further consideration.

<sup>50</sup> Compare the scenes on the pyramids of her two principal obelisks at Karnak: *Top. Bibl.*, II<sup>a</sup>, pp. 81–2; (conveniently) Lange & Hirmer, *Egypt*, 4th ed., pl. 134.

<sup>51</sup> Petrie, *TelA*, pl. 15 (82) & p. 28. One such mould is in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford: 1893.1–41 (628), and Mrs Samson informs me that there are eighteen in the collection at University College, London.

<sup>52</sup> Harris, *GM*, IV (1973), pp. 15–17.

<sup>53</sup> It may be significant that on dockets from el-Amarna dated in years 10 and 11 (Peet & Woolley, *CoA*, I, pls. 64 (1–2), 63 (I)), what is clearly the name of Nefertiti occurs simply as Nefernefruaten, i.e., without any epithet (cf. also the sealing in Petrie, *TelA*, pl. 21 (10)), and that the stamp on a jar handle (Pendlebury, *CoA*, III, p. 182, fig. 23) appears to have had the same epithet erased.

<sup>54</sup> Helck, *CdE*, XLIV (1969), pp. 200–201; cf. Munro, *ZÄS*, XCV (1969), p. 112, n. 8. As Helck very rightly points out, the limited scope of the known erasures and substitutions will hardly support the idea of a general *damnatio*, where one would surely expect a degree of thoroughness such as was shown in attacking Amūn.

