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On the Pyramid of Ameny-Qemau and its Canopic Equipment

By NABIL SWELIM and AIDAN DODSON

(Plates 54-55)

The 1957 discovery of the pyramid of the Thirteenth Dynasty king Ameny-Qemau at South Dahshur was one of the more important, yet most obscure, events in the history of pyramid exploration. Incidents immediately following it prevented any substantive publication of the monument appearing until a decade after its discovery; the objects found have hitherto escaped publication altogether. This paper aims for the first time to reconstruct the events surrounding the find, consider the full architectural/historical context of the pyramid, building upon the pioneer work of MARAGiology and RINALDI, and publish the material that is known to have been recovered from it.

I. The Discovery

The pyramid of Ameny-Qemau\(^2\) lies upon a small hill, 1.150 metres S.E. of the Bent Pyramid, and approximately a kilometre S.S.W. of the pyramid of Ammenemes III at Dahshur (fig. 1). It overlooks Lake Dahshur from the west at a distance of 500 metres, and the wadi leading to the lake from the south, at a similar distance. Its location seems to have escaped the notice of even such a keen spotter of ruined pyramids as LEPSIUS\(^3\).

However, in 1957, an American scientist and publisher, CHARLES ARTHUR MUSES, approached the Antiquities Service with a view to undertaking excavations at Dahshur and Matariya\(^4\). Excavations began...
tions began at Dahshur under Muses’ direction in association with Sami Gabra, south of the Black Pyramid of Amenemhes III. Shafik Farid, Chief Inspector for Lower Egypt, was also involved in the work.

Excavations initially revealed Old Kingdom mastabas, one of which, belonging to a certain Ipi, contained a pair of standing, headless statues\(^5\). The final two weeks of work, however, brought to light what first appeared to be a mastaba, but on further investigation proved to be a pyramid\(^6\). The discovery was made known via annual summaries of fieldwork\(^7\), but Muses’ sponsorship of the work was shortly brought to a sudden halt at the end of the season\(^8\). On 20 June, Dr Muses was detained at Cairo airport, on charges relating to antiquities and currency allegedly found in his possession\(^9\). The most important charges were overturned at appeal in June 1958\(^10\), but Muses seems never to have returned to Egypt, and he apparently never completed the book he stated that he was writing on his discovery\(^11\).

Following this debacle, work at the site was abandoned. However, some time later, those parts of the pyramid substructure which had been exposed were examined in detail by Vito Maragioglio and Celeste Rinaldi, who published their report in 1968\(^12\). No further substantive work seems to have been carried out, although some scrutiny of the area was carried out in the mid 1970s\(^13\). Apart from a discussion of the pyramid’s chronological placement\(^14\) and an incomplete discussion of the objects found\(^15\), little else appears to have been thus far published concerning this most important structure.

II. The Pyramid Complex

THE PYRAMID

The scanty ruins of Ameney-Qemau’s pyramid are scattered around the central pit in which the substructure had been constructed. Maragioglio and Rinaldi were unable to locate any route for supplying materials such as white limestone, quartzite and bricks, and thus surmised that these supplies may have come along the wadi to the south.

To construct the superstructure of the monument, the site was prepared by removing the surface sand and uncovering the bed rock (fig. 2). The levels in the west were a little higher than in the east.

\(^5\) Gabra, Chc., 205, 209; cf. PM III, 895. The name of the tomb’s owner is reported in Rocky Mountain News (hereafter RMN) 12 May 1958, 32.

\(^6\) Gabra for some reason had doubts as to the monument’s status (cf. Dia ‘Abou-Ghazi, Last Excavations, Organisation des Antiquités de l’Égypte, Vies et Travaux II: Sami Gabra, from Tasa to Touna [Cairo, 1984], who calls it ‘a mastaba built on the top of the hill’).

\(^7\) H. Brunner, Ausgrabungen in Gizeh, Saqqāra, Memphis, Dahshur, AFO 18 (1937–8), 479–80, based on information given out by Selem Hassan on 2 September 1957 at the 24 Congress of Orientalists; Leclant, Orientalia NS 27, 81–3, used a press release, supplemented by Hassan’s remarks. The discovery also featured in the contemporary press.

\(^8\) Dia ‘Abou-Ghazi, Vies et Travaux II, 32.

\(^9\) As well as by Gabra, and in various press reports, the events are recounted by E. F. Wente, NARCE 25 (July 1957). Cf. below footnote 29 and p. 326.

\(^10\) RMN 27 June 1958, 68.

\(^11\) RMN 13 April 1958, 8. Muses has proposed an account for publication in a forthcoming issue of KMT.

\(^12\) Maragioglio and Rinaldi, Note sulla piramide di Ameney’Aamu, Orientalia NS 37 (1968), 325–38.

\(^13\) D. Arnold / R. Stadelmann, Dahschur – Erster Grabungsbericht, MDAIK 31 (1975), 174, Abb. 3, Taf. 112. The possible location of two more pyramids in the area was noted (see fig. 1).

\(^14\) Dodson, The Tombs of the Kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty in the Memphite Necropolis, ZAS 114 (1987), 36–44.

Following this, three large trenches were dug in the bed rock with a level bedding; two ran east west and the third joined them on the west side. Toward the east the pair of trenches ended in an open area roughly levelled by extracting the superficial rock and accumulating it on the limits of this side.

The trench surrounds a rough square, upon which the pyramid nucleus was built. The top of this rough square was not level; thus, it decreased from 120 cm at the south west corner to 90 cm above the level of the south trench at the south east corner. The nucleus brickwork is still in situ above this feature, which measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North side</th>
<th>East side</th>
<th>South side</th>
<th>West side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.20 metres</td>
<td>45.20 metres</td>
<td>44.80 metres</td>
<td>45.30 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 84,351 cubits</td>
<td>= 86,259 cubits</td>
<td>= 85,496 cubits</td>
<td>= 86,450 cubits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outer walls of the trenches were covered with crude brickwork and a little limestone. The width of the trench on each side of the pyramid is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North side</th>
<th>East side</th>
<th>South side</th>
<th>West side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.50 metres</td>
<td>6.00 metres</td>
<td>5.85 metres</td>
<td>6.20 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 12.40 cubits</td>
<td>= 11.45 cubits</td>
<td>= 11.16 cubits</td>
<td>= 11.83 cubits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level bedding and width of the trenches surrounding the brickwork of the nucleus allows for a foundation, backing masonry and outer facing for a pyramid of a base length of 100 cubits (52.40 metres). The following pyramids have a base length ranging from 90–110 cubits, two of which date to the Thirteenth Dynasty, possessing the same base length:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PYRAMID</th>
<th>base length in cubits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giza Gl</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giza Glc</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giza Glb</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahshur, Ammenemese II</td>
<td>95 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Saqqara, Khendjer</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazghunah, South Pyramid</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahshur, Bent Pyramid ‘subsidiary’</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saqqara, Unas</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazghunah, North Pyramid</td>
<td>110 (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The brickwork surrounding the trenches would have to be explained as either the foundation of the pavement or some element associated with the construction of the monument.

---

16) *Maragioglio* and *Rinaldi* introduced the option of a narrow pyramid court and a wavy thin wall of bricks surrounding the monument: cf. *Orientalia* 37, 329.

17) Since the base-length of this pyramid exceeds one fifth of the base length of the Bent pyramid, one might question this monument’s true classification as a subsidiary. On the other hand, the pyramids south of those of Chephren and Userkaf also show this peculiarity.
Fig. 2: Plan of the pyramid of Ameny-Qemau
THE TEMENOS

In their report, Maragioglio and Rinaldi point out some destruction on the east side which could indicate the former presence of an upper temple. It is difficult without any further clearance to determine details of a causeway or other elements of the pyramid complex. The north trench of the pyramid superstructure, however, is 6.50 metres wide for 26.26 metres from the west, and then suddenly widens to 9.60 metres, as is shown in fig. 2. This widening is created by turning the outer brickwork 3 metres northward, then 8 metres eastward, after which it is lost for 11.50 metres, before reappearing, aligned with the first part, for 12.40 metres; the trench may have never been completed in the areas of these missing sections. Consequently, it is likely that this rectangular projection was intended for the stone foundation for a northern chapel; the building process will have been discontinued at an early stage.

THE SUBSTRUCTURE

The substructure was constructed in a roughly squared central pit. A ramp approaching from the east appears to be on the axis of the nucleus, with an entrance displaced a little, 0.65 metres, to the south. The ramp and pit were probably excavated after the pyramid's nucleus was set\(^{18}\). The ramp began at the same level as the area directly east of the nucleus and a little to the east of the side line\(^{19}\). Maragioglio and Rinaldi were unable to measure either the descending angle of the ramp or the depth of the pit.

The rock wall of the ramp is level in the upper part of the north side and unfinished at the west end of the south side. There appear to be no traces of a connection between the descending ramp and the constructions in the central pit. Perhaps the work was discontinued, or finished off quickly with less care. Consequently the ramp that should have led to the substructure was filled in.

The substructure was entered by a narrow passage, blocked by dry masonry from an early age, although the lower parts were neatly built in brick. To the east, masses of chippings and a large limestone block were found \textit{in situ}. The constructions that lay in the pit were lined with limestone blocks of approximately 1.5 to 0.60 metres thickness, a fill being observed between this masonry and the rock wall of the pit.

The basic scheme of the extant substructure is shown in fig. 3:

- A sloping corridor (A) descends westwards, to be followed by a short horizontal passage (B); from this, a visitor would ascend a vertical shaft (C-D) to a second horizontal passage (D-E), still in a westward direction.
- This shaft would be closed at the top by a large vertically dropping quartzite block. From the end of the horizontal passage, a second vertical shaft (E-F) ascends to a third horizontal westward-leading passage ending in a north-south chamber (G). The shaft was designed to be closed by a large quartzite block sliding from the south.
- From G, a stairway (H)\(^{25}\) leads in a northward direction to a second apartment (I). A second stairway leads out of this room in a westward direction to give access to the antechamber (J). In the antechamber the sarcophagus lid was stored until the burial took place.
- This lid was slid into the burial chamber (K) after the interment had taken place, closing the great quartzite monolith that combined the features of a sarcophagus and canopic chest, by containing separate cavities for the mummy and the canopic equipment.


\(^{19}\) This means that it probably began from the pyramid facing and could support a base length of 100 cubits.

\(^{25}\) This area was badly damaged; a stairway is suggested by Maragioglio and Rinaldi.
Fig. 3: Reconstructed layout of the substructure of the pyramid of Ameny-Qemau (after Maragio Gl. and Rinaldi)

- The burial chamber would have been sealed off by a quartzite slab sliding from the west, and thus separating it from the antechamber.

The plan of the substructure is very similar to, but slightly less developed than that of the North Pyramid at Mazghuna. The two monuments should therefore be closely linked chronologically, with Ameny-Qemau's regarded as the earlier.  

III. The Canopic Equipment and other Finds

From the nearly-contemporary tomb of Hor, we have a fairly good idea of the kind of material that was to be found in a king's tomb of the Thirteenth Dynasty. However, the devastated state of Ameny-Qemau's monument left little chance of substantial survivals; aside from a set of broken canopics, to be discussed shortly, only one fragment can be traced. Entered in the Cairo Museum Temporary Register (TR) as $25^{11}_{11}$, it is the edge of a flat calcite object, 0.9 cm thick, conceivably part

---


\(^{22}\) *PM III*, 888-9; cf. Dodson, ZAS 114, 42.

\(^{23}\) There remains very considerable uncertainty as regards the fate of much of the material recovered (cf. n. 29, below), and it is possible that other items may have been found, not susceptible at present to identification.
of an offering table, although such an item is absent from Hor’s sepulchre. From the photograph in the Register\(^{24}\), it does not seem to be from a stela of the types found in that king’s tomb\(^{25}\). The Ameny-Qemau fragment bears the end of a band of text: \[\text{[]} \text{[]} \text{[]} \text{[]} \text{[]} \text{[}]. This is easily restored as having read ‘[Ameny-Qema]u, true [of voice]’\(^{26}\).

We have no clues as to where TR\(^{2511}\)\(_{601/4}\) originated within the pyramid, although the antechamber seems most likely; however, the remaining items certainly came originally from the burial chamber, its floor entirely filled by the giant combined sarcophagus/canopic chest. The actual canopic cavity lies at its south (foot) end, the normal orientation for such containers. From the parallel of the approximately contemporary interment of Hor, one would assume that a wooden inner chest was formerly present, but no fragments of such are recorded. On the other hand, remains of four calcite jars were recovered (pl. 54–55, fig. 4):

A. Description: Fragments making up complete jar, bearing the Imseti formula, incised and filled with blue/green pigment.

Dimensions\(^{27}\): Height 26.5 cm, Diameter 20.5 cm.

Present Location: Uncertain\(^{28}\).

Text:

- \(\text{išt tt} p s.t  hr\) Isis, delimit your protection about
- \(\text{ms.t nty im.t}\) Imseti, who is in you;
- \(\text{im.ty hr mst.t}\) the honoured before Imseti,
- \(\text{nts} w \text{imn-y-qmtw m.t} hr w\) King Ameny-Qemau, true of voice.

B. Description: Fragments making up almost complete jar, bearing the Hapy formula, incised and filled with blue/green pigment.

Dimensions: Height 27.5 cm, Diameter 21.5 cm.

Present Location: Uncertain; a portion, made up of three glued fragments and measuring overall \(13.9 \times 8.2 \times 0.12\) cm, is Cairo TR\(^{2511}\)\(_{601/3}\). It includes a large part of the text area. A piece of the rim, measuring \(10 \times 1.8\) cm, with the top left-hand corner of the text panel, is TR\(^{2511}\)\(_{601/3}\).

Text:

- \(\text{nht-htw} [\text{st}] p s.t  hr\) Nephthys, delimit your protection about
- \(\text{hpy nty im.t}\) Hapy, who is in you;
- \(\text{im.ty hr hpy}\) the honoured before Hapy,
- \(\text{nts} w \text{imn-y-qmtw m.t} hr w\) King Ameny-Qemau, true of voice.

C. Description: Fragments making up partial jar, with most of its upper part missing, bearing the Duamutef formula, incised and filled with blue/green pigment.
Two pieces bear numbers in ink\textsuperscript{30}: ‘A637’, on fragment of shoulder, and ‘A696m\textsuperscript{25}’ on a rim sherd.

Dimensions: Height ∼ 19 + x cm.

Present Location: Uncertain; part of the shoulder (8.2 cm wide), with the upper parts of the left-hand text columns, is Cairo TR \textsuperscript{25111} \textsuperscript{6012}.

Text: 

\textasciitilde\textit{\ldots} p s.t \textit{hr} \textit{[\ldots]}, delimit your protection about 
\textit{\ldots} dw\text{3} - mw\text{3}tf $\text{nty im\text{3}t}$,\textit{\ldots}$ \text{[Duamut\text{3}ef, who is in you;}
\textit{\ldots} \text{im\text{3}ty hr dw\text{3} - mw\text{3}tf}$, the honoured before Duamutef, 
\textit{\ldots}$ \text{nts \text{\ldots}}$, King [\ldots].

D. Description: Fragments making up complete jar, bearing the Quebehsenuef formula incised and filled with blue/green pigment.

Dimensions: Height 26 cm, Diameter 19 cm.

Present Location: Uncertain.

Text: 

\textit{slqt stp s.t \textit{hr}} $\text{[\ldots]}$, Selqet, delimit your protection about 
\textit{qbh-sn.wf nty im\text{3}t}$, Quebehsenuef, who is in you; 
\textit{\ldots}$ \text{im\text{3}ty hr qbh-sn.wf}$, the honoured before Quebehsenuef, 
\textit{\ldots}$ \text{nts \text{\ldots}}$, King Ameny-Qemau, true of voice.

There remains confusion as to whether anything of the lids were found. \textit{Edward F. Wente}\textit{ remarks that 'the jars, as usual, had lids representing the four sons of Horus'.}\textsuperscript{31}) A contemporary newspaper report also mentions 'covers from four canopic jars found in the tomb'.\textsuperscript{32}) However, no such elements are included in the \textit{Farid} photographs, nor do they appear to be in the Cairo Temporary Register. Their existence thus remains uncertain.

DISCUSSION

The jars basically conform to the size, shape and textual content that becomes broadly standard from the latter half of the Twelfth Dynasty. The precise textual formulation is that characterised by \textit{Sethe as 'Type III'}}\textsuperscript{33}), whose distinguishing features are the writing out of the initial $\text{f}$ of $\text{stp-s\text{t}}$, together with ending the first section with $\text{im\text{3}t/t}$, rather than $\text{hr.t/t}$. The type specimens come from the reigns of Sesostris III and Ammenemes III, being the jars of Princesses Menet\textsuperscript{34}) and Sithathoriniut\textsuperscript{35}).

Given the problems in precisely fixing Ameny-Qemau within the Thirteenth Dynasty, it is interesting to compare his jars with those of the fourteenth king, Hor\textsuperscript{36}), and those of the latter's daugh-

\textsuperscript{30}) The nature of the numbers marked on sherds is unclear. They were presumably applied before arrival at the Egyptian Museum, since they do not square with any of the numbering systems used there.

\textsuperscript{31}) \textit{NARCE} 25, [1]. In response to an enquiry, Professor \textit{Wente} tells us: 'My recollection is that the description I gave of them came solely from a conversation I had with Sami Gabra. I rather doubt now that the stoppers of the jars had the animal heads of the 4 sons of Horus at this early date, and perhaps the statement I made was based on a mention of the 4 sons on the body of each jar. I do not remember ever actually seeing the jars' (personal communication, 3 March 1996).

\textsuperscript{32}) Denver Post 24 July 1957.

\textsuperscript{33}) K. \textit{Sethe}, \textit{Zur Geschichte der Einbalsamierung bei den Ägyptern, und einiger damit verbundener Brüche} (Berlin, 1934), 14. The text-types mentioned in this paper are reproduced at figure 5.

\textsuperscript{34}) CG 4005–6, from Dahshur (G. \textit{Reisner}, \textit{Canopics} (CCG) [Cairo, 1967], 3–4).

\textsuperscript{35}) MMA 16.1.45–8, from Lahun (G. \textit{Brunton}, \textit{Lahun I: the Treasure} [London, 1920], pl. 14).

\textsuperscript{36}) CG 4019–22 (\textit{Reisner}, \textit{Canopics}, 11–4; CEKE, 146).
Fig. 4: The canopic texts of Ameny-Qemau

Fig. 5: Canopic formulae of the late Middle Kingdom (after Sethe)

Typus III: Ameny-Qemau; Princesses Menet, Sithathoriunet
Typus IV: Hor, Sobkemsaf (jars)
Typus V: Hor (chest)
Typus VI: Princess Nubheteptikhered (jars)
Typus VII: Princess Nubheteptikhered (chest)
ter, Nubhetepthikhered. Both individuals had been buried in tombs built into shaft-graves along the north side of the Dahshur pyramid of Ammenemes III.

Dimensionally, all the vases are very similar; likewise, their shapes conform to Middle Kingdom norms. In addition, the v-vipers all lack the rear of their bodies, and both kings' jars have their bird signs deprived of legs. Those of Nubhetepthikhered lack birds altogether. These features clearly distinguish the Thirteenth Dynasty jars from the late Twelfth Dynasty group.

However, no set is precisely the same as another in the area of text-formulae. The two kings' jars are the most alike, but with differences which might point to Ameny-Qemau's being the earlier. Hor's comply with Sethe's 'Type IV', in failing to spell out in, and using for im. This type persists into the Seventeenth Dynasty, with the implication that jars bearing it should be later than those with Type III, attested in only the Twelfth and (now) Thirteenth Dynasties. Pointing in a similar direction is the fact that Hor's chest, and the jars of Nubhetepthikhered, bear versions of the canopic formula (Types V and VI) which move a step further away from Type III, dropping at the opening of the formula in favour of -eway - the concept of protective embrace that becomes the core of most subsequent canopic formulae. In addition, these two types add the phrase (in) at the beginning, thus heralding the introduction that becomes normal from the Eighteenth Dynasty onwards. Of course, one should be careful of drawing any far-reaching conclusions from such a small sample of material.

Turning to the royal names inscribed on the jars of Hor and Ameny-Qemau, a number of interesting points arise. One is the fact that while Hor employs the full title, nsw-bity, Ameny-Qemau is only called nsw. Looking at the full range of extant royal canopic equipment, the vast majority use simply 'nsw', ranging from the early Seventeenth Dynasty chest of Djehuty, through those of mid-Eighteenth Dynasty kings, down to Apries of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. Only a tiny number use 'nsw-bity', principally those of Tutankhamun (isolated use on two coffinettes only), Smen-
des^{48}), Amenemope (chest only)^{49}, and Harsiese^{50}). That there can be no significance in this variation is shown by the random nature of this distribution, although emphasising that `nsw' is clearly the fundamental designation for a deceased monarch. The same phenomenon of the general use of `nsw' is also seen on royal coffins, the only extant users of `nsw-bity' being Hor^{51}, Taa II^{52}, Tuthmosis I^{53}, Neferneferuaten^{54}, and the Saite coffin provided for Mykerinos^{55}.

The other difference concerns the choice of cartouches on the jars. On Hor's, the prenomen is found on the Imseti and Duamutef jars, the nomen on those of Hapy and Qebehsenuef. Based on the Ameny-Qemau fragments in the Cairo Temporary Register, which only preserve one (nomen) cartouche, together with remains of the Hapy formula, it had been assumed that a similar situation existed in Ameny-Qemau's set, with the Imseti and Duamutef jars adorned with the king's hitherto-unknown prenomen^{56}). However, the photographs here published show that all four jars bore the nomen.

This exclusive use of the nomen seems at first sight curious, since the prenomen is generally seen to be the usual mode of designating a king, where only one name is employed, from the end of the Old Kingdom until the very end of the Third Intermediate Period and later, when the nomen comes to the fore^{57}). However, looking at funerary equipment of the Second Intermediate Period, the situation appears rather less singular. Taking canopics first, of the three extant Seventeenth Dynasty, only that of Inyotef V^{58}) includes a prenomen, albeit in the same cartouche as the nomen. Those of Djehuty^{59}) and Sobkemsaf II^{60}) carry only a nomen. Likewise, the coffins of Inyotef V^{61}) and VI^{62}), together with Kamose, have only a nomen (without even a cartouche in the latter case)^{63}).

IV. The King

The discovery that all four canopic jars of Ameny-Qemau bore his nomen removes the main hope of easily ascertaining his prenomen, and thus tying him into the Thirteenth Dynasty through the Turin Canon or other documents, given his apparent absence under the guise of his nomen from

48 Metropolitan Museum of Art 47.60, and Paris, Aubert Collection.
49 Cairo JE 86068.
50 Cairo JE 59900. The texts of all these are provided in CEKE, 168, 172, 176, 178.
51 Cairo CG 28106.
52 Cairo CG 61001.
53 Cairo CG 61025.
54 Cairo JE 39627.
55 British Museum EA 6647. All original texts from royal coffins will be published in Dodson, The Coffins and Canopic Equipment from the Tomb of Tutankhamun (in preparation).
56 CEKE, 30.
58 Sekhemre-wepmaet: Louvre E 2538; CEKE, 150.
59 Berlin 1175; CEKE, 148.
60 Sekhemre-wadjkhau (?): Leiden AH 216; CEKE, 152.
61 Louvre E 3019.
62 Nubkheperre (BM EA 6652).
63 Dodson, Coffins; the latter situation, however, may be due to lack of space on the 'stock' coffin, since the preceding Taa II includes both his cartouches. Inyotef VII (Sekhemre-heruhiirmaat), probably short-lived successor of Inyotef VI, had his prenomen inscribed on his coffin (Louvre E 3020); one might imply that the practice of using both prenomen and nomen was reverted to in the latter half of the Seventeenth Dynasty.
any other monuments). However, the implication of the canopic formulation, that he should precede Hor, is wholly consistent with the typological position of Ameny-Qemau’s sarcophagus/canopic chest amongst the period’s funerary monuments.

This places the pyramid between the Hawara monument of Ammenemes III and the North Pyramid at Mazghuna, which in turn precedes the Southern Mazghuna monument, and finally that of Khendjer. The latter, and the tomb of Hor, are the only royal sepulchres of the dynasty securely tied into its chronological structure. Ameny-Qemau ought thus to fall amongst the first dozen kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty. In view of the extreme rarity of the ‘Qemau’ element in royal names, there might seem a high likelihood that it is he who is referred to in the nomen of King Hetepibre-Hornedjhiyrotet-si-Qemau, known from material from near Asyut and the eastern Delta. If the latter monarch has been correctly identified with Turin VI.12’s Sehetepibre, Ameny-Qemau would then logically become the preceding Smenkare. However, this equation has been disproved by the discovery that the latter’s nomen was actually Nebnuni.

On the other hand, if one follows Ryholt in reading Ameny-Qemau’s name as meaning ‘Qemau, (son of) Amen’, taking the ‘Amen’ as being Ammenemes V, this would seem to imply that he had the prenomen Sehetepibre (T.VI.8), and was separated from his alleged ‘son’, Hornedjhiyrotet, by the reigns of Iuefni, Ammenemes VI and Nebnuni. Ryholt nevertheless takes an alternative view of the Turin Sehetepibres, making VI.8 Hornedjhiyrotet and holding that the nomen of the king at VI.12 remains unknown. This would leave Qemau without a known prenomen, and also absent from the Turin Canon.

In the present state of knowledge it is difficult to definitively choose between these options, although Dodson tends to lean towards the T.VI.8 Sehetepibre equation. In any case, it is clear that Ameny-Qemau should be placed amongst the earlier kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty.

Appendix 1: Lepsius Pyramid LIX is identified with the north pyramid of Mazghunah.

Nearly seventy alleged pyramids were logged by Carl Richard Lepsius’ great expedition. Although a number have proven not to be actual pyramids, all but one have been identified by mod-

---

64) Cf., however, the curious fragment published by Hans Goedicke, A puzzling inscription, JEA 45 (1959), 98-9, which may name him, as was pointed out to me by Kim Ryholt (personal communication, 30 August 1996). For this piece, see also H. Fischer/R. Caminos, Ancient Egyptian Epigraphy and Paleography (New York, 1987), 49.

65) Dodson, ZÄS 114, 40.

66) G. Darey, Remarques et notes, RT 16 (1894), 133; A. Kamal, Rapport sur le nécropole d’Arabe-el-Borg, ASAE 3 (1902), 80; L. Habachi, Khnta’-na-Qantir: Importance, ASAE 52 (1954), 458-70, pl. IX. Steven Quirke would also take the names as evidence for a father to son succession, although noting that there remains the possibility of Hornedjhiyrotet’s father being a non-royal Qemau (MK Studies, 129).
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71) For example, L. XXXIII-IV are the North and South Buildings of the Step Pyramid enclosure.
ern research, most recently L.I, the Brick Pyramid at Abu Rowash\textsuperscript{72}); that exception is L. LIX. This monument has long puzzled us, and one might have initially speculated that it could represent the pyramid of Ameny-Qemau. Part of the problem has been a discrepancy in Lepsius' reports: on the plate in the Denkmäler itself\textsuperscript{73}, it is stated to be 'östlich' of Dahshur (village); this is, however, corrected to 'west' in the text volume produced after his death\textsuperscript{74}). The latter also gives other data concerning the monument, which is stated to be:

- A destroyed pyramid clearly seen as a black square, the side of which measured 75 paces (= 58 metres = 110 cubits), oriented to the cardinal points and surrounded by a white circle (of stone chippings) several metres thick;
- \(\frac{3}{4}\) hour's walk away from the southern end of the main Dahshur necropolis.

- Closer to Dahshur village than L. LVI, LVII and LVIII (the Bent Pyramid, its subsidiary and the Black Pyramid).

- It lies in an Arab cemetery built of brick and stone.

\textbf{COMMENT:} a \(\frac{3}{4}\) hour's walk away from the southern end of the main Dahshur necropolis (i.e. the Bent Pyramid), should cover a distance of about 3000 metres; this makes Ameny-Qemau's pyramid too close and brings us to the pyramids of Mazghunah (See Fig. 1);

\textbf{COMMENT:} there is more than one Dahshur:

i. Manshiyet Dahshur close to the Black Pyramid;

ii. Zawiyet Dahshur close to the pyramids of Mazghunah (See Fig. 6 b);

iii. Dahshur village, close to the pyramids of Mazghunah (See Fig. 6 b);

\textbf{COMMENT:} the site of the pyramid of Ameny-Qemau is bare of any modern cemetery. Ernest Mackay's work in 1912 at the northern pyramid of Mazghunah\textsuperscript{75}), however, mentions a Coptic cemetery over the site of his excavation, and a dike (the Gisr Dahshur, adjacent to a drainage canal). For the latter, see Fig. 6 b.

Further to these statements Lepsius' plan of pyramid LIX is redrawn here as fig. 6 a, and certain features lettered for further analysis:

\textbf{A:} a pyramid oriented to the cardinal points and surrounded with chippings, a feature also mentioned in the text.

\textbf{COMMENT:} the chippings might, of course, have been quarried away since Lepsius' day, the bricks recycled and every trace of the pyramid's base denuded.

\textbf{B:} another small pyramid.

\textbf{COMMENT:} this is most probably a queen's pyramid; subsidiary pyramids were not built subsequent to Sesostiris I's monument at Lisht. The relative position of this queen's pyramid is similar to the pyramid of the queen of Khend-
Fig. 6a: Lepsius Pyramid LIX (from LD I, Taf. 43)

Fig. 6b: The north pyramid of Mazghunah = Lepsius Lyramid LIX
C: a long white building.

D: a causeway 50 metres wide.

E: an apparently rectangular building, with a path(?) descending in a north-westerly direction.

F: the desert edge lying at a distance of 300 metres from the pyramid.

G: a dike.

H: an unidentified feature.

Although few of the elements discerned by the Prussian expedition can be easily paralleled in the known components of any of the pyramid complexes south of the main Dahshur necropolis, the distinctly summary examinations carried out in them makes this difficulty less significant than might otherwise be the case. More positively, however, one can safely exclude the equation of LEPSIUS LIX with the pyramid of Ameny-Qemau, and state that the balance of probability would point to its identity with the northern pyramid of Mazghunah.

Appendix 2: Summary List of the Pyramids of the Thirteenth Dynasty

Given the fact that the kings of the late Twelfth Dynasty and those of the Seventeenth all constructed pyramids, one would assume the continuation of the tradition throughout the Thirteenth. However, the latter dynasty’s thirty-plus monarchs are matched by only eight potential kingly pyramids, leaving a considerable shortfall.  

76) Cf. the tomb of Hor as a possible archetype for many of the ‘missing’ tombs.
To the Thirteenth Dynasty we can attribute ten actual pyramids, and two pyramidia in the Cairo Museum\(^7\):

- Mazghunah: North Pyramid (LEPSIUS LIX).
- Mazghunah: pyramid of the queen(?) of the owner of LEPSIUS LIX.
- Mazghunah: South Pyramid.
- Dahshur: ‘Central’ pyramid of Ammenemes V (LEPSIUS LIV).
- South Dahshur: pyramid of Ameny-Qemau.
- South Saqqara: pyramid of Khendjér (LEPSIUS XLIV).
- South Saqqara: pyramid of the queen of Khendjér.
- South Saqqara: Unfinished Pyramid (LEPSIUS XLVI)\(^7\).
- Pyramidia in Cairo: Merneferre Ay.
- Another from Ezbet Rushdi el-Kibira (Tell el-Dab’a)\(^7\).

Appendix 3:
Relative positions of Middle Kingdom Pyramids in Dahshur/Mazghunah area

The following table gives the distances in metres between 5 pyramids, namely the Bent Pyramid, the Black Pyramid, Ameny-Qemau’s pyramid (A-Q), Mazghunah northern pyramid (MN) and Mazghunah southern pyramid (MS):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bent</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>A-Q</th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Q</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>2230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>3450</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abstract

The publication of the canopic jars from the Thirteenth Dynasty pyramid of king Ameny-Qemau at South Dahshur, together with remarks on aspects of the sepulchre’s discovery and context amongst the royal tombs of the late Middle Kingdom. The canopic jars and their inscriptions are discussed in connexion with other examples of the same general date from Dahshur.

\(^7\) The pyramids are mapped conveniently by LEHNER, Complete Pyramids (London, New York, 1997), 10.

\(^7\) The owner has now been identified by RYHOLT as bearing the Nebty-name Wsr-h’tw.

\(^7\) HABACHI, ASAE 52, 471–9; RYHOLT, The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period c. 1800–1550 B.C. (Copenhagen 1997), 82, 146 f., p. 254, argues strongly that these items were the result of the plundering of the Memphis royal cemeteries by the Hyksos, who also transported many other items of sculpture to Tell el-Daba (e.g. CG 392 ff.).
b) Fragments of the Happy Jar (B); the missing parts include

Cairo TR 25 11 and 60 3

a) The Imhotep Jar (A) of Ameny-Qemau