

THE JOURNAL OF
Egyptian
Archaeology

VOLUME 75

1989

PUBLISHED BY

THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY

3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON WC1N 2PG

ISSN 0307-5133

THE JOURNAL OF
Egyptian Archaeology

VOLUME 75

PUBLISHED BY
THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY
3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON WC1N 2PG
1989

CONTENTS

	PAGE
EDITORIAL FOREWORD	vii
MEMPHIS, 1988	D. G. Jeffreys and Lisa L. Giddy 1
TECHNIQUES OF DECORATION IN THE HALL OF BARQUES IN THE TEMPLE OF SETHOS I AT ABYDOS.	John Baines 13
A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF COPPER ORE FRAGMENTS FOUND AT THE OLD KINGDOM TOWN OF BUHEN	El Sayed El Gayar and M. P. Jones 31
A PROTECTIVE MEASURE AT ABYDOS IN THE THIRTEENTH DYNASTY	Anthony Leahy 41
AN EARLY EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY MONUMENT OF SIPAIR FROM SAQQÀRA	Jaromir Malek 61
WALTER SEGAL'S DOCUMENTATION OF CG 51113, THE THRONE OF PRINCESS SAT-AMUN	M. Eaton-Krauss 77
DOMESTIC SHRINES AND THE CULT OF THE ROYAL FAMILY AT EL-'AMARNA	Salima Ikram 89
SOME REMARKS ON THE TRIAL OF MOSE	S. Allam 103
A WORD FOR 'CAUSEWAY' AND THE LOCATION OF 'THE FIVE WALLS'.	Paul John Frandsen 113
A THEBAN TOMB AND ITS TENANTS	Aidan Dodson and Jac. J. Janssen 125
TAKELOTH II—A KING OF THE 'THEBAN TWENTY-THIRD DYNASTY'?	D. A. Aston 139
STATIONS AND TOWERS ON THE QUSEIR-NILE ROAD	Ronald E. Zitterkopf and Steven E. Sidebotham 155
CHRISTIAN PAINTINGS FROM TEBTUNIS	C. C. Walters 191
MUSEUM ACQUISITIONS, 1987	Janine Bourriau 209
BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS	
AN OLD KINGDOM EXPEDIENT FOR ANCHORING INLAID EYES	Henry G. Fischer 213
THE TRANSCRIPTION OF THE ROYAL NAME PEPY	Henry G. Fischer 214
THE CHIEF BAKER	John Coleman Darnell 216
CALEMBOUR, TROMMELWETTSTREIF ODER KAMPF AUF LEBEN UND TOD IN DER AUTOBIOGRAPHISCHEN STELENINSCHRIFT DES EMHAB	Alfred Grimm 220
HATSHEPSUT AND 'HER FATHER' MENTUHOTPE II	Aidan Dodson 224
EARLY SQUEEZES MADE IN THE TOMB OF KHAEMHET	J. Malek and E. Miles 227
AN ARTISTIC INTERPRETATION OF SETY I'S WAR RELIEFS.	Clive Broadhurst 229

BELZONI, THE EGYPTIAN HALL, AND THE DATE OF A LONG-KNOWN SCULPTURE	C. N. Reeves	235
ZWEI BEMERKUNGEN ZU GEBEL ES-SILSILA NR. 100	Karl Jansen-Winkel	237
WAHIBREEMAKHET AT GIZA	Lisa Montagno Leahy	239
FURTHER NOTES ON STELE ASWAN 1057	J. D. Ray	243
THE NATURE OF THE HIEROGLYPH 𓆎	P. M. E. Jones	245
ON THE ACCURACY OF SEXING OF SKELETONS IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS	George E. Mann	246
DQR, SPINNING AND TREATMENT OF GUINEA WORM IN P. EBERS 875	R. L. Miller	249
REVIEWS		
JOHN BAINES, <i>Fecundity Figures</i>	Reviewed by James K. Hoffmeier	255
D. G. JEFFREYS, <i>The Survey of Memphis, I</i>	Michael Jones	256
ANTHONY JOHN SPALINGER, <i>Aspects of the Military Documents of the Ancient Egyptians</i>	William J. Murnane	259
MARK LEHNER, <i>The Pyramid Tomb of Hetep-heres and the Satellite Pyramid of Khufu</i>	I. E. S. Edwards	261
RAINER STADELMANN, <i>Die ägyptischen Pyramiden</i>	Erhart Graefe	265
LABIB HABACHI, <i>Elephantine IV. The Sanctuary of Heqaib</i>	Rita Freed	266
ASHRAF I. SADEK, <i>The Amethyst Mining Inscriptions of Wadi el-Hudi, II</i>	Edmund S. Meltzer	270
M. EATON-KRAUSS AND E. GRAEFE, <i>The Small Golden Shrine from the Tomb of Tutankhamun</i>	Kate Bosse-Griffiths	271
R. HARI, <i>La tombe thébaine du père divin Neferhotep (TT 50)</i>	Lise Manniche	273
WILLIAM J. MURNANE, <i>The Road to Kadesh</i>	K. A. Kitchen	276
GEOFFREY THORNDIKE MARTIN <i>et al.</i> , <i>The Tomb-chapels of Paser and Racia at Saqqâra</i>	Alain-Pierre Zivie	278
DOMINIQUE VALBELLE, <i>"Les Ouvriers de la tombe" Deir el-Médineh à l'époque ramesside</i>	M. L. Bierbrier	279
JEAN-CLAUDE GOYON, <i>Les Dieux-Gardiens et la genèse des temples</i>	J. Gwyn Griffiths	281
HEIKE STERNBERG, <i>Mythische Motive und Mythenbildung in den ägyptischen Tempeln und Papyri der Grieschisch-römischen Zeit</i>	J. Gwyn Griffiths	283
JEAN LECLANT AND G. CLERC, <i>Inventaire bibliographique des Isiaca, L-Q (IBIS)</i>	J. Gwyn Griffiths	285
WIKTOR ANDRZEJ DASZEWSKI, <i>Corpus of Mosaics from Egypt, I. Hellenistic and Early Roman Period (Aegyptiaca Treverensia 3)</i>	D. M. Bailey	286
SOPHIE KAMBITZIS (ed.), <i>Le Papyrus Thmouis I, colonnes 68-160</i>	J. David Thomas	288
NAPHTALI LEWIS (ed.), <i>Papyrology</i>	Revel Coles	289
SUSAN A. STEPHENS, <i>Yale Papyri in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, II</i>	Bärbel Kramer	291

CONTENTS

v

MICHAEL FACKELMANN, <i>Restaurierung von Papyrus und anderen Schriftträgern aus Ägypten</i>	Adam Bülow-Jacobsen	295
COLETTE SIRAT <i>et al.</i> , <i>Les Papyrus en caractères hébraïques trouvés en Égypte</i>	J. B. Segal	297
E. C. KRUPP (ed.), <i>Archaeoastronomy and the Roots of Science</i>	Rolf Krauss	298
Other books received	298

undoubtedly reflected in the daybook entries, his involvement was not their entire *raison d'être*. I would prefer to say that the ideology of kingship required that the Pharaoh's personal leadership be glorified in a fitting manner, and that, while short compositions of the *iw.tw* form were not excluded, the preferred medium was a lengthier effusion which would, of course, draw on the daybooks for information: what else, after all, was available? The inscriptions which Spalinger characterizes (pp. 126-7) as having the daybook as their core are simply those in which this source is most obvious. Even those described as 'without daybook as core', however, must have depended on such a record for the nuggets of hard information they contain (e.g. dates). I am not assuming that Spalinger overlooks or denies this, but there is an essential distinction between form and purpose which must be kept in mind. To be sure, elaborate compositions in the 'King as Hero' vein generally describe campaigns which the Pharaoh led, just as sorties led by others are often relegated to shorter reports (e.g. the *iw.tw* form). This, however, is not a fixed rule. As we have seen, the *iw.tw* formula also applies to summaries of wars directed by the king in person; and there is at least one example of an extended 'literary report' on a campaign which the king did *not* lead, i.e. the Karnak war inscription of Merneptah (*KRI* IV, 2-12). To see these cases as exceptions to a general rule or as reflecting the 'eclecticism' of later scribes (p. 211) unnecessarily implies that these forms were originally tied to a specific environment (the king's presence or absence) which was eroded over time (cf. p. 193). Spalinger's literary analysis, which demonstrates eloquently how eclectic these compositions could be, even in the Eighteenth Dynasty (pp. 193-206), does not require this assumption. Let us hope that these results, which the author has modestly described as preliminary (pp. 237-8), will be a foundation for further contributions from his pen.

WILLIAM J. MURNANE

The Pyramid Tomb of Hetep-heres and the Satellite Pyramid of Khufu. By MARK LEHNER. Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut, Abteilung Kairo, Sonderschrift 19. 330 × 210 mm. Pp. x + 85, figs. 27. Mainz am Rhein, Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1985. ISBN 3 8053 0814 0. Price DM 88.

In Egyptological circles, at least, Professor G. A. Reisner was known not only for his outstanding work as an archaeologist, but also as a keen student of detective fiction. When, in 1925, the Boston-Harvard expedition, under his direction, found the shaft- and stairway-tomb of Hetepheres at Giza (G7000x), it gave him an opportunity to try his hand at practical detective work. The tomb appeared to be intact and yet the sarcophagus was empty. Reisner conjectured that the queen had been buried near her husband, Snofru, at Dahshur and that robbers had entered the tomb soon after her burial and had stolen her body for its rich equipment. He also conjectured that, although Cheops was told that the tomb had been violated, he was not informed that the thieves had taken his mother's body. In the hope of achieving greater security, he ordered a secret tomb to be prepared for her at Giza, near his pyramid, and all the contents of her original tomb were transferred to the new tomb, where they remained undisturbed for more than four thousand years.

The views of Reisner and those of the writer of this book (who is directing a project sponsored by the American Research Center in Egypt and Yale University for mapping the Giza plateau) have little in common, except that they both believe that Hetepheres had two tombs and that a cutting in the rock immediately to the south of G7000x was part of the entrance-corridor of a pyramid which was never built. Reisner thought G7000x was the queen's second tomb, but Lehner maintains it was her first. The abandonment of work on the pyramid (GI-x) was, according to Reisner, a consequence of the decision to place the 'secret tomb' in front of it, while Lehner believes that the cutting was made *after* G7000x had been prepared; in his opinion GI-x, if it had been completed, would have formed the superstructure of G7000x, but there would have been no connecting passage between the two substructures.

An examination of the site of GI-x revealed that the surface of the rock had been 'regularized, although not levelled, to a point 3.9 m. south of the shaft' (of G7000x, p. 7), where there was a shallow cutting which probably marked the intended northern limit of the pyramid. Lehner freely concedes that such a layout has no real parallel in the Fourth Dynasty, but it has some affinities with the Step

Pyramid of Zoser and the Layer Pyramid of Zawiyet el-Aryan. G7000x is, however, situated 'almost exactly in the place occupied by a north entrance chapel such as has been found attached to other royal pyramids dating from the 4th to the 13th Dynasties' (p. 6). In conclusion, he makes two suggestions: (1) 'G7000x may have been hastily prepared before a clear idea was formed of what type of superstructure the tomb should possess' and (2) 'GI-x would have been the first subsidiary pyramid intended for a queen, those at Meidum and Dahshur being ritual pyramids of the king. Therefore the pyramid substructure reflected a vacillation between 3rd and early 4th Dynasty precedents and the innovation of the rock-cut sloping passage being developed in the king's pyramid (GI) then under construction' (p. 10).

Whether GI-x was cut before or after the construction of G7000x, it may have been intended to be the initial element of the first of three pyramids for queens set in line from north to south. No preparations for the two other pyramids had been made. Lehner writes: 'At the time Hetep-heres I died the Eastern Cemetery with its blocks of mastaba cores organized by streets and avenues had not been laid out on the site. The area that would later be covered by this cemetery was characterized by the natural crusty bedrock surface dipping gently from NW to SE' (p. 35). Bearing in mind that so little work was done on GI-x (Lehner estimates no more than 'several days') and that G7000x was never finished, it is conceivable that the king had second thoughts about the whole project, but not before the burial had taken place. At any rate, three queens' pyramids were built 28.0 m to the west, nearer to the Great Pyramid. According to Lehner, 'the reason for the change concerned calculations and measurements for the unified plan of the Eastern Cemetery which was still being formulated' (p. 38). Later in the book he ascribes it to 'the establishment of a new long, north-south axis to which all the subsidiary pyramids would be aligned' (p. 65). As soon as the substructure of the northernmost queen's pyramid (GI-a) had been completed, he maintains, the blocking of the shaft of G7000x was extracted, some of the furniture in the chamber was removed in order to make it possible to reach the Canopic chest and the sarcophagus. Having cleared a way to the end of the chamber, the workmen were able to lift the lid of the sarcophagus by breaking its south-west corner and levering it up. The queen's body was then taken for burial in GI-a and the furniture in G7000x, which had been shifted, was put back in place. Finally, the shaft was re-filled and its mouth was overlaid 'with irregular local limestone paving so as to camouflage it with the surrounding natural rock surface ... Later, it became covered with the limestone gravel and packed mud of the 4th Dynasty street' (p. 40).

With disarming modesty, Lehner tells the reader: 'The truth may lie somewhere between the two explanations (i.e. Reisner's and his own). It might, for example, be argued that Reisner is correct about the earlier plundered tomb and the transfer of the burial. Even if the body had been lost, it could still be argued that the unfinished tomb GI-x had been intended as a superstructure for the burial of Hetep-heres' (p. 41).

In both Reisner's and Lehner's theories, two tombs are postulated, one of which was G7000x. But is it really necessary to suppose that Hetepheres had a second tomb, unless and until some positive evidence comes to light to provide proof of it? Reisner's conjecture that the queen's body was stolen at Dahshur and that the king was kept in ignorance of the theft seems rather fanciful. Cheops must have seen the damaged sarcophagus either at Dahshur or while it was being taken to the Giza tomb and he could hardly have failed to inquire whether the body was safe or not. Lehner's reasoning that the damage to the lid of the sarcophagus was done in the Giza tomb and was done with the tools which were left in the tomb (and which were a puzzle to Reisner) seems much more probable. Is he right, though, in thinking that it was done by necropolis workmen in order to remove the body and transfer it to GI-a? It seems more likely that such rough treatment could only have been inflicted by robbers working in a hurry. Lehner points out that, if the openers 'had used levers and supports under the projecting lugs of the lid, it might have been possible to open it without damage' (p. 30). But that method would have required more room to manoeuvre than was available without removing very much of the furniture in the vicinity of the sarcophagus. Again, it can be argued that it would only be robbers who would have been short of time. They would have had to act quickly not only before work on blocking the shaft had begun but under cover of darkness when the hundreds of builders and labourers were not working on the Great Pyramid.

If it be assumed that G7000x was the queen's only tomb and that her body was stolen soon after her funeral, many difficulties which are inherent in both Reisner's and Lehner's theories disappear. It

would explain why the Canopic chest was not removed from G7000x. If the body had been transferred to GI-a, the chest would surely have been taken with it. Is it conceivable that the Egyptians of the Old Kingdom would have been so profligate as to leave such a wealth of furniture in what would have been an abandoned tomb? On the other hand, it is easy to imagine why it should have been left there after the body had been stolen and why the shaft should have been blocked and its mouth concealed, both by camouflage and by the construction of a road over it. A superstructure would, in the circumstances, have been inappropriate, since there would have been no reason for presenting offerings to the dead owner. Moreover, it would have served as a marker betraying the exact position of the tomb to later robbers. It may have been for these same reasons that work on the pyramidal superstructure was abandoned so soon after it was begun. However, it must be recognized that the evidence is insufficient for a positive conclusion to be formed and Lehner's theory cannot be lightly discarded, nor can Reisner's, even though some of his individual observations and conclusions have been shown by Lehner to be invalid.

A century and a half ago, H. Vyse and J. S. Perring excavated what they termed the 'inclined passages' north-east of the Great Pyramid. The results, together with a plan and detailed measurements, were published in *The Pyramids of Gizeh*, I, 189-90 and II, 130. Perring, in a note at the latter reference, remarked: 'As the flaws in the sides of them (i.e. the passages) have been made good, and as the rock has been levelled for the foundation of a building, it was probably intended to erect a pyramid over them.' Petrie, in *The Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh* (1883), 50, calls these rock cuttings trial passages and describes them as 'a model of the Great Pyramid passages, shortened in length, but of full size in width and height'. He adds that the only respect in which they differ is in the vertical shaft which is placed at the junction of the ascending and the descending passages and not like 'the well in the pyramid gallery'. Most writers in recent years have followed Borchardt in regarding the three chambers (the lowest unfinished) as indicating changes in the architectural plan adopted as the building rose. Such an interpretation of the pyramid's evolution is, however, not easily reconcilable with a model carved in the rock for 'trial' purposes and the weight of evidence seems to be clearly against Petrie's assumption that the passages were a model.

Now we have from Lehner a new and attractive explanation of the 'trial' passages. In his opinion, they were cut in the rock to form the substructure of a satellite pyramid which was never built. At Meidum and in the enclosure of the Bent Pyramid at Dahshur, the satellite pyramids, like the mastabas in the enclosures of the step pyramids of Zoser and Sekhemkhet, were situated on the south sides of the main pyramid, and the same applied to the subsidiary pyramid of Chephren at Giza. A north-eastern orientation for the satellite pyramid of Cheops would be without parallel, but its position might have been dictated by practical considerations. The principal quarry from which stone was obtained for the inner core of the Great Pyramid lay immediately south of it and consequently it was most probably the side on which the chief supply ramp was erected. If so, there would have been no free space on that side for building a satellite pyramid until a very late stage in the construction of the main pyramid and its complex, when the ramp would have been dismantled. Nevertheless, there is, cut in the rock on the south side of the Great Pyramid, a short sloping passage leading to a small chamber which Junker, who found it, suggested was intended to be the substructure for the pyramid of a queen, but it seems an unlikely explanation, especially in view of the fact that a comparable construction was found at the pyramid of Chephren, where there was a subsidiary pyramid.

Since the superstructure of the satellite pyramid was not built, calculating its intended dimensions is rather an academic exercise, but it leads to some interesting conjectures regarding the development of the Great Pyramid complex. First, however, it is necessary to note that Lehner does not seem to have paid much attention to Perring's assertion that the rock had been levelled in the vicinity of the passages, perhaps because he did not regard the extent of the ground so treated as being likely to be indicative in determining the area covered by the base. One important factor which he had to bear in mind was that the buildings near the satellite pyramid had undergone major changes in the course of time, with the result that the space which had at first been available for its layout was diminished. The mortuary temple, he believes, was initially designed as a small edifice comparable with the mortuary temple of the Bent Pyramid. Some evidence of it may still lie in a roughly rectangular cutting in the rock behind the sanctuary of the subsequent mortuary temple. Another possibility is that the causeway was originally planned differently at its upper end so that it would join the Great Pyramid

enclosure wall at its north-eastern corner, like the causeway of the Bent Pyramid. The boat-pits north of the temple and parallel to the causeway would not have been constructed. With such a configuration it would have been possible to build a satellite pyramid based on a layout square of 200 cubits to a side but reduced on each side by 3.0 m. The north-south axis of that pyramid would have been positioned over a long and shallow trench cut in the rock parallel to the trial passages and about 7.0 m to the west. The east-west axis would have been over the vertical shaft in the passages. The north-south axis of the trench would have been in line with the west side of the entrance corridor of the first queen's pyramid (GI-a).

When it was decided to build a much larger mortuary temple and to have a straighter causeway, there was no room for a satellite pyramid laid out from a square of 200 cubits. In its stead, Lehner believes, a pyramid with sides of about 88-9 cubits (46.5 m) was planned. It would have been about the same size as the pyramids of the queens. By the foreshortening of the passages at a scale of 1 to 5.5 in relation to those in the Great Pyramid (as determined by the length of the ascending passage), both the passages and the chambers would fit into the superstructure and occupy appropriate places. However, it remained unbuilt and Lehner, as a 'final possibility', asks whether 'GI-a could have been taken over as the satellite pyramid' when the original project was abandoned 'in favour of the expanded mortuary temple and final route of the causeway' even though it had been built for the queen-mother. In that case, he suggests, Hetepheres would have been buried in one of the two other queens' pyramids, GI-b or GI-c. In support of that surmise, he points out that, although the surface of the rock at the eastern centre of GI-a has been regularized, no trace of a chapel, not even of its ground-plan, remains, despite the survival of such relics at GI-b and GI-c. The absence of a chapel would certainly be anomalous in a queen's pyramid.

How are Lehner's two proposals to be assessed? In the reviewer's opinion, neither is capable of proof, but his arguments for the satellite pyramid are considerably more persuasive than those for a transfer of the body of Hetepheres from G7000x to GI-a or GI-b. The evidence for the shaft of G7000x having been reopened and refilled after the removal of the body is slender and would appear to lend itself to more than one interpretation. His claim that it was the intention to build a pyramid over G7000x, on the other hand, would be hard to dispute, and that alone constitutes a valuable addition to knowledge. With regard to the substructure of the satellite pyramid, which was never built, the term 'trial passages' adopted by Petrie has proved to be mistaken, because it indicates a purpose which Lehner has shown they were not intended to fulfil. His definition 'replica passages' is anodyne and indeed more accurate. It was always difficult to believe in Petrie's interpretation, which seemed to imply that chambers and corridors of the Great Pyramid were designed in their final layout from the beginning, not in three phases, which seemed probable from structural evidence. In other pyramids there is a resemblance in design between the interior plans of the satellite and the main pyramid, so that there would be nothing exceptional in having approximate conformity in the case of the Great Pyramid. The most exceptional feature would be the location of the satellite pyramid north-east of the main pyramid.

It will already have become evident to readers of this review that Lehner has produced a work which is indeed valuable and important for pyramid studies. In every probability it will be reprinted and the opportunity should be taken to put right the numerous graphic errors, which are in striking contrast with the level of scientific accuracy visible throughout the book. It would serve no useful purpose to catalogue these faults here, save in one case, namely his references to Petrie's *Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh*. In every instance the page and plate numbers quoted are those of the 1885 abridged edition, but the reference is stated to be to the 1883 edition. Since the discrepancies between the two editions are considerable, and since few readers are likely to possess both editions, the following correspondence of the citations as given by Lehner and the passages in the 1883 edition may be helpful:

1885 edition reference

p. 25, n. 9 Petrie, 1883, 51-2
 p. 45 Petrie, 1883, 15-16, pl. II
 p. 48 Petrie, 1883, 15-16, pl. II
 p. 50 Petrie, 1883, pl. II

1883 edition reference

135-6
 50-1, pl. III
 50-1, pl. III
 pl. III

1885

p. 52	Petrie, 1883, 17
p. 60, n. 25	Petrie, 1883, 85
p. 61	Petrie, 1883, 87
p. 62	Petrie, 1883, pl. v
p. 63	Petrie, 1883, 21-2
p. 65, n. 31	Petrie, 1883, 34
p. 66, n. 32	Petrie, 1883, 83
p. 59	Petrie, 1983 (sic) 93

1883

55
213
214-15
pl. IX
64-5
104
213
1883, 220

I. E. S. EDWARDS

Die ägyptischen Pyramiden. By RAINER STADELMANN. Vom Ziegelbau zum Weltwunder (Kulturgeschichte der Antiken Welt Bd. 30) 255 × 180 mm. Pp. 296, figs. 92, colour pls. 23, pls. 54. Verlag Ph. v. Zabern, Mainz 1985. ISBN 3 8053 0855 8. Price DM 78.

Anders als manche früheren Bücher über die ägyptischen Pyramiden ist dieses von vornherein in normalem Buchformat und mit hervorragender Ausstattung an Zeichnungen und Photos herausgebracht worden; sicherlich ein Zeichen dafür, daß man mit weiter Verbreitung auch außerhalb des Kreises der Fachgelehrten rechnet. Der Autor widmete das Werk Jean Philippe Lauer (dessen eigenes ähnlich konzipiertes Buch von 1952 zuletzt in der Version von 1974 auch 1980 in Deutsch in ähnlicher Aufmachung herauskam¹), sowie dem Andenken von Ludwig Borchardt und Herbert Ricke.

Die ägyptischen Pyramiden gehören zu denjenigen Denkmälern, die immer wieder das besondere Interesse der Archäologen auf sich ziehen und so ist in den letzten zwanzig Jahren derart viel neues Material hinzugekommen, daß man eine neue zusammenfassende Darstellung aus der Feder eines der Pyramiden-‘Ausgräber’ nur begrüßen kann.

In sechs Kapiteln werden zunächst die Entwicklung der Königsgräber (‘Abydenisches Grubengrab’ und ‘Butische Mastaba’), hin zu Stufenpyramide und echter Pyramide dargestellt; danach die Gestalt und Veränderung der Kultanlagen einschließlich der sogenannten ‘Sonnenheiligtümer’ und unsere heutigen Vorstellungen über die technische Seite des Pyramidenbaus des Alten Reiches. Das siebte Kapitel ist den Pyramidenbauten des Mittleren Reiches gewidmet und das letzte zur Abrundung den Pyramiden von der 3. ZwZt. and bis zu den späten nubischen Pyramiden.

Anmerkungen sind en bloc am Ende angefügt, es folgen ein Abkürzungsverzeichnis, eine Bibliographie, Zeittafel und Fotonachweis. Bedauerlicherweise fehlt ein Index.

Es sei mir gestattet, mein Gesamturteil über dieses Buch schon dieser Inhaltsübersicht anzufügen: Es ist eine sehr gute und verständliche Darstellung des aktuellen Forschungsstandes, wobei ich besonders hervorheben möchte, daß die zahlreichen Lücken in unserer Kenntnis bzw. die unterschiedlich deutbaren Fakten dort, wo es notwendig ist, vom Autor angemerkt werden (was für ein Buch, das auf einen größeren Leserkreis zielt, leider nicht immer selbstverständlich ist). Das heißt aber auch, daß der Verfasser bei manchen Problemen, die kontrovers beurteilt werden, Stellung beziehen muß. Auf einige möchte ich (in meiner willkürlichen Auswahl) hinweisen:

- (1) Der Königsfriedhof der Frühzeit war der von Saqqara, nicht der abydenische (S. 10 ff, bes. S. 33/34).
- (2) König Huni hat nicht die Meidumpyramide begonnen, auch sie ist ein Projekt des Snofru (S. 79 mit Anm. 262).
- (3) In der Frage der Deutung des Djoserbezirks (S. 60ff) folgt Stadelmann Kaiser (keine Jenseitsresidenz, sondern Kultbühne für Bestattungsfeierlichkeiten) gegen Brinks (vgl. S. 40, Anm. 100, 128).

¹ *Le problème des pyramides d’Égypte* (Paris, 1952) bzw. *Le mystère des pyramides* (Paris, 1974), deutsch *Das Geheimnis der Pyramiden. Baukunst und Technik* (München/Berlin, 1980).