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ABSTRACT

Ancient Egyptian belief in an afterlife influenced a wide variety of architectural and art forms. In the Eighteenth Dynasty at Thebes, non-royal officials were equipped with tombs that were decorated to aid in their everlasting sustenance and rebirth in the hereafter as well as commemorate them to living visitors. Part of this continuation of life involved the participation of the funerary cult of the deceased, as well as the prompting of visitors to speak the owner’s name and provide the required offerings—allowing (and encouraging) public access to the decorated tomb chapel. However, some visitors wished to harm the deceased’s perpetuation of life. In order to obliterate the memory of the tomb owner in the minds of the living and his existence in the afterlife, enemies carefully hacked the tomb owner’s images out of the decoration program in an act of damnatio memoriae. The owners of Theban tombs 66, 75, and 76 fell victim to this intentional destruction by contemporary hands.
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1 INTRODUCTION

A proper burial was essential for the successful transition into a transfigured being in the afterlife. The tomb itself, the ‘home for eternity,’ served as the catalyst for this shift each ancient Egyptian diligently prepared to make. Each aspect of the tomb held an important meaning for the owner and their funerary cult. In the Eighteenth Dynasty of the New Kingdom, the structure, layout, and decoration of the tomb of a non-royal official was thoughtfully chosen to commemorate his life and ensure a successful transition into the afterlife. The tombs of officials that served the pharaoh in varying capacities dotted the western desert cliffs and were oriented towards their ruler’s mortuary temple or to the Temple of Amun at Karnak on the opposite bank. Similar in function to the nearby pharaohs’ mortuary temples, these tombs served the deceased officials’ funerary cult and perpetuated their memory for eternity—or until the deceased became a victim of damnatio memoriae.\(^1\) As the Latinized term devised by modern day scholars suggests, damnatio memoriae references the damnation of an individual’s memory into oblivion. This phenomenon has occurred from the onset of the earliest civilizations, but it is best known from Roman imperial portraiture.\(^2\) However, the earliest practice of damnatio occurred thousands of years before throughout the ancient Near East in response to the power represented by an image.

As the focus of this study, the decorated walls located in the above ground tomb chapel incurred intentional destruction to the tomb owner by enemies. My first exposure to this phenomenon was through photographs and line drawings of the decoration program of Theban

\(^2\) See Eric Varner, *Mutilation and Transformation: Damnatio Memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture*. In Roman society, imperial portraits expressed political authority and prestige as they were prominently displayed throughout the empire. Mutilations of these portraits (as well as monuments and inscriptions) of the “bad” emperors spoke volumes to Roman citizens, 1.
tomb 75 of Amenhotep-si-se, a Second High Priest of Amun. Every instance of Amenhotep-si-se’s large, painted figure was chiseled out along and within the outline of his image. What does intentionally damaging an image of a person actually mean?

Sifting through the different categories of destruction (defined in the next section), the following discussion will address the damage as the result of ill-intentioned, enemy-driven damnatio memoriae found in the tombs of officials that are securely dated to the reign of Thutmose IV of the Eighteenth Dynasty (1400-1390 BCE). The significance of the tomb to the owner and the decoration in the tomb chapel (discussed in the next section) gives insight into how detrimental the removal of the deceased’s figure was to their eternal well-being. For the ancient Egyptians (and other cultures of the ancient Near East), representations of people, deities, and objects were imbued with the life force of what is signified in the various mediums.\(^3\) The three Theban tombs (denoted as TT from here on) for analysis are those of Hepu (TT 66), Amenhotep-si-se (TT 75), and Tjenuna (TT 76). In addition to the tomb chapel walls themselves, I use ancient Egyptian religious and mortuary literature to understand the relationship between the various components of ancient Egyptian identity to the tomb structure and decoration. I propose that the carefully excised images of an individual were attacked to mimic acts of violence to a human body with the intention to act on two levels—to ritually “kill” the living entity embodied by the image and to erase their memory in the minds of the living.

---

2 CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK

‘Little is in life on earth, Eternity is in the necropolis.’ – (Amen)user (TT 131), 18th Dynasty

All life long, ancient Egyptian officials prepared for the inevitable day of departure to the ‘Field of Reeds.’ Their status in life determined what kind of burial and funerary equipment could be afforded. Ideally, a proper burial as attested in the literature asks for, above all, “a goodly burial in the west.” Regardless of how the official received his portion of the necropolis, once the tomb was hewn from the rock cliff, the walls provided the necessary information to assist the tomb owner on two levels—to mirror his status in life into the afterlife and to maintain his position and importance to future generations who would provide for his funerary cult.

A number of aspects constituted an individual in life and death (Table 2.1). Each of the following components, or “manifestations,” of a person had their own afterlife. First and foremost, the physical body was preserved in the likeness of the deceased to serve as the eternal home for the *ka*, *ba*, heart (*ib* and *h₃ty*), and shadow. The body was mummified and contained the *ib*, which was believed to be the seat of moral character and would be weighed against the feather of *ma’at* in hopes of the deceased being declared by Osiris as *m₃h₃rw*, or “true of voice.”

There are three different levels of typical Eighteenth Dynasty rock-cut tombs with distinct functions and relationships to ancient Egyptian religion (Figure 2.1). Accessible to the public, the tomb chapel rests between the two opposing realms of the sun (upper level) and underworld (lower level). The middle ground, starting in the forecourt leading into the tomb chapel proper, served as a meeting point between the living and the dead, with hopes of an intervention by their

---

5 Hartwig, 22.
6 Dodson, 13-14.
departed loved one. Required offerings, corporal or verbal, sustained the tomb owner’s *ka*, or life force, within the tomb. As a laud to the solar cult, the uppermost portion of the tomb structure, open to the rays of the sun, consisted of a superstructure in the shape of a pyramid or façade with recesses for funerary cones and, sometimes, a place for a stelophorus statue containing a solar hymn. Void of light, the lower level echoed the cavernous land of Osiris where the body would be laid to rest. The shaft would typically be cut into the floor of the inner chamber before the statue niche and end in a burial chamber. The mummified corpse of the tomb owner was placed in the burial chamber. Further protected by sarcophagi and coffins, the mummy functioned as the home and final resting place for the dead person’s *ba* and *ka*. Together, the name, mummy, statues, and two-dimensional references to the tomb owner worked in conjunction with his mortuary cult to eternally perpetuate his existence on earth and in the afterlife.⁸

In the tomb chapel, visitors, encouraged to speak the deceased’s name, deposited offerings and letters or participated in festivals within the confines of the liminal space of the tomb chapel. Eighteenth Dynasty tombs were typically an inverted T-shape in plan. This layout clearly divided the eastern land of the living from the western land of the dead in hall form. Despite the actual layout of the tomb, each tomb was ritually placed on an east-west axis. In combination with text, each scene adorning the walls of the transverse hall of the T-shaped tomb were carefully picked to relay significant events and the most important aspects of the tomb owner’s career. Subtle and more obvious references to rebirth, domination over chaos, and continuous cycles of the seasons also decorate the walls throughout the transverse and longitudinal halls.⁹ As the largest, most elaborate, and most frequently depicted figure, the tomb owner was easy to identify—and thus an easy target for intentional destruction by enemies. *Blickpunktsbilder*, or the focal walls opposite

---

⁸ Hartwig, 5-7.
⁹ Ibid, 53.
the tomb entrance, receive the most natural light and highlight significant scenes, usually showing the close relationship between the pharaoh and the tomb owner or an equally important aspect of their career.  

Table 2.1 Attributes of the living and the dead (from Nicola Harrington 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes of the living</th>
<th>Additional attributes gained after death</th>
<th>Objects created for the continuation of the dead to living world</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka (k3; vitality)</td>
<td>Corpse (h3t)</td>
<td>Tomb (is, mr, 3h 3i)</td>
<td>Heka (h3k3; magic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba (b3; movement)</td>
<td>Mummy (s’h3)</td>
<td>Statues (nwt)</td>
<td>Akh (3h 3i; powerful state of entire being)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (rn; individuality)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stelae (’h3; wd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ib-heart (emotion, intellect, morality); h3ty-heart (physical organ)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offering tables (‘b3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3-body (physical appearance)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropoid busts (nwt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow (s3wr; movement)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shabtis (us:3bry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1 Typical New Kingdom Theban tomb schematic.

2.1 Types of Destruction

All of the elite tombs located in the western desert have some form of damage. To differentiate damnatio memoriae, all types of damage need to be outlined. Enemy-driven destruction in the tomb chapels of the officials in the Theban cemetery can be detected in a few forms. According to Alan Shulman’s study from 1969, damnatio memoriae is “the practice of

10 Ibid, 17.
destroying the memory and very existence of a person from the knowledge of both his contemporaries and posterity. To the Egyptians this practice had a dual purpose—to wipe out the victim’s memory on earth and to destroy his existence in the afterworld.”

His definition requires a threefold condition that I cannot agree with. For Shulman, the practice must consist of the removal of every reference to both the individual’s name and image on all of their monuments. By his definition, a true damnatio memoriae must consist of both the victim’s name and image. However, this depends on a level of literacy unattainable by the ancient Egyptian population at large. In regards to the figure of the tomb owner, his or her image was removed typically in one of two ways. One mode of execution partially removed the figure, with focus given to the face as the seat of identity. The other mode was more thorough as it removed the entire image of the tomb owner, carefully following the outline of his or her figure. Oftentimes, damage to the name was rarely executed fully, if at all. Ann Macy Roth describes eight modes of mutilation carried out on Hatshepsut’s relief-cut images: 1 – scratching with a pointed implement, 2 – chipped silhouette with a flat chisel, 3 – rectangular roughening, 4 – smoothing and plastering, 5 – replacement of her figure with an inanimate object or replacement of her cartouches, 6 – patching, 7 – covering, and 8 – dismantling. The painted tomb chapels of officials on the west bank of Thebes in my study only contain Roth’s second mode of destruction with clearly defined chisel marks following (and occurring within) the outline of the figures.

A large amount of destruction is simply ‘wear and tear’ over the few thousand years of their existence. Natural destruction can take many forms, such as earthquakes and other natural disasters. Additionally, not all tombs were created equally. The quality of the rock cliffs varies

---

12 Ibid, 37.
across the desert. Rock-cut tombs cut into the friable limestone led to a bad state of repair from the onset, while other tombs weakened and collapsed over time. Rock-cut tombs honeycombed the desert cliffs and occasionally newer tomb construction would accidentally encroach on an earlier tomb. This type of natural and accidental destruction is fairly easy to recognize. It consists of large visible cracks, collapsed walls, and holes with signs of repair. Furthermore, wasps were no strangers to the Theban tombs. For those tombs inhabited by wasps, nests were attached to the ceilings and walls—leaving telltale outlines and damaging underlying decoration.

Usurpation of tombs could also result in intentional destruction of the original tomb owner’s name and of specific aspects of the decoration program, including the biographical texts, which were replaced with the name and personal details of the new owner.\textsuperscript{14} Even though tomb chapels were open to the public, a group of Nubian mercenaries, called the Medjay, were employed in the necropolis to guard the tombs as best as they could from those who would harm them. Some cases of usurpation could be the result of tombs abandoned by the funerary cult—potentially a few generations after the owner was buried.\textsuperscript{15} Ancient Egyptians from later dynasties could also benefit from the existing tomb by altering the personal information to transfer the magical imagery and text to themselves.\textsuperscript{16}

Dramatic changes in the ancient Egyptian religion prompted another form of destruction. Enforced by Akhenaten, the religious reform under his rule favored a single god in the form of the sun disk called the Aten. Amun, the hidden one, was quickly abandoned in favor of the all


\textsuperscript{15} Nicola Harrington notes in \textit{Living with the Dead} that the deceased’s memory typically faded from social memory after a couple of generations before being absorbed into the collective ancestor community, 29.

\textsuperscript{16} During the tumultuous times of the Third Intermediate Period, tombs were reused and usurped as the result of limited resources available to afford entirely new burials. Theban tombs were also reused as late as the Graeco-Roman period. For example, Nigel Strudwick discusses this practice in \textit{The Tombs of Amenhotep, Khnummose, and Amenmose at Thebes}.
too visible Aten.\textsuperscript{17} The resulting Amarna destruction was thoroughly executed throughout the Theban necropolis by the agents of Akhenaten. The top priority of this type of destruction was to erase any mention of the beloved Theban god, Amun. However, as Peter Der Manuelian points out, the semi-literate Atenist agents scanned the walls for Amun and ended up taking out words with the $mn$ sign (a game board). Misreadings of $mni$ (to perish), $mn$ (to establish), and $mn’t$ (nurse) were removed since their spellings included the same hieroglyph in the spelling of Amun.\textsuperscript{18} Likewise, other targeted gods, such as Amun’s consort Mut, were wrongfully excised.\textsuperscript{19} Represented by the single vulture hieroglyph, the goddess Mut was effaced from monuments together with Amun. The same misreading of the vulture-$mwt$ sign occurred in contexts clearly referring to words such as “mother” or names that incorporate the protective goddess.

While pushing his new monotheistic religion, Akhenaten banned the traditional polytheistic religion along with the hieroglyphs that represented the previous worship of gods represented by three $nt\!r$ signs or the $nt\!r$ sign with the three strokes of plurality.\textsuperscript{20} In addition to undermining the sole worship of the Aten, $nt\!rw$ was also closely associated with one of Amun’s epithets as “king of the gods.” Interestingly, $nt\!rw$ written with three strokes of plurality was frequently overlooked by the Atenists. It might be that signs associated with gods ($Im\!n$, $mwt$, $nt\!rw$) were thought to remind ancient Egyptians familiar with the traditional religion of the previous, now abandoned, gods, and had to be removed because of such associations. It is possible that the Akhenaten followers were given a list of words to banish from the monuments and took care of it without knowledge of Egyptian vocabulary and grammar as evidenced by the inconsistent and occasionally incorrect execution. As far as images are concerned, the $sem$ priest

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, 286-8.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid, 291-3.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid, 289-290.
\end{flushleft}
was the target of Amarna destruction in the Theban tombs of officials. Identifiable by the leopard or panther skin garment worn across their body, *sem* priests were systematically removed from the decoration program because of their “historical costume,” described by Jan Assmann as the antithesis of Amarna art; the art of the Amarna Period aimed to only represent reality.\(^{21}\) Serving as one of the most important figures for the sustenance of the deceased in the tomb along with the lector priest, a *sem* priest is typically shown before the tomb owner and his wife, providing the required offerings to sustain them. After the death of Akhenaten, the religion quickly reverted back to the traditional and favored worship of Amun and the entire Egyptian pantheon of gods.\(^{22}\)

The next type of destruction would occur a few thousand years later, but similarly by people who were monotheists. Coptic Christians took refuge in western Thebes, specifically in tombs of the officials, either to live as monks or to avoid Roman taxation.\(^{23}\) In addition to dwellings, ancient Egyptian tombs were sometimes converted to small churches and shrines. Evidence of Coptic Christian occupation in the rock-cut tombs of western Thebes is indicated by archaeological evidence of alterations to the existing structure, such as the addition of doors, shelves, and expansions into other tombs. Other modifications to the decoration program include graffiti scratched into the wall’s surface in Coptic or covering existing scenes with a coat of plaster or whitewash on which to apply their own religious motifs.\(^{24}\) The eyes, and sometimes faces, of painted individuals were also removed from the wall to prevent the images from


\(^{22}\) It has been noted by Norman de Garis Davies in *The Tomb of Puyemre at Thebes* (TT 39) that the hacked out mentions of the name “Amun” were restored into the relief decoration as part of secondary post-Amarna reconstructions: “The votaries of the worship of Aton entered it and erased the name of Amon; Ramesside piety or policy tried to make good the injury some generations later, but used neither skill nor intelligence,” xviii. For secondary post-Amarna restorations of state monuments see Peter Brand, “Methods Used in Restoring Reliefs Vandalized During the Amarna Period” and “Secondary Restorations in the Post-Amarna Period.”


\(^{24}\) Ibid, 35.
“looking” at the new inhabitants, who were apparently fearful of the original pagan elements of decoration.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Cracked and collapsed walls (earthquakes, poor stone quality), wasp nests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usurpation</td>
<td>Removal of original tomb owner’s name, painted name of usurper, changes in decoration (text, image)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarna</td>
<td>Amun (text, image), other gods (text, image), sem-priests, rams and other animals/symbols sacred to Amun(-Ra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coptic</td>
<td>Focus on faces—eyes especially, gods, graffiti, Coptic crosses, whitewash or painting over existing wall decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemy-Driven</td>
<td>Partial and full body of tomb owner (sometimes his wife), name of tomb owner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 LITERATURE REVIEW

In the context of ancient Egypt, scholarship on damnatio memoriae primarily focuses on the most obvious and thorough examples in the royal sphere. Most famously, ancient Egyptians attempted to rewrite history by removing the name and images of Hatshepsut from her monuments. Daughter of the pharaoh Thutmose I and his primary wife Ahmose, Hatshepsut married her half-brother Thutmose II, the son of the pharaoh’s secondary wife Mutnofret. After the death of her brother-husband, Hatshepsut shared the rule of Egypt with her step-son and nephew Thutmose III. Eventually, Thutmose III ordered the removal of Hatshepsut from monuments, most likely to ensure his son Amenhotep II’s uncontested rise to pharaoh.\(^{26}\) This intentional destruction left her two-dimensional images full of chisel marks and her statues obliterated, surviving today only by conservationists piecing her back together. The royal examples of this public display of eradication surely provided the inspiration for the private execution and similar acts in the officials’ tombs in the Theban necropolis.

One of the earliest mentions of damnatio memoriae was published in the Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt in 1969 by Alan Shulman, entitled “Some Remarks on the Alleged “Fall” of Senmut.”\(^{27}\) Senmut provides an interesting case study for the investigation of what damnatio memoriae is and how it can be carried out on both two- and three-dimensional monuments. In the previous section, I referenced Schulman’s definition of this practice. His explanation of damnatio memoriae must include “both the effacement of the likeness of a person on whom it was to be inflicted and simultaneous and complete erasure of his name wherever it occurred.”\(^{28}\) This refers to the concept of the power of a person’s name, which constitutes an essential component of their identity. While I agree that, whenever possible, this would be the

---

\(^{28}\) Ibid, 36.
ideal method of execution for a true damnatio memoriae, it is too limiting in its scope and lacks the nuance needed to define this act. In the cases throughout the Theban necropolis, it is rare to find the removal of both the targeted individual’s name and image in every single occurrence. However, the image of the tomb owner is frequently removed from his most obvious representations throughout the tomb. The fact that the tomb owner’s image is more frequently removed than his name would account for the literacy level of the offender carrying out the defilement. Shulman places emphasis on the name, and thus ‘identity,’ of the tomb owner as the most important aspect of the deceased—noting that “even if every other vestige of him had been destroyed, as long as [the name] was intact, the identity of its owner was intact.”29 In other words, as long as their identity was recognizable, the person’s existence was safeguarded. The frequency of instances in which only images of the tomb owner were deliberately hacked out questions this line of thought.

About thirty years later, Patricia Bochi published an article called “Death by Drama: The Ritual of Damnatio Memoriae in Ancient Egypt.”30 Bochi’s focus is the importance of identity (social and visual) with an emphasis on ritual remembrance. Likewise, losing one’s identity resulted in damnation. Instead of examining existing monuments created by the person, the author looks to figurines created to be broken or curse the identified individual.31 It is her argument that the manufacture of these objects (figurines of desecration—the voodoo doll and pseudo-tablet types) express a higher level of a ritualized act over the mutilation of existing images.

29 Ibid, 36.
31 Ibid, 77-78.
In a study of *damnatio memoriae* carried out in the tomb of Ay (KV-23), Richard Wilkinson was able to determine the number of agents involved in the purposeful destruction of Ay’s image, his *ka*’s image, and his name by a close examination of the chisel width and depth. Even more fascinating, the direction and patterning of the chisel marks was used by Wilkinson to suggest whether the individual was left- or right-handed and what his approximate height might have been. Such a study could prove useful in determining how many people could be involved in the obliteration of an official to help answer questions about who could authorize the systematic removal and further implications on the tomb owner’s second, final, death.

In 2012, the University of Chicago hosted a conference entitled *Iconoclasm and Text Destruction in the Ancient Near East and Beyond*. The resulting publication consists of papers on intentional destruction from the earliest instances in Mesopotamia to late medieval Christianity. Egyptologists Betsy Bryan and Robert Ritner contributed chapters on New Kingdom iconoclasm and the power of images (and consequential image destruction) to ancient Egyptians, respectively. Betsy Bryan approaches this act of intentional destruction with examples dating to the Eighteenth Dynasty. Royal examples include the erasure of Hatshepsut and Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV) from their monuments. Additionally, she addresses Amarna destruction, targeting the traditional gods with particular attention to Amun, set in motion by Akhenaten in at least year eight of his reign. In the non-royal sphere, Theban tombs of officials, the focus of my study, are discussed. Bryan highlights important pitfalls in the analysis of iconoclasm in private tombs as well as the difficulty, and impossibility, of determining the exact reasons and organizers behind the act. Brilliantly laid out, Bryan’s study concludes by attributing the

---

mutilation of images to “hindering their potential activity in the world,”\(^{34}\) not the resulting death of the embodied spirits. While I agree that this was certainly part of the reason for destruction of the tomb owners’ images, I cannot fully abandon the consequence of the obliteration of the victims’ components living within the images (\(ka\), \(ba\), and \(akh\)) by the hands of the executers.

In “Killing the Image, Killing the Essence: The Destruction of Text and Figures in Ancient Egyptian Thought, Ritual, and ‘Ritualized History,’” Robert Ritner contextualizes the ancient Egyptian perception of images and the link with iconoclasm. He looks to the Egyptian language to shed light on their insight and nuances of the terms for “images,” concluding a close connection with an understood “point of contact with the represented entity.”\(^{35}\) In sum, the existence of an image (or text) ensured the existence of the person or object’s essence. Likewise, their destruction resulted in the death of the entity. Ancient Egyptians, in response to the fear of being forgotten to the living and obliterated from the afterlife, acquired a number of insurance policies to serve as vehicles for their spirits after death—the mummy, the coffin, images, texts, and statues. There is no way to know if these additional objects, located within the tomb or at local temples, suffered damage at the hands of enemies. However, the function of the tomb—as a sacred space of commemoration and resurrection of the deceased—points toward the meaning behind the harm of its images and texts by adversaries.

\(^{34}\) Ibid, 377.

\(^{35}\) Robert K. Ritner, “Killing the Image, Killing the Essence: The Destruction of Text and Figure in Ancient Egyptian Thought, Ritual, and ‘Ritualized History,’” *Iconoclasm and Text Destruction in the Ancient Near East and Beyond* (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2012), 395.
4 METHODOLOGY

If one looks hard enough, intentional destruction can be found everywhere. I observed partial and full body destruction in numerous Theban tombs in many reigns of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties and started to see “destruction” where it was almost impossible to tell if it was deliberate or not. In order to ensure the intentional destruction laid out in this study is, in fact, damnatio memoriae, the following parameters have been put in place. To be certain the study only examines the destruction by the tomb owners’ contemporaries, I have limited the evidence to a single reign, firmly dated to that of Thutmose IV in the Eighteenth Dynasty based on the presence of the pharaoh’s cartouche in the tomb. As a study examining the decoration program of walls, access to photographs were necessary to determine eligible tombs. Prof. Melinda Hartwig provided photographs of officials’ tombs that served Thutmose IV taken during the research stage of her dissertation on tomb painting and identity in Thebes. Only tombs in which the tomb owners’ images have been hacked out fully, following the outline of the figure, were chosen; other types of damages allow too much speculation on destruction that ‘could’ be considered damnatio memoriae or executed for reasons unrelated to the present discussion. Of the seven tombs with photographic evidence, three tombs exhibited the main criterion of damnatio memoriae with the full body excision of deceased and often times their relatives—Theban tombs 66, 75, and 76. These parameters will establish the contemporary practice of damnatio memoriae and construct a pattern from the available evidence.

As extensions of the deceased’s mummy, I argue that his or her two- and three-dimensional images represented the animated corpse and, therefore, could be subjugated in death by ritually “killing” the vehicle of his essence. The end result was the hacked pattern silhouette

36 Eliminated due to the lack of fully intact decorated walls, TT 116 does feature the anonymous tomb owner’s figure hacked out of the few existing scenes.
of the victims’ representations, which had two meanings for ancient Egyptians. To the living visitors to the tomb, the ghost-like images tainted the memory of the deceased. To the dead, defiled figures represented in the tomb, the essence of their being ceased to exist as their constituent parts that resided in their representations could no longer interact with the living.
5 CASE STUDIES

The following case studies attest to the varied executions of enemy-driven destruction as well as the difficulty of discerning such damage. All of the tombs in this study (TT 66, 75, and 76) are situated on the prominent and highly sought-after hill of Sheikh abd el-Qurna. Each of the tomb owners served the pharaoh Thutmos IV who reigned 1400 to 1390 BCE. Similarly, traces of damnatio memoriae can be detected on the wall surfaces of every tomb chapel. In the examination special attention will be given to the particular scenes in which the intentional damage occurs as well as the location on the wall.

Figure 5.1 Sheikh abd el-Qurna on the West Bank of Thebes.
5.1 Theban Tomb 66—Hepu

Hepu, the owner of TT 66, served as a Vizier (t3t) to Thutmose IV, despite his modest sized tomb. As the most powerful position below the pharaoh, the Viziers of the north and south delegated the tasks of Egypt’s large bureaucracy during Thutmose IV’s reign. Following Friederike Kampp-Seyfried’s tomb types, TT 66 is classified as type 5b, a typical Eighteenth Dynasty inverted T-shaped tomb plan with a forecourt, a transverse hall, and a long hall ending in a statuary shrine to Hepu and his wife, a Chantress of Amun (shm3yt nt [Imn]), Renni (Rn-n3y) (Figure 5.2). The overall condition of the tomb chapel is fragmentary at best. However, what does remain of the decorative program shows Hepu as a worthy recipient of a funerary cult. Entire walls have suffered extensive damage largely due to what appears to be natural causes. Sheila Whale notes the poor condition of the tomb and states that Hepu and his wife “appear to have been damaged by enemies.”

Figure 5.2 TT 66 plan (Porter and Moss).

### Table 5.1 TT 66 Tomb Chapel Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transverse hall</td>
<td>10.48 m. (34 ft. 2/3 in.)</td>
<td>2.07 m. (6 ft. 9 ½ in.)</td>
<td>2.68 m. (8 ft. 9 ½ in.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal hall</td>
<td>5.4 m. (17 ft. 8 2/3 in.)</td>
<td>2.07 m. (6 ft. 9 ½ in.)</td>
<td>2.3 m. (7 ft. 11/20 in.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.2 TT66 Decoration Program with Damnatio Memoriae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM/Location</th>
<th>Scene Description</th>
<th>Intentional Destruction</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Remnants of a procession of men with branches</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Remains of text about H.’s 39 installation as Vizier</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H. before offering lists and rituals</td>
<td>H. seated before an offering table</td>
<td>Each figure: ca. 2 ½ ft. (1 to 6 ½ ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H. oversees craft production in workshops of Amun?</td>
<td>Two seated figures of H. stacked on top of each other</td>
<td>Each figure: ca. 2 ½ ft. (1 to 6 ½ ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Craft production</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Remains of a banquet scene</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>H. fowling in the marshes</td>
<td>H. rears back throw stick</td>
<td>ca. 2 ½ ft. (2 ½ to 5 ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fishing in the marshes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>H. and wife receive offerings from their son</td>
<td>Seated H. and wife; standing son</td>
<td>ca. 3 ft. (1 ½ to 4 ½ ft. on wall); ca. 2 ½ ft. (1 ½ to 4 ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>H. and wife in statue niche</td>
<td>Seated H. and wife; inscriptions</td>
<td>ca. 4 ft. (1 ½ to 5 ½ ft. on wall); 0 to 7 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 Hepu.
5.1.1 Transverse hall

The small wall (PM 3) at the end of the left wing of the transverse hall is an example of a number of kinds of destruction on one wall (Figure 5.5). The wall surface is mostly rugged and, while the cause of the damage is unknown, the absence of clearly defined marks of damnatio memoriae prohibits the assumption of intentional destruction. An entire wall in this condition could be the result of poor stone quality or naturally occurring disasters. However, this wall has suffered numerous modes of destruction over time. The initial layer of destruction is the intentional mutilation of the figures of Hepu and his wife receiving offerings and rituals of which currently his hacked out head and upper chest area survive. As a whole, the text is mostly intact. In the area directly above Hepu’s head, however, the text appears to be removed with the same chisel marks as his body, possibly signifying a true damnatio memoriae by the removal of his name in conjunction with his figural outline. Noticeable throughout the entire tomb chapel, but particularly in the left wing of the transverse hall, is a layer of a black substance coating the wall’s surface. The discoloration appears to have bonded to certain pigments more strongly than others. For instance, the blue paint in the frieze decoration is more resistant than the color used inside the design, which can be assumed red as seen on a less effected wall, and is now a saturated black. Based on the settlement of the black substance and the resultant darkening of the wall surface, the fire would have occurred after the enemy-driven defacement of Hepu and the subsequent natural damage to the lower portions of the wall. Exposed rock, rough and random, is consistent with the natural destruction defined at the start of this paper. It may also be the consequence of the fire, which led to the destabilization of the decoration that later fell off the

40 Whale, 203. Nina Davies, 11. Each author states the presence of Hepu’s wife in the original scene, but her presence is difficult to see within the damage—making it hard to tell if her figure is hacked out like her husband’s.

41 The tomb was most likely lived in by Copts who burned lamps inside or perhaps caused the fire.
wall. In contrast to the lower portion of the wall, the upper left damage occurred after the fire, as it is stark white with no traces of black residue.

The long walls on either side of the offering scene are in poor condition with only fragments of the original decoration in place (Figures 5.3 and 5.4). Similarly to the small wall, the large, rugged areas of damage do not appear to be the result of intentional destruction with the goal of damnatio. As Vizier, Hepu oversaw the production of equipment and fine products for the benefit of the state. Fulfilling this duty in the tomb decoration, two depictions of Hepu stacked on top of one another show him seated before three smaller registers of craftsmen (Figure 5.8). On each chair, only the ghost image of the Vizier remains. Once again, the full body of Hepu is carefully removed from the wall’s surface in each instance, following his outline. The same approach to the removal of Hepu’s image was executed as the ghost images are made of chisel marks that follow the outline of his figure and the implements of authority he holds—pre-dating the fire. The text before the upper excised Hepu appears largely untouched except for a couple of damaged areas that appear to be the result of Amarna destruction as “the House of Amun” has been erased. Interestingly, “the Vizier, Hepu” was also removed, but this seems to be the consequence of the Atenist agents removing “Amun” from the wall—accidently removing this nearby portion of text. An investigation of the scenes with minor figures completing tasks on behalf of Hepu reveal yet another layer of destruction. There are many clearly defined scratches that correspond with one craftsman’s face, arms, and the Thutmose IV statue he works on. Immediately below, more graffiti-like scratches appear in the form of continuous “M”s. The scratches appear lighter than the tinted surface and might suggest a later date than the fire and the damnatio memoriae of Hepu’s figure (or have been filled by conservators to prevent further damage).
Opposite this wall, an even more fragmented wall leaves traces of males carrying branches in a procession (Figure 5.3). Entirely damaged, the right wing of the transverse hall address an issue when assessing the *damnatio memoriae* of the tomb owner since every scene that would have featured Hepu’s image are now missing (Figures 5.4, 5.5, and 5.9).
Figure 5.3 TT 66: PM 4—Procession of men with branches.

Figure 5.4 TT 66: PM 6—Remains of text of Hepu’s installation as vizier.
Figure 5.5 TT 66: PM 3—Offering list and rituals before Hepu and his wife.

Figure 5.6 TT 66: Small wall (right wing).
Figure 5.7 TT 66: PM 1, 2—Craft Production before two figures of Hepu.
Figure 5.8 TT 66: PM 2—Two seated figures of Hepu excised from the wall.
Figure 5.9 TT 66: PM 5—Remains of a banquet scene.
5.1.2 Longitudinal hall

The longitudinal hall, however, provides more instances of the removal of Hepu from his tomb chapel (Figure 5.10). Remnants of a fishing and fowling scene are located on the right wall of the longitudinal hall (PM 8 and 9). Hepu, about to release his throw stick, is once again fully and carefully removed from the marshy swamp as seen in Figure 5.12. One would expect to have a mirrored image of Hepu fishing with a spear to balance the fowling pose, but the section of the wall that would have shown this is completely damaged as seen in the left portion of Figure 5.12. A male figure stands on the prow of the boat, most likely a son.\textsuperscript{42} The area is damaged by natural causes because of the haphazard portions of the wall missing, but the minor figure was not targeted as part of the damnatio memoriae campaign. Directly across from the fishing and fowling scene, Hepu and his wife, now removed, are the recipients of offerings from their son who is also removed (Figures 5.13 and 5.14). Unfortunately the scene of seated Hepu and his wife has suffered subsequent damage after their initial damnatio memoriae, but the feet of Hepu follow the thorough mutilation of his figure throughout the rest of the tomb chapel (Figure 5.14).

The tomb owner’s son, Neferhebef who is labeled as a \textit{wab} priest of Amun, also suffered a full body defacement because he was represented in the capacity of a funerary \textit{sem} priest, wearing the leopard or panther skin garment that caused his removal by the Atenists.\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Sem} priests, not necessarily the low priestly rank of Neferhebef, were systematically removed from tombs as part of Akhenaten’s religious revolution. However, he was removed later than the figures of his parents as part of Amarna destruction, along with the name “Amun” throughout the tomb, because of his role as \textit{sem} priest to his parents’ mortuary cult. At the end of the longitudinal hall, rock-cut statues of Hepu and his wife are heavily mutilated (Figure 5.11). All inscriptions have

\textsuperscript{42} Whale, 203.
\textsuperscript{43} Davies, \textit{Some Scenes from Theban Tombs}, 12.
been removed, but Hepu is most likely the figure on the left and the slimmer figure on the right is probably his wife.\footnote{44} Each and every depiction of Hepu and his family have been systematically removed from the life-sustaining decoration program of the tomb chapel despite the poor condition of many of the walls.

\footnote{44} Davies, \textit{Some Scenes from Theban Tombs}, 9.
Figure 5.10 TT 66: Longitudinal hall.

Figure 5.11 TT 66: PM 10—Niche with rock-cut statues of Hepu and his wife.
Figure 5.12 TT 66: PM 9—Fishing and fowling scene.
Figure 5.13 TT66: PM 7—Neferhebef giving offerings to Hepu and his wife.

Figure 5.14 TT 66: PM 7—Hepu and his wife receive offerings from their son.
5.2 Theban Tomb 75—Amenhotep-si-se

The Second High Priest of Amun during the reign of Thutmose IV, Amenhotep-si-se, is the owner of Theban tomb 75. Classified as type 5b, the plan of Amenhotep-si-se’s house for eternity is a typical inverted T-shape tomb of the Eighteenth Dynasty (Figure 5.15). This tomb, as with that of Hepu, also suffered significant damage to entire walls, typically leaving only fragments for researchers to work with. Only the transverse hall will be discussed since the longitudinal hall has lost nearly all the efforts of the ancient Egyptian artists.

Figure 5.15 TT 75 plan (Porter and Moss).

---

45 Kampp-Seyfried, 310.
### Table 5.3 TT 75 Tomb Chapel Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transverse hall</td>
<td>14.9 m.</td>
<td>1.9 m</td>
<td>2.65 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(48 ft. 10 ¾ in.)</td>
<td>(6 ft. 2 4/5 in.)</td>
<td>(8 ft. 8 1/3 in.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal hall</td>
<td>4.8 m.</td>
<td>2.1 m</td>
<td>2.4 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15 ft. 9 in.)</td>
<td>(6 ft. 10 2/3 in.)</td>
<td>(7 ft. 10 ½ in.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.4 TT 75 Decoration Program with *Damnatio Memoriae*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM/Location</th>
<th>Scene Description</th>
<th>Intentional Destruction</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Transverse hall, far left wall</td>
<td>A.(^{46}) presents a bouquet and gifts to Thutmose IV; A. receives the Gold of Honor</td>
<td>A. before Thutmose IV in a kiosk; two mirrored figures of A.—one being bestowed with the Gold of Honor, the other returning home</td>
<td>All figures ca. 4 ft. (2 to 6 ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Transverse hall, far right wall</td>
<td>A.’s installation as Second High Priest of Amun</td>
<td>Two consecutive figures of the same height in procession—one with an unguent cone (probably A.)</td>
<td>Both figures ca. 4 ft. (2 to 6 ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Transverse hall, near left wall</td>
<td>A. oversees the workshops of Amun</td>
<td>A. holding a staff</td>
<td>ca. 5 ½ ft. (1 ½ to 7 ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Transverse hall, near left wall</td>
<td>A. oversees the fields of Amun</td>
<td>A. holding a staff</td>
<td>ca. 4 ½ ft. (1 ½ to 6 ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Transverse hall, right small wall</td>
<td>A. being purified by priests</td>
<td>A. between priests performing purification ritual; two sets of seated couples before offerings on either side</td>
<td>ca. 1 ½ ft. (6 ½ to 8 ft. on wall); both ca. 1 ft. (6 ½ to 7 ½ ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Transverse hall, near right wall</td>
<td>A. and his wife at a banquet</td>
<td>A. and his wife (R.)(^{47}) seated before a table of offerings</td>
<td>A: ca. 5 ft. (1 ½ to 6 ½ ft. on wall); R: ca. 4 ft. (1 ½ to 5 ½ ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{46}\) Amenhotep-si-se.  
\(^{47}\) Roy.
5.2.1 Transverse hall

On the left wing of the transverse hall, the near wall (Figure 5.23) has incurred minor damage with small missing areas of plastered decoration. Nevertheless, the dominating figures of Amenhotep-si-se show the characteristic removal of his full body as the result of damnatio memoriae. By the doorway in Figure 5.23, it is difficult to recognize, but what would have been Amenhotep-si-se’s figure stands with his sons as they inspect the workshops of Amun depicted in the smaller registers before them. The intentional damage and surrounding accidental damage has now been filled in and smoothed over by the work of conservators, thus, removing the ‘hand’ in the form of chisel marks of the enemy performing damnatio memoriae. The profile of Amenhotep-si-se’s face and his bent arm holding a staff of authority are discernable despite the loss of chisel mark width and depth into the wall surface. About halfway down the wall, another large representation of Amenhotep-si-se is precisely hacked out from the decoration program (Figure 5.24) as he inspects the fields of Amun and chariot makers in the succeeding four registers. Not only is the tomb owner’s entire figure removed, but the attributes of authority he holds are excised as well. Except for a few patches, the original chisel marks are maintained and are evidence for intentional enemy-driven destruction. The small wall at the end of the left wing of the transverse hall is completely obliterated from what appears to be a naturally occurring collapse of the prepared and plastered wall surface, but the far wall show more indications of ill intent to the figures of Amenhotep-si-se (Figure 5.16).

Bestowed upon Amenhotep-si-se, the Gold of Honor, or shebyu collar, was the highest award given by the pharaoh to his most worthy officials. Unfortunately, the figure of the Second High Priest did not escape the view of his enemy (Figure 5.19). Curiously, the figure immediately behind that of Amenhotep-si-se has been expunged as well. It has been suggested
that this figure is the tomb owner as he returns home after receiving his reward because the accompanying text captions the scene as “coming home from the mark of distinction by the king.” Regardless, the visual legibility of the second figure most likely could be assumed to be the tomb owner since it is the same height as the clearly delineated image of Amenhotep-si-se being donned with the Gold of Honor. Without a label addressing the figure (given the enemy was even literate), it is better to be safe than sorry in an attempt to obliterate the commemoration of the owner in this life and the hereafter. Above the rewarding scene, smaller registers feature the fine goods Amenhotep-si-se was in charge of overseeing in the temple of Amun-Re at Karnak. The gifts are neatly arranged before Thutmose IV, seated in an elaborate kiosk, on the occasion of the New Year’s festival as indicated by traces of the distinctive crown and fillet worn by the pharaoh during this particular event (Figure 5.17). The image of Thutmose IV and the kiosk scene are mostly smoothed over from conservation efforts and no longer allow for an interpretation on whether the damage was the result of expected environmental damage of the rock-cut tomb or hostile purpose. One last instance of the removal of Amenhotep-si-se occurs on this wall as he offers life in the form of a bouquet to Thutmose IV, a popular play on words because both “life” and “bouquet” are ankh (\textit{nh}) (Figure 5.18). Arms outstretched and legs apart, the tomb owner’s figure has been dutifully removed following the outline of his image. Unlike the objects of authority Amenhotep-si-se holds in other scenes, the lower portion of the bouquet of Amun is still intact while the upper portion is filled in and smoothed over, but appears to follow the outline as well.

The right wing of the transverse hall sustains the ordinary types of damage as the result of being millennia old in addition to instances of intentional mutilation of numerous figures (Figure

\textsuperscript{48} Hartwig, 82.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid, 61-2.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, 64.
On the right end of the far wall, the only remaining decoration, Amenhotep-si-se is in procession to his installation as Second High Priest of Amun. The preceding figures wear wigs, and consequently, are not actively shown as priests who were characterized by their shaved heads. In contrast, the two fully expunged figures in procession do not appear to be wearing a formal wig, thus indicating a priestly status (Figure 5.21). Perhaps the similar appearance of the two shaven men was another instance in which the executioner of Amenhotep-si-se’s damnatio memoriae removed both figures at the risk of not knowing for certain which image was that of Amenhotep-si-se. Accompanying text above the scene indicates possible removal of hieroglyphs since the mutilation neatly falls within the confines of the column outlines. The carefully attacked hieroglyphs within the text are the result of Amarna destruction with the removal of the god Amun, featured numerous times in a description of the appointment of Amenhotep-si-se (containing the god’s name) in a high office to serve the targeted god. The tomb owner’s name was not attacked purposely because the hieroglyphs for “hotep-si-se” (“si” as the duck sign; “se” as the kneeling man sign) remain after the hacked out portions of text that would follow the missing “Amun.” Additionally, his title of Second High Priest of Amun (Hm-ntjr tpy snw n Imn) remains intact except for the “Amun” at the end.

The small wall at the end of the right wing of the transverse hall, too, has incurred damage—both natural and deliberate (Figure 5.22). Among the destruction, the removed figure of Amenhotep-si-se as he is purified by priests at the center of the composition is clearly the result of purposeful damage, following the outline of his figure. Flanking the scene of the purification ritual on each side, a seated couple has also been chiseled away, probably the parents of Amenhotep-si-se and his wife.
On the final wall of the transverse hall, the seated figures of Amenhotep-si-se and his wife have been removed from the banquet before them (Figure 5.25). Different from every other removal of Amenhotep-si-se and the seated couples, the figures of the tomb owner and his wife (and daughter seated next to her mother) are mostly hacked out; this is definitely part of the damnatio memoriae to the owner and his wife. Intense focus is given to the complete eradication of all of their heads, arms, and legs. His wife, Roy, is most fully excised, while his daughter’s legs are mainly visible as she kneels on a mat. With the figure of Amenhotep-si-se, his arm positioned across his body is removed along with his legs. Interestingly, his chest and the lower portion of his body to his knees features haphazard chisel marks and leave this area largely untouched—unlike anything previously discussed. This approach seems to target the most important areas of the deceased’s representation. In regards to the minor figures in the banquet scene, quite a few appear to have sustained injuries to their heads (Figures 5.26 and 5.27). As in most cases with signs of damage, the affected areas are filled to prevent worsening loss.

Arriving to his own banquet by chariot, Amenhotep-si-se is mostly intact possibly because he is represented unexpectedly small, and therefore presumably undetected by his enemy (Figure 5.28). More surprising are the thin marks scratched on the surface of the portion of the wall. Consistent with their execution to other scratches noted in this tomb, the marks do not necessarily point to a language, which would make it easier to pinpoint the timeframe of execution.
Figure 5.16 TT 75: PM 3—Amenhotep’s rewarding and presentation of gifts.

Figure 5.17 TT 75: PM 3—Seated Thutmose IV in a kiosk.
Figure 5.18 TT 75: PM 3—Amenhotep-si-se presents a bouquet to Thutmose IV.

Figure 5.19 TT 75: PM 3—Amenhotep receives reward and returns home.
Figure 5.20 TT 75: PM 6, 5—Amenhotep’s installation as HPA and purification.
Figure 5.21 TT 75: PM 6—High Priest of Amun procession.
Figure 5.22 TT 75: PM 5—Purification ritual.
Figure 5.23 TT 75: PM 1, 2—Amenhotep oversees the workshops and fields of Amun.

Figure 5.24 TT 75: PM 2—Amenhotep-si-se oversees the fields of Amun.
Figure 5.25 TT 75: PM 4—Amenhotep-si-se and his wife seated before a banquet.
Figure 5.26 TT 75: PM 4—Offering bearers.
Figure 5.27 TT 75: Detail of musicians and dancers.

Figure 5.28 TT 75: PM 4—Amenhotep-si-se's arrival to the banquet by chariot.
5.3 Theban Tomb 76—Tjenuna

The largely destroyed tomb of Tjenuna (\textit{Tnw-n3}), Fan Bearer and Chief Steward of the King (\textit{t3w h w imy-r pr wr}), and his wife Nebetawy (\textit{Nbt-t3wy})\footnote{Whale, 194.} also features many layers of destruction beyond the expected wear over time consistent with those of the tomb chapels of Hepu and Amenhotep-si-se. Distinctly different in plan, Tjenuna’s tomb is classified as type 7a, in which the transverse hall is widened and features four columns along the horizontal axis (Figure 5.29).\footnote{Kampp-Seyfried, \textit{Die thebanische Nekropole}, 312.} Consistent with Theban tombs of the Eighteenth Dynasty, TT 76 has a longitudinal hall along the central axis. Only the best-preserved walls will be analyzed in terms of the evidence damage—all located on the right wing of the transverse hall.

![Figure 5.29 TT 76 plan (Porter and Moss).](image-url)
### Table 5.5 TT 76 Tomb Chapel Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transverse hall</td>
<td>11.3 m. (37 ft. 7/8 in.)</td>
<td>5.6 m. (18 ft. 4 ½ in.)</td>
<td>3.10 m. (10 ft. 2 1/20 in.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal hall</td>
<td>9.59 m. (31 ft. 5 9/16 in.)</td>
<td>2.12 m. (6 ft. 11 ½ in.)</td>
<td>2.94 m. (9 ft. 7 ¾ in.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.6 TT 76 Decoration Program with Damnatio Memoriae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM/Location</th>
<th>Scene Description</th>
<th>Intentional Destruction</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T.(^{53}) and another person present a pectoral to Thutmose IV and Hathor</td>
<td>Two consecutive figures of the same height—T. and an unidentified person</td>
<td>Both figures ca. 4 ft. (2 ½ to 6 ½ ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Offerings before the parents and parents-in-law of T.</td>
<td>Two sets of couples seated before tables piled with offerings</td>
<td>Both couples ca. 1 ½ ft. (bottom: 4 ½ to 6 ft.; top: 7 to 8 ½ ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A priest presents offerings and a bouquet to T.</td>
<td>Seated T.; a column of text</td>
<td>ca. 3 ft. (4 ½ to 7 ½ ft. on wall); ca. 6 ft. (2 ½ to 8 ½ ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T. inspecting cattle</td>
<td>T. holding a staff</td>
<td>ca. 5 ft. (2 ½ to 7 ½ ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T. offering braziers</td>
<td>T. standing with his arms out</td>
<td>ca. 3 ½ ft. (2 ½ to 7 ft. on wall)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{53}\) Tjenuna.
5.3.1 Transverse hall

Here, the small wall (Figures 5.31 and 5.32) appears to mainly suffer by the hand of Tjenuna’s enemy and additional collapsing areas of wall, which have been filled by conservators. The full body of the seated Fan Bearer has been cautiously expunged following the painted image, including his outstretched arms to meet an elaborate bouquet presented to him by an unknown man. Whereas the offering bearer’s body is unscathed by destruction, his damaged, or removed, face could be the result of intentional malice, but is more likely later destruction unrelated to Tjenuna. In the caption to the scene below, the text appears to have at least one column neatly removed and could correspond with the deliberate elimination of Tjenuna by an adversary. On the wall to the left of the offering scene, a few registers consist of couples seated before offerings. From photographs, the couples, parents and parents-in-law of Tjenuna, in the top and bottom registers respectively, suffer the same focused hack marks as seen and discussed on the neighboring wall of the tomb owner and his wife (Figures 5.33 and 5.34). As in the tomb of Amenhotep-si-se, large areas are missing and filled to avoid further damage. The text associated with the lower register looks as if someone smeared water across the wall in broad, horizontal strokes beginning just under a decoration band separating the two registers to the right above the offering table before the seated couple (Figure 5.34). Text cancellation is usually done with a tool to remove any indication of the original, fully denying its existence. The smeared text, on the other hand, leaves the text legible yet disfigured. As the process of hacking numerous rows of text was a time consuming task, the use of water to loosen and smear paint pigments may be a quicker alternative.\footnote{This could possibly be damnatio memoriae but carried out in a different manner than the hacked out figures. Perhaps the ease and quicker execution with water made this appealing to the perpetrator working in low light or in a limited time frame (presumably before getting caught). TT 76 is a larger tomb (especially in height) than the others in this study, which could explain the additional use of the water method in the execution of damnatio memoriae.} The effect would still seem to cancel out the benevolent function
of the text, now in a chaotic state. Like the ghost images of the intentionally mutilated figures, the less than perfect text, still readable, offers information to visitors in the same manner.

Directly across the transverse hall from the aforementioned seated couples before offerings, the last wall in front portion of the transverse hall in Tjenuna’s tomb will be discussed. At the far left end, Tjenuna inspects cattle on this fragmented wall (Figure 5.35). As seen before, clear chisel marks now make up the full body of Tjenuna, including his authoritative staff. Located on the same wall toward the entrance of the tomb chapel, Tjenuna’s hacked out image is shown offering braziers (Figure 5.36). In a similar execution to the text above the seated couple across the hall, the text above Tjenuna’s hacked out figure appears smeared with water, however, this time in swift vertical strokes aligned with the text columns (Figure 5.37). Tjenuna’s name remains intact at the bottom of the far left column. Behind the two right columns, the far wall of the transverse hall depicts Thutmose IV and Hathor in a kiosk with Tjenuna offering a pectoral to them (Figure 5.30). Mainly lost to wear over time, the majority of this scene has been patched by conservators. The typical full body mutilation to Tjenuna and a second figure behind him is consistent with every other image of his figure demarcated by clear chisel cuts. The removal of the second figure may be a similar execution of damnatio in TT 75 in which two indistinguishable figures of the same height are hacked out to ensure the tomb owner was one of them. Melinda Hartwig suggests, based on Royal Kiosk icons from contemporary tombs, this figure is a male family member of the tomb owner—his father or brother.55

55 Hartwig, 71.
Figure 5.30 TT 76: PM 5—Tjenuna offering a pectoral to Thutmose IV and Hathor.
Figure 5.31 TT 76: Looking toward PM 3.

Figure 5.32 TT 76: PM 3—Priest offering bouquet of Amun to Tjenuna and wife.
Figure 5.33 TT 76: PM 4—Upper register of Tjenuna's parents seated before offerings.

Figure 5.34 TT 76: PM 4—Lower register of Tjenuna’s parents-in-law.
Figure 5.35 TT 76: PM 2—Tjenuna inspecting the cattle.
Figure 5.36 TT 76: PM 1—Tjenuna offering braziers.
Figure 5.37 TT 76: PM 1—Text above Tjenuna offering braziers.
6 CONCLUSION

In all three case studies, each tomb owner and most of his family members were entirely and carefully hacked out from the life-sustaining decoration program in the tomb chapel. There are three main categories of excised figures in the study. The first category, yielding the most examples, pertains to the removal of the tomb owner performing his official duties or as recipient of rewards and ritual. Despite the literacy of the damnatio memoriae-performing enemy, the representation of the tomb owner as the largest and most prominent figure allowed for an easy identification in each scene. The only exception is when the deceased is before the pharaoh (TT 75 and TT 76). There is no doubt in the enemy’s mind that the figure before Thutmose IV was the tomb owner because it was part of the visual language in Theban tombs in which the deceased aims to show his close relationship with the pharaoh. However, the executer of damnatio took a “better safe than sorry” attitude when the clear distinction of the tomb owner’s figure is camouflaged with another figure of the same height. As seen specifically in the tomb of Amenhotep-si-se, ambiguous representations of the owner side by side generally resulted in the removal of both.

The second category consists of the tomb owner and his wife (TT 66, TT 75, and TT 76). It is rare that the wife is not included in the damnatio carried out against her husband. A significant role of the depictions of the tomb owner’s wife in the tomb chapel is one of sexual regeneration as part of her husband’s eternal rebirth in the afterlife. One exception occurs in TT 75 during Amenhotep-si-se’s installation as Second High Priest of Amun. His wife, a singer of Amun, remains intact as well as their daughters that follow in the procession. Perhaps the enemy did not know to look for the deceased’s wife in this scene or the damnatio was not extended to her.
The final category extends to other family members of the tomb owner and his wife. Sons were often depicted in the tomb as *sem* priests presenting offerings to their deceased parents. In this way, whether his actual occupation was a priest or not, a son serves as his parents’ main funerary priest, sustaining their funerary cult and providing the required offerings (TT 66). However, this example is hindered by the fact that the removal of Hepu’s (and most all tomb owners’) son(s) was (were) part of Amarna destruction that targeted *sem* priests wearing the leopard print garment. More securely representative of *damnatio*, seated couples of the tomb owner’s parents and his wife’s parents were also hacked out within their outline (TT 75 and TT 76). Other instances of the removal of family members occur on Tjenuna’s focal wall before Thutmose IV and Hathor in which two figures have been hacked out. Just as each scene depicted in the tomb chapel served the owner’s continual rebirth and sustenance in the afterlife in some capacity, the removal of his image would, in turn, be detrimental to his survival.

In addition to providing a mirroring image into the hereafter, another equally important function of the tomb will shed light onto the perception of *damnatio memoriae* to the realm of the living. Anticipated visitors were expected to participate in festivals at the tomb, present offerings, and speak the names of Hepu, Amenhotep-si-se, and Tjenuna on a regular basis. What impact would the faint ghost images of the tomb owner, intentionally removed, have on the viewer? Many tomb scenes were selected to show the deceased as an individual worthy of a funerary cult and the required offerings. The scenes depicted within the tombs of Hepu, Amenhotep-si-se, and Tjenuna each contain scenes of offerings to the deceased couple, important aspects of their career as overseer of large estates, the close relationship with the pharaoh as the result of their office, and texts to caption each scene, furthering their identity to the living and the divine realm. Would this taint the perception of the official for future
generations as the enemy intended? Once the mortuary cult ceased to remember the tomb owner, the texts and images dealing with offerings to the deceased (now removed and void of their heka, or magic) would not provide the attributes that resided within the tomb with the nourishment required for eternity. The deceased would be completely reliant on the funerary goods interred with the body to sustain his souls.

What made these three ancient Egyptians the target of such a fatal ending in terms of their commemoration on earth and identity in the afterlife? Each of these men were highly placed officials in Thutmose IV’s civil and religious administrations. Hepu, Vizier (tꜣt) in the south, was second in command after the pharaoh. Tjenuna, Chief Steward (imy-ꜣ pr wr) and Chief Steward of Amun (imy-ꜣ pr wr n Imn), was an overseer of the large holdings of Thutmose IV and Amun, serving an equally important role to the pharaoh as the Vizier. Amenhotep-si-se, Second High Priest of Amun (ḫm-ṯr tpy snw n Imn), was second in command of the wealthy and powerful Amun precinct, responsible for the workshops and estates of Amun and carried out Thutmose IV’s building projects at Karnak. The power entrusted to each of these men may have been their downfall, surely to have made enemies over the course of their careers. The specific name attached to the executioner of damnatio against Hepu, Amenhotep-si-se, and Tjenuna will never be known, as Betsy Bryan points out that it is difficult to pinpoint exactly when the mutilation of images were carried out. Was the enemy who caused their excision from the tomb the pharaoh who gave them their authority? My hesitation on this supposition is the exclusion of the name from the intentional destruction; the pharaoh would have access to the literate class to ensure every component of the individual was accounted for, including the victim’s name. As seen with Hatshepsut, Akhenaten, Tutankhamun, and Ay, the pharaoh had the

---

57 Ibid, 257 and 266.
power to execute *damnatio memoriae* in the royal sphere. Following by example of public references to pharaonic *damnatio*, it seems most likely to me that contemporary officials wronged by the powerful men in this study perhaps took matters in their own hands, as did the aforementioned pharaohs.

Images of the deceased in the tomb permitted the *ba*, *akh*, and shadow (the individual’s mobile elements) to interfere with the living.\(^{59}\) Enemies may have also attacked the deceased’s images—vehicles of the *ba*, *akh*, and shadow—out of fear for the malevolent spirits of the dead. It seems likely that the *damnatio memoriae* found in the tombs of this study suffered the immediate gratification of enemies who dutifully hacked out each representation of the owner in an attempt to cancel future negative interference and erase their memory to visitors to the tomb. The *heka*-magic that resided in the figural representations, landscapes, and objects of the tomb chapel decoration was lost with its removal.

The resulting hacked out images of the deceased, clearly indicating their presence, allowed visitors to acknowledge the attack as an insult of the owner’s morality. As the focus of the mortuary cult, the erased tomb owner could no longer be commemorated. A part of identity was expunged with the tomb owner eliminated from his tomb. Depictions became an idealized reality for ancient Egyptians. The ordered tomb, the vehicle of the deceased’s commemoration and resurrection, was now thrown into chaos—an attack on *ma’at*. Yet, the entire tomb did not sustain damage; only the tomb owner and his family fell into chaos.

The examination up to now has established a pattern in three tombs of the Eighteenth Dynasty with consistent removal of the tomb owners and their close relatives executed in the same exact manner—following the outline of the figures. With a well-established pattern come the possible culprits. Based on the thorough execution of *damnatio* carried out in TT 66, TT 75, 59 Harrington, 2.
and TT 76, I believe that the offenders were officials that worked closely with or under the tomb owners and were in some way wronged as part of their power and influence related to their administrative and temple duties. Another possibility is familial animosity, perhaps still linked to profession, since most all relatives (especially wives and parents) were hacked out of the tomb chapel as well. Two of the most important aspects of the tomb decoration program—career and family ties—make easy targets in the liminal space of the deceased’s continued existence. The function of images coupled with the aspects of identity that lived on and could interact with the living illuminate the main goals of damnatio memoriae—to condemn their memory and destroy the essence of the deceased residing within their representations.
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