

A. KADRY

THE MILITARY CHARACTER OF THE REGIME UNDER TUTANKHAMON AND AY

The gradual reversion to orthodoxy, which was mainly aiming to ensure a recovery out of the miserable economic and political state of affairs was steadily carried out during the two royal reigns which immediately followed Akhenaton. Ay reappeared again after the accession of Tutankhamon authorized with new additional powers on the stage of events. A fragment discovered in Biban-el-Moluk with the title of a vizier is generally ascribed to him.¹ This official admission of his actual power over spheres of activities, probably already practised by him under Semenkhkare, reflects his growing influence as that of the strong man of the army and the court. He was represented on the left of Tutankhamon on a tiny piece of gold-leaf in a traditional kingly scenery,² which confirms Ay's venerable position as the powerful man behind the minor king. At Akhetaton Ay was "overseer of all the horses of his Majesty",³ which means his supremacy over the most effective branch of the army, the chariotry. The garrison of chariotry which moved to Amarna with the royal court of Akhenaton,⁴ might have been under the direct or indirect superintendance of this officer and influential courtier. He carried the military ranks of "standard bearer", "scribe of the army" before being promoted as general of chariotry in Amarna.⁵ Ay's devotion to the new religious doctrine may be deduced from the fact that the only complete copy of the great hymn to Aton, ascribed to Akhenaton himself, was recorded in his tomb in Amarna.⁶

Ay's political line, representing the growing interests of the military class, was intentionally aiming to absorb the direct political reaction of the Amarna revolution by presenting religious concessions in gradually growing and calculated doses, enough to realize a political balance. While a deliberate tolerance towards Amon was practised since Semenkhkare,⁷ no damnation of the name of Akhenaton was officially practised under Tutankhamon, and the names of Semenkhkare, Nefertiti and of Akhenaton himself were found in Tutankhamon's tomb.⁸ Though the religious aspects of the Amarna revolution suffered a failure, a political success was achieved by army representatives who backed the revolution from the very beginning.⁹ The Theban officials and priests did not regain their former power.

Memphis and the royal court after Amarna

Whether the decision after abandoning Amarna, under Tutankhamon, was to move to Thebes or to Memphis as new royal residence is open to debates. Before deserting Akhetaton, Tutankhamon and his spouse had to expell the reference to Aton from their names and this was replaced by Amon's name.¹⁰ This was a turning point in Ay's policy in connection with the traditional religious institutions and beliefs. In my opinion, Memphis was chosen as the new royal residence, because the danger of resistance against the ambitious policy of the army officers still existed. One of the largest stelas of the Post-Amarna-Period was erected in the name of Tutankhamon, depicting the king making offerings to Amon and Mut, while the accompanying inscription describes him as beloved of Atum-Harakhti of Heliopolis, and of Ptah of Memphis.¹¹ This attitude towards Amon and the other gods of the north aims, above all, to establish a balance of power between the religious influences of the main schools of theology of Egypt, a policy adopted further on by all the monarchs who succeeded Ay on the Egyptian throne and which began to disappear only after the dissolution of the central power towards the end of the 19th Dyn. Nothing would have been more in contradiction with this policy than to situate the royal residence after the desertion of Amarna, once again into Thebes, the religious capital of god Amon. The above mentioned stela reads: "When His Majesty arose as a king, the temples of the gods and goddesses, beginning from Elephantine down to the marshes of the Delta had fallen into decay, their shrines had fallen in desolation and became ruins overgrown with weeds, their chapels as though had never been and their halls serving as footpaths. The land was topsy-turvy and the gods turned their backs on this land."¹² Clearly, the restoration policy sought to placate not only Amon but also the other deities of Egypt.

That the royal court moved to Memphis after the desertion of Amarna may be deduced from Tutankhamon's aforementioned restoration stela, as it states that whilst the king was in his palace of the House of Aakheperkare (Thutmosis I), he took counsel with his heart as to how he might best placate Amon and the other gods.¹³ Gardiner indicates that the House of Thutmosis I, where Tutankhamon took his abovementioned council, was located in Memphis.¹⁴ It was probably Ay who had placed his assistant Haremheb on the top of power by appointing him as a "commander in chief" of the army with his headquarters at Memphis.¹⁵ About the same time Haremheb was appointed as a *mr-pr-wr* (overseer of the king's properties) of Tutankhamon with his office also at Memphis, which means that the military and economic powers were put in one hand, with its highly important significance, never surpassed before in any individual case.¹⁶ It is rather improbable, in my opinion, that an active *mr-pr-wr* of His Majesty can carry on the duties of his office, so closely connected with the monarch, from a point laying so far to the north of Thebes, where the royal court resided according to the Theban theory. During the whole Amarna period the acting *mr-pr-wr* of Akhenaton, Dudu, resided cer-

tainly in the royal court of Akhetaton.¹⁷ Helck himself gave up his original idea¹⁸ and now states in his work "Geschichte des Alten Ägypten" that Tutankhamon moved his capital to Memphis.¹⁹ The tombs of the high officials disappeared from Thebes and were located in the necropolis of Saqqara in the neighbourhood of Memphis. In his coronation text on the famous Turin Statue, Haremheb mentioned how he was called by the palace to ask for his counsel concerning the critical situation in Egypt that followed the Amarna crisis,²⁰ and this gives the impression of the indispensable role of Haremheb in the court.

Hornung in his chronological studies founded on the assumption that the mummy of Tutankhamon needed some time to be transferred from Memphis to its burial ground in Thebes, has obviously the same opinion we adopt.²¹ Aldred joins other scholars who believe that Amarna was abandoned, early in Tutankhamon's reign, to Memphis, where he promulgated his famous restoration decree.²² Undoubtedly, the moving of the capital to Memphis to the military headquarters corresponds with the army's intensified interference in the internal political life after Amarna.

I am inclined to believe that the term "military regime", which is usually connected with the reign of Haremheb, must be extended on Tutankhamon's and Ay's royal reigns. Moreover, the personage behind this historical change in the political power in Egypt and its final shifting to the hands of the officers of the army can be more reasonably identified with Ay than with Haremheb.²³ Ay raised Haremheb to both powerful posts of commander-in-chief of the army and *mr-pr-wr* of king Tutankhamon. Meanwhile, he kept for himself the actual command of chariotry, the most decisive branch of the armed forces, and the post of the vizier, putting thus the whole fortunes of Egypt in his hand.²⁴ In Asia, an active policy to face the deteriorating military situation was necessary to satisfy the army leaders.²⁵ The threats of the Hittites against the Egyptian properties in Syria and their probably attack against Amka²⁶ were held up by war, under the leadership of Haremheb himself, as the representations of his Memphite tomb may indicate.²⁷ We can conclude that an active defensive policy to save the Egyptian sphere of interests in the East was an important engagement of the policy makers of the regime, and that Ay and Haremheb, imposed this military policy and their religious programme in the same time. The archaeological remains from this period leave no room to deny, as Gardiner states, "some reality of the implied warlike campaigns."²⁸

It is worthwhile to mention in this connexion that the military dignitaries, who were sharing in the state's activities under Haremheb, occupied powerful posts under Ay's reign or even under Tutankhamon. Paramesses, for instance, the founder of the 19th Dyn., had, most probably, held the military post of "overseer of coasts and commander of the fortress of Sile" under King Ay.²⁹ This may prove true also in the case of general Amoneinet, who was appointed as an "overseer of the funerary temple of Thutmosis III." under Haremheb.³⁰ General Haremheb held, probably under Tutankhamon, together with his military post, the offices of "overseer of prophets of all gods", and "overseer of works of Amon."³¹ We can mention

additional examples of military officers, who occupied posts of high political and administrative significance under Tutankhamon and Ay. In this connection we quote a statement of Kees in his work "Priestertum": "Jedenfalls standen um die Könige der Gegenreformation als nächste Helfer wiederum Soldaten, keine Priester: Männer wie der Vizekönig von Kusch unter Tutanchamon, Veteran der Pferdetruppe Haja, der selbst drei Söhne bei der Garde der Wagenkämpfer hatte."³² A private body-guard of Tutankhamon, who accompanied him on a royal inspection tour of the restoration of some tempels, was an officer of the army.³³ It is important to refer to a recent study on the owner of the tomb no. 271 in Qurna, Nay, who was an officer and high official under the short reign of Ay. He carried the significant military rank of "scribe of recruits" while he practised the functions a "royal scribe", "overseer of royal harem", "overseer of works", "fanbearer on the right of the king".³⁴ Nay was obviously an example of officers of the military class with many-sided cultural background which characterized the members of that class since the early decades of the foundation of the Empire in the 18th Dyn.

Ay, a turning point to a new historical epoch

The critical political situation which immediately followed the death of Tutankhamon was reflected in the scurry with which the funeral preparations for his royal burial took place. The comparatively humble tomb was not initially intended for him and the shrines has been so quickly arranged that they were layed in the sepulchral chamber contrary to their pointed directions.³⁵ Ay, himself an aged man with powers as a vizier and the actual supervisor of the army,³⁶ was obviously the strongest figure who faced the situation. He already assumed the royal title as co-regent when he conducted the funerary rituals of the deceased king.³⁷ Hornung confirms that the Egyptian princess who asked the Hittites' help was Ankhesenamun, the widow of Tutankhamon, and not Nefertiti, as some scholars still believe.³⁸ Gardiner too, clearly identifies the sender of this letter with Ankhesenamun.³⁹ The Hittite prince, who was supposed to be acknowledged as future pharaoh, was killed by the Egyptian army on his way to Egypt.⁴⁰ A war against the Hittites was inescapable after Ay's accession. Without the complete co-operation between Ay and Haremheb, as the actual commander of the army who necessarily superintended the military actions, it should have been impossible to face all the internal and external troubles without a serious breakdown. No archaeological remains give evidence for internal troubles. Most significant in this relationship is Ay's title "Der die Asiaten schlägt", as he was the first Egyptian monarch, since Amenophis III., who adopted this epithet.⁴¹ In conjunction with this events a settlement of Hittite prisoners of war is attested near Memphis, under Ay.⁴² An Egyptian reference to this military struggle is probably found in the Memphite tomb of Haremheb, where the Hittite prisoners of war are represented.⁴³ The spread of the plague epidemic all over

the Near East, mentioned in Hittite sources, resulted in the temporary freezing of the Hittite danger after the death of Ay.⁴⁴ This gave Haremheb the historical opportunity to begin his economic and administrative reforms, which gained him his big reputation in the history.⁴⁵

Pflüger's hypothesis concerning a social revolution led by Ay as the exponent of the people's interests against the nobles represented by Haremheb⁴⁶ cannot be supported by the facts of the age and by the social status of Ay himself. It is true that there was an ancient Theban aristocracy associated closely with the rise of the 18th Dyn. and even earlier, but the circumstances of the Empire gave this local aristocracy no chance, and a new social class of warriors pushed it gradually and steadily to the shadow. On the eve of the Amarna crisis the accumulated social and cultural contradictions were so ripe that the new military aristocracy undergone a revolutionary growth of power, and after Amarna it became possible for this class to gain complete supremacy in Egypt. Wolf states that Egypt was always, and in particular under the 18th Dyn., a state of officials and that the circumstances of the developing of a proletarian class did not exist in the 18th Dyn.⁴⁷ Those officials who constituted Egypt's aristocracy were replaced by the army officers, a new military aristocracy, with all their social and professional commitments. Moreover, a class struggle, in its modern sense, as it is actually described by Pflüger, could not be imagined within the limits of the given cultural and religious state of the human evolution of the age. Under such strong religious prejudices and social traditions the man of the ancient world and of Egypt could not develop a sophisticated class consciousness. A class struggle could find its expression only in more or less spontaneous uprisings, like those which characterized the Egyptian life during the first and second intermediate Periods.

Beckerath supports the idea of the complete fall of the traditional Theban officials of the 18th Dyn. and points out that the essential political results of the Amarna crisis continued to exist. The disturbances which followed were, according to him, suppressed thanks to the army leaders namely Ay, Haremheb and their followers.⁴⁸ The imminent danger in Asia brought an internal peace which Ay and Haremheb achieved by their initiative of a restoration policy of which Haremheb was the second personage after the death of Tutankhamon. He was represented in an inferior position in relation with Ay in Tutankhamon's tomb.⁴⁹ Beckerath infers from Ay's title "god's father", inserted also in his royal cartouches, that it reflected a vague relation with the royal family and had to legitimize his claim to the throne.⁵⁰ This title which was carried by several nobles before and after Ay's reign, was, however, never used as a legitimate excuse for any pretender of the Egyptian throne. It seems more likely, in my opinion, that the adoption of this title in his royal cartouches was intended mainly to confirm a certain traitional or religious prestige which this title referred to.

Kákosy's comparative study of the representations of the royal tombs of Tutankhamon and Ay clarifies the different attitudes of the remainder of Amon's clergy towards the two kings in their „house of eter-

nity." In Ay's tomb we do not meet that part of the Osiris-scene, where the metamorphosis of the king into Osiris is realized, and he is not represented as a member of the Ennead in the solar bark (cf. the parallel scene on shrine II. of Tutankhamon). Kákósy concludes that the apotheosis, the divine nature of the king, is much more stressed upon in case of Tutankhamon's tomb and he ascribes this difference in the two kings' representations in their royal sepulchres to Amon's priests, who saw in Ay a close collaborator of Akhenaton.⁵¹ It is reasonable that the remains of the priesthood of Amon accorded Ay the apotheosis to a lesser extent than to Tutankhamon. The latter was the only monarch who carried the name of Amon in the Post-Amarna period.⁵² This was a direct expression of the compromise with the religious orthodoxy, and in the same time it aimed at the soothing of the reaction raised by moving the capital to Memphis instead of Thebes. The several years which elapsed since the fall of the Amarna regime and Ay's accession were enough to deal effectively with the imminent dangers, specially the reaction against the heresy among the pious masses. It is rather significant, in this context, that the architectural activity of Tutankhamon⁵³ was concentrated in Luxor temple,⁵⁴ and not in Karnak, the traditional centre of the high priests of Amon.

Ay, and not Haremheb, was the real regent of the land under Tutankhamon.⁵⁵ Ankhesenamon's letter to the Hittite sovereign proves that Ay was not a close relative of the royal family.⁵⁶ The royal widow was later perhaps locked in the harem of Ay deprived of any royal titulature, which was granted only to Ay's original wife Ty, who was depicted with him in his royal tomb.⁵⁷ The ring on which the name of Ankhsenamon was combined with that of Ay⁵⁸ is not enough evidence for a royal marriage as Hornung reasonably indicates.⁵⁹ The supposition that this ring is an evidence for a co-regency,⁶⁰ is not in accordance with the fact that Ankhsenamon was the sender of the letter to Suppiluliuma.⁶¹ Even if Ay was really the grandfather of Ankhsenamon, the success of her plans should have meant the end of Ay himself.⁶² Evidently, any interpretation of Ay's taking of power under Tutankhamon and his accession to the Egyptian throne, may be acceptable only in the light of the growing importance of the role of the military class in domestic policy since Amarna and of his close relation to the army as an influential member of the military cast.

Hornung adopts the idea that Haremheb was raised to the respectable posts he held under Tutankhamon thanks to Ay, as his close collaborator, in the same way as Paramesses owed his accession to Haremheb.⁶³ Ay was the first chancellor, and not Haremheb, who under Tutankhamon or probably under Semenkhkare took the initiative for a positive and balanced religious policy towards the main deities of Egypt. This can be also deduced from his buildings erected during the four years of his reign. A funerary temple was built for him in Medinet Habu according to the traditional cults and even there are traces of his building activity in Karnak and Luxor.⁶⁴ At Akhmim a rock-chapel was built in his name dedicated to the god Min.⁶⁵ At Abydos, the ancient centre of Osiris, whose cult was completely forbidden in Amarna, a funerary building of Ay was erected.⁶⁶

The restoration stela of Tutankhamon, usurped later by Haremheb, belongs to the year 2 or 3 or later of his reign.⁶⁷ We can accordingly deduce that Ay and his military collaborators were the initiators of the religious policy under the young king. Hornung refers to a certain unpublished scarab, now in a private collection in Switzerland, on which the familiar title of Ay "god's father" is preceded by the title "crown prince" or "heir prince".⁶⁸ Moreover, he supports Helck's, Seele's, and Newberry's idea that Ay had held the post of a vizier under Tutankhamon.⁶⁹

Although Beckerath supports the idea that Ay, and not Haremheb, was the strong man behind Tutankhamon, he tries to explain the supposed conflict between them, which was dramatized by Helck to such an extent that a "coup d'état" during Ay's visit to Haremheb's military headquarters at Memphis was assumed.⁷⁰ Beckerath's interpretation to bridge the differences about this alleged conflict found its ground in the traditional historical concurrence between the cultural and theological centres of the North and South of Egypt. As Haremheb was born in the 18th Nome of Upper Egypt and served in the headquarters in Memphis, Beckerath suggests that he represented the northern cultural centres, while Ay represented a southern movement of a Theban party, which tried to liquidate the political and cultural achievements of the northern centres, continued by the Amarna reforms.⁷¹ He concludes that this contradiction resulted into Haremheb's revolt against Ay in the year 4 of his reign.⁷² In my opinion there is compelling evidence to assume that Haremheb was more impressed by northern cultural and theological influences than Ay. Both were officers who were probably equally exposed to the same influences and enjoying the same cultural background. Ay probably belonged to Akhmin not far from the 18th province of Upper Egypt, the birth place of Haremheb. The funerary representations in Ay's tomb, in which he was granted a lower degree of apotheosis than his predecessor, were probably executed intentionally by Amon's priests. This means that he was not held to be a supporter of their plans to revive their old power. It is true, nevertheless, that Haremheb, in his coronation text, while considering Horus as his patron god,⁷³ paid a visit to Thebes where Amon played the traditional role in his coronation ceremony. A war with the Hittites, according to their own records, had taken place after the death of Tutankhamon, as a direct result of the assassination of their prince. Consequently, we cannot say that the old Theban circles were the foremost in forcing the restoring of the imperial position in Asia, surpassing in this effort even the army itself, as Beckerath suggests.⁷⁴ The conversion to orthodoxy was imposed, according to Helck, to ensure an internal social peace necessary to fulfil the pressing demand of the army circles for an active military policy in the Asiatic part of the Empire.⁷⁵ Moreover, since the last two high priests of Amon, under Amenophis III, namely Meriptah and Ptahmose, no trace of any high priest of Amon is seen till the reign of Haremheb, who appointed Neboua in this position.⁷⁶ Lefebvre indicates that during the period, which separated Tutankhamon and Ramesses II, the priests of Amon had a relatively humble prestige.⁷⁷ This confirms

that there was considerable resistance against the aspiration of the Theban clergy, and they lacked the proper leadership for a renewed struggle for power. The religious reaction against the Amarna heresy found substantially its ground in the Egyptian masses that the religious restoration, after the crisis, was intended to satisfy. Secondly, the reaction of these masses grew gradually in its dimensions till it reached its culmination, at least two generations after the death of Akhenaton.⁷⁸

A significant inscription of Ay at Panapolis, unfortunately severely broken, reads: "... it occurred. The King of Upper and Lower Egypt Ay was a *nsw-mnh* in (the entire land). On one of these days it came to pass that His Majesty was seeking beneficial things for all of the gods (his fathers) in order to embellish the sanctuaries of the gods and in order to adorn their (temples)."⁷⁹ This unfortunately undated inscription with the full titulary of the king preceding the text and the narrative construction: "one of these days it came to pass" (*w^c-m-nn-hrw-hpr.w*),⁸⁰ and the "*wn. inf*" construction⁸¹ leads one to think that the text was inscribed after the death of the king.⁸² This text is reminiscent of the stela dated to the 1st year of Amasis, in which he gives his predecessor and enemy a proper burial, as befits a true Pharaoh, "His Majesty buried him (Apries) together with every *nsw-mnh*".⁸³ Another text, dealing with the legend of Hatshepsut's divine birth states: "... the queen will perform a *mnh* kingship in the entire land."⁸⁴ Also in the Westcar papyrus it is mentioned that the three youthful kings will practise a *mnh* office or kingship.⁸⁵ Another important parallel of Ay's text is inscribed on the alabaster stela of Seti I from Karnak, in which the king is called a "*nsw-mnh* who performs what is good."⁸⁶ King Snefru is qualified as a *nsw-mnh* in the Instructions of Kagemni. He was referred to as "the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Snefru, the justified, was the *nsw-mnh* of the entire land."⁸⁷ The phrase "*nsw-mnh*" normally translated as "excellent King" or "beneficent king" was used by the Egyptians when they wished to stress with especial emphasis the excellent character of a good monarch.⁸⁸

Thus we are dealing with a king of a high historical importance, at least in the eyes of his contemporaries and of the immediate posterity. He became damned only later at the time of the documentation of the kings' lists of the Ramesside Period. It can be assumed that Ay's religious restoration policy which intended to revive the cults of all gods of Egypt, realizing a calculated balance with Amon, was consciously continued, in its broad concepts, by his successors who were all brought up in the Egyptian army.

¹ Th. M. Davis: The Tomb of Harmhabi and Toutankhamonou. London 1912. p. 28, fig. 4; A. Gardiner: Egypt of the Pharaohs. Oxford 1961. p. 233.

² A. Gardiner: *ibid.*

³ A. Gardiner: *op. cit.* 240.

⁴ W. Helck: Der Einfluss der Militärführer. Leipzig 1939. p. 15, 65.

⁵ W. Helck: *op. cit.* p. 73.

⁶ M. Sandman: Texts from the Time of Akhenaten. Brussels 1938. pp. 93 ff.

- ⁷ A. Gardiner: JEA 14 (1928) 10–11.
- ⁸ H. Carter: The Tomb of Tut. Ankh. Amen. London 1923–1933. II, p. 34, 160; W. Helck: *op. cit.* p. 76.
- ⁹ W. Helck: *op. cit.* p. 78.
- ¹⁰ A. Gardiner: Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 236; W. Helck: *op. cit.* p. 75.
- ¹¹ PM II, 16, 17; JEA 25, pp. 8 ff.
- ¹² A. Gardiner: Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 237.
- ¹³ *ibid.*
- ¹⁴ *ibid.*
- ¹⁵ W. Helck: *op. cit.* p. 78.
- ¹⁶ *ibid.* p. 76.
- ¹⁷ N. de G. Davies: The Rock Tombs of El Amarna. London 1903–1908. IV, pl. XIX.
- ¹⁸ W. Helck: *op. cit.* p. 75, note 6.
- ¹⁹ W. Helck: Geschichte des Alten Ägypten, p. 214 f.
- ²⁰ A. Gardiner: The Coronation of King Haremhab. JEA 39 (1963) 13–31, esp. p. 14. Urk. IV, 2115.
- ²¹ E. Hornung: Neue Materialien zur ägyptischen Chronologie. Wiesbaden 1967. p. 12.
- ²² C. Aldred: Akhenaton, the Pharaoh of Egypt, p. 181.
- ²³ W. Helck: Geschichte, p. 215.
- ²⁴ W. Helck: Militärführer, p. 78; P. E. Newberry: JEA 18 (1932) 52.
- ²⁵ W. Helck: Militärführer, p. 74.
- ²⁶ Rec. Trav. 29, p. 162, 1.8; Tutankhamon Stela Cairo 34183.
- ²⁷ PM III, 195–197; JEA 39, pp. 3 ff.
- ²⁸ A. Gardiner: Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 248;
- ²⁹ ASAE 14, p. 30; W. Helck: Militärführer, p. 22 ff.
- ³⁰ W. Helck: *op. cit.* 32
- ³¹ *ibid.* p. 29, note 1.
- ³² H. Kees: Das Priestertum im ägyptischen Staat, p. 89.
- ³³ A. Radwan: Ein Relief der Nachamarnazeit. Orientalia 43 (1974) 393 ff.
- ³⁴ L. Habachi: Le tombeau de Nay. BIFAO 1977, pp. 27 ff.
- ³⁵ ASAE 40, pp. 136 ff.; A. Gardiner: Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 239.
- ³⁶ LÄ I, 1975, 1211.
- ³⁷ ASAE 38, pp. 641 ff.
- ³⁸ ANET p. 319; E. Hornung: Neue Materialien zur ägyptischen Chronologie, p. 12.
- ³⁹ A. Gardiner: Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 241 f.
- ⁴⁰ ANET pp. 394 ff.; A. Gardiner: Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 241 ff.
- ⁴¹ E. Hornung: Das Grab des Haremheb im Königstal, p. 16 f.
- ⁴² Urk. IV, 2109, 17.
- ⁴³ P. A. A. Boeser: Ägypt. Sammlg. Leiden, IV, pl. 21/5.
- ⁴⁴ W. Helck: Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien... Wiesbaden 1971². p. 182; KUB XXIV, 3.
- ⁴⁵ A. Gardiner: Egypt of the Pharaohs, 245.
- ⁴⁶ K. Pflüger: Haremheb und die Amarnazeit. 1936.
- ⁴⁷ W. Wolf: OLZ 1937. Sp. 677 f.
- ⁴⁸ J. V. Beckerath: Tanis und Theben, p. 21 ff.
- ⁴⁹ *ibid.* p. 22.
- ⁵⁰ *ibid.*
- ⁵¹ L. Kákosy: Some Remarks on Tutankhamon's Tomb. In: Tutankhamon i jevo vremja. Moscow 1976. p. 32 f.
- ⁵² J. V. Beckerath: *op. cit.* 23 f.
- ⁵³ A. Gardiner: Egypt of the Pharaohs, p. 237.
- ⁵⁴ W. Wolf: Das schöne Fest von Opet. Leipzig 1931.
- ⁵⁵ E. Hornung: Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte des Neuen Reiches, p. 93.
- ⁵⁶ *ibid.*
- ⁵⁷ PM II, p. 550 f.
- ⁵⁸ P. E. Newberry: JEA 18, p. 50; Urk. IV, 2108.
- ⁵⁹ E. Hornung: Untersuchungen, p. 93.

- ⁶⁰ *K. Seele*: JNES 14 (1955) 176; *P. E. Newberry*: *op. cit.* 50 f.
⁶¹ *E. Edel*: JNES 7 (1948) 11 ff.; *E. Hornung*: *Neue Materialien zur ägyptischen Chronologie*, p. 2.
⁶² LÄ I, 1975, 1211.
⁶³ *E. Hornung*: *Untersuchungen*, p. 93.
⁶⁴ LÄ I, 1975, 1211.
⁶⁵ *ibid.*
⁶⁶ *ibid.* 1212.
⁶⁷ *E. Hornung*: *Untersuchungen*, p. 92.
⁶⁸ *ibid.* p. 93.
⁶⁹ *ibid.*
⁷⁰ *W. Helck*: *Militärführer*, p. 84.
⁷¹ *J. V. Beckerath*: *Tanis und Theben*, p. 23 f.
⁷² *ibid.* 24.
⁷³ *J. V. Beckerath*: *op. cit.* p. 23.
⁷⁴ *ibid.* p. 24.
⁷⁵ *W. Helck*: *Militärführer*, p. 74 f.
⁷⁶ *G. Lefebvre*: *Prêtres*, pp. 240 ff.
⁷⁷ *ibid.* p. 245.
⁷⁸ *A. Gardiner*: *Mes.* 32, note 82; *JEA* 24, p. 124.
⁷⁹ *T. Spalinger*: *Aspects of the Military Documents of the Ancient Egyptians*. Yale University, Thesis (unpubl.); *Urk. IV*, 2106-7.
⁸⁰ *Urk. IV*, 2106.
⁸² *Urk. IV*, 2107.
⁸² *T. Spalinger*: *op. cit.*
⁸³ *ibid.*
⁸⁴ *Urk. IV*, 221. 9.
⁸⁵ *T. Spalinger*: *op. cit.*
⁸⁶ *ibid.*
⁸⁷ *ibid.*
⁸⁸ *ibid.*