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The Cache of Akhenaten, erroneously called “ The Tomb of Queen Tiyi,” was discovered by Mr Ayrton in the year 1907, on behalf of Mr Theo.M.Davis.

The tomb wherein this cache was found is though fairly [hw: large] [st: spacious] [hw: corridor -] of the simplest kind, [st: ?? corridor-tomb] [hw: ??] cut in the rock of very fair quality. It has a descending stairway of nineteen steps hewn in the bed-rock, which lead to a doorway 1.61 metres broad and 2.34 metres high. The doorway in [st: sequence] gives ingress to a descending corridor over 8 metres long and 2.34 metres high, and at the further end is another doorway, of similar dimensions, opening directly into the burial-chamber. The burial-chamber is of oblong rectangular shape measuring 6.65 by 5.03 and 3.86 metres in height, the floor is cut one metre below the level of the sill of the doorway, and in the south wall is [st: an] [hw: a small] unfinished [st: niche.] [hw: chamber.]

No attempt [st: has been] [hw: was] made to decorate this tomb, but the walls of the burial-chamber were once coated with a thin white plaster - now mostly fallen away. Upon the walls and ceiling of the corridor the mason’s pointing marks in black are still visible upon the chisel marked surfaces.
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When the tomb was discovered, Ayrton found the doorway to be closed with a roughly built wall made of limestone splinters and built upon the rubbish that partly filled the entrance of the tomb (pp.7,8) - an indication that an old tomb had been re-used, which hypothesis is supported by the following fact. Behind this roughly built wall were the remains of an original wall sealing the doorway, which was, in contrast to the other, carefully constructed upon the rock floor and was made of limestone blocks mortared together and coated on the outside with a plaster of a very hard nature. On this plaster coating were the impressions of an oval seal having a not unusual device - A JACKAL OVER NINE PRISONERS,(p.8).

The cache had been deposited on the rubbish that partly filled the tomb, which Ayrton describes as: “ clean limestone chippings which gave the appearance of never having been moved far from the tomb or left outside for any length of time” (p.8).

Over the mouth of the entrance of this tomb “ several large jars of the XXth dynasty type lying together in what appeared to be a recess in the rock “ were discovered (p.7).
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The tomb does not appear to have been especially made for a royal personage[st:, that is when judging from other tombs in this particular necropolis,] and in design one would assign it as being made for a private person. In all events the probabilities are that it was an old tomb utilized as a hiding place for Amenhetep IV when he was transported from [st: his tomb at] Tell El Amarna.

It may of course been made expressly for the re-burial of the king, but if that was the case why were there distinct traces of two separate sealings to the doorway - one original, the other rough and temporary nature - and the passage and chamber half full of detritus upon which this royal cache had been deposited? Those facts in themselves suggest an old tomb having been re-used.

Maspero seems to have been somewhat of this opinion and says: “First of all it must be clearly understood that the vault discovered by Davis is not a real tomb: it is a rough cell in the rock, which has been used as a secret burying place for a member of the family of the so-called Haertatic kings, when the reaction in favour of Amon triumphed.

[page 4]

The transfer of the mummy from its original tomb at Thebes, or El Amarna, was devised and made in order to save it from the wrath of vi[hw: c]torious sectarians; if this had not been the case, it would have been destroyed or robbed of its treasures. Only two Pharoahs are likely to have been actuated by kind feelings for Khuniatenu - those two who were connected with his family, AI and Tuatenkha[st: a]manu - it was one of them who planned and executed the operation. That he succeeded in carrying it out secretly is evident from the fact that, while the tombs of the kings were desecrated and plundered completely, this place, with its wealth of gold, remained concealed and untouched unitil last year. The whole furniture was still in it, ready to bear witness as to the name and rank of its owner.” (p.XIII).

But Maspero adds: “when subsequently tested, its evidence was both obscure and conflicting”(p.XIII); and he, after putting forth various conjectures which he himself terms as “too far-fetched to hold good”, finally ends his note upon the tomb by saying that “ I believe that Davis’ vault was originally designed for Tiyi, and for Tiyi’s furniture, but that Khuniatenu’s mummy was buried in it by mistake.” (pp.XIII,XIV).

This last remark seems strange, especially in the face of the excavator’s note of the two separate closings of the
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doorway of the tomb; the det[hw: R]itus which partly filled the entrance, corridor and chamber, upon which the cache was deposited; [hw: and] that there is good reason to believe that Queen Thiy was buried in the tomb of Amenhetep III in Wadyein (cf. MM.Jellois et Devilleirs, Descrip.de l’Egypte, Ant.III,193, and X,218, Ant.pl.II, 79 to 81. [hw: also Resulli Carnarvon Excs.])[st: . and that t]There is only one object, the ca[st: o]nopy, found in this cache that [st: can] [hw: could] be claimed as solely belon[hw: g]ing to the Queen.

The cache comprised the mummy and coffin of Akhenaten; jewellery found upon his mummy; pedestals of the magical figures , bearing his name; a set of four canopic jars; some small objects of funerary nature; a funerary canopy of Queen Thiy; and some clay seals of Tutankhamen.

[st: The following is a conspectus of this cache.]