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This worthy, attired in the leopard’s skin of his calling, is shown pouring a libation over a pile of offerings, and purifying them by extending a censer over the foodstuffs. The front ‘flap’ of Pehefnefer’s kilt is outlined in red, and the toes of one foot are likewise in outline only.

The Cult of Ḥoremheb

On the basis of stylistic and epigraphic criteria it is clear that the north and south plinths described above were not part of the original architecture of the tomb but were added in the Ramesside Period. However, at this stage of excavation it remains to be seen whether the tomb of Ḥoremheb, with its cult chapel for the deified tomb-owner, was the focus of a necropolis of minor members of the family of Ramesses II. It is curious and probably significant, for instance, that Tia, the daughter of Seti I and sister of Ramesses II, should have chosen to have her tomb physically joined to the Memphite tomb of Ḥoremheb.

Certain facts are known about the family origins of the Ramesside dynasty: the genealogy is secure for five generations backwards from Ramesses II, but Ḥoremheb, as far as can be seen, was not a member of this family. Nevertheless, Paramessu (later Ramesses I), owed his influence and status to the great commander, and this is surely the reason why the early Ramesside kings, or at least Ramesses II, promoted the cult of Ḥoremheb. The few extant documents which relate to the cult of the deified Ḥoremheb are not exclusively Nineteenth Dynasty in date, and there is even some evidence to suggest that, like Ramesses II, Ḥoremheb was deified and worshipped in his own lifetime.

Notes: The genealogy above is reconstructed from the north and south plinth inscriptions. If a relationship existed between the ḫry-hb Sḥḥ-n–Ptḥ and this family it is unstated. He may have been a lector priest of the deified Ḥoremheb (‘lector priest of his lord’) or a lector of Pehefnefer. Two generations are commemorated on the plinths, but the title of ‘lector priest of Ḥoremheb’ does not appear to have descended to the second generation, at least not when the reliefs on the plinths were carved.

1 The only other possibility is that the plinths themselves were part of the original decorative scheme, but that the reliefs and texts were not added until the Ramesside Period.
2 See Martin, JEA 66 (1979), 16.
4 On the alleged ancestry of Ḥoremheb see Lepsius, Denkmäler iii, 119c; PM ii, 356 (renewal text of Ḥoremheb in the Deir el-Bahri temple of Hatshepsut).
5 Cf. Ranke, ZAS 67 (1931), 78–82. On the deification of kings see Barta, Untersuchungen zur Göttlichkeit des regierenden Königs (Munich, 1973); Habachi, Features of the deification of Ramesses II (Gluckstadt, 1969); Rosenvasser, ‘The stela Aksha 505 and the cult of Ramesses II as a god in the army’. RIAH 1 (1972), 99–104; Bell, ‘Aspects of the cult of the deified Tutankhamun’, in Melanges Gamal Elidin Mokhtar, i ( Cairo, 1985), 31–59. There is as yet no comprehensive study on posthumous royal cults. On the royal cult see Wildung, Egyptian Saints: Deification in Pharaonic Egypt (New York, 1977), 1–30. For the deity Ḥoremheb see Yoyotte, RevE 34 (1982–3), 148–9; Leaby, GM 50 (1982), 155. For documents relating to the cult of Ḥoremheb cf. stela Bologna 1906 (Kminke-Szedolo, Museo Civico di Bologna. Catalogo di antichità egizie, 182–3; Ferri, Il Museo Civico di Bologna, 2nd edn., 10, no. 8); coffin Leiden Inv. ANM26 (Boeer, Beschreibung der ägyptischen Sammlung, viii (The Hague, 1916), no. 10, with pl. 8.x). The lid and mummy are on loan to the Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam; the coffin, which is in poor condition, is in Leiden); stela Leiden Inv. APO2612; scene in tomb of Ramose (no. 7) at Deir el-Medina (PM ii, pt. 1, 13). Probably also relevant is the statue fragment with (added?) graffito of Year 27 found in the mortuary temple of Ḥoremheb at Medinet Habu: Hölscher, Excavations at Ancient Thebes 1930/31 (Chicago, 1932), 51, 52; id., The Temples of the Eighteenth Dynasty. The Excavation of Medinet Habu, i (Chicago, 1939), 106–8; Helck, CAE 48 (1973), 253–64; Wente and van Siclen, in Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes (Chicago, 1976), 281–2, with references. It is possible that the statue was presented to the temple in Year 27 (of Ramesses II) in connection with the cult of Ḥoremheb in that reign.
A number of questions relating to the cult of Horemheb at Saqqara can be posed, but not answered in any detail at present. These are:

(a) What was the duration of the cult? Presumably it lasted until the tomb was finally abandoned (in the late Ramesside Period?), and its superstructure disappeared under the sand. The tomb was no doubt intact and completely accessible during the reign of Ramesses II, when the Saqqara cult seems to have been instituted.

(b) Was the uraeus added to Horemheb’s brow in his Memphite tomb scenes in connection with the cult, i.e. under Ramesses II, rather than at that great official’s accession to kingship? Doubtless the cartouches of Tutankhamun in the historical texts in the monument were also ‘usurped’ as part of the same operation, whenever that took place. Why was the addition of the uraeus selective in the tomb reliefs? It will be noted that, of the two depictions of Horemheb in the Statue Room, the site of the cult, only one [58] has the added uraeus. The absence of the symbol of kingship on some of the reliefs may be due to the carelessness of officials charged with adding the uraeus. The only other pre-royal ‘portrait’ of Horemheb, apart from the two scribal statues (for which refer below, p. 23), is on the celebrated ‘Trauerrelief’ in Berlin. The uraeus has not been added there.

(c) What part, if any, did Mutnodjmet play in the Saqqara cult of Horemheb? As yet, no information is forthcoming on this question.

---

1 E. Berlin 12411, PM III, pt. 2, 711–12.