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Introduction

Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA), through its subsidiary, AERA-Egypt, launched the project, Memphis, Egypt’s Ancient Capital: A Plan for Site and Community Development (MSCD), in September 2015 to develop an Ancient Memphis Walking Circuit encompassing eight archaeological sites at Mit Rahina, with an assessment of the sites for conservation and a training program in heritage management. Otherwise known as Memphis Site and Community Development, the Project utilizes local labor and the knowledge of local stakeholders to benefit the community economically and to provide a quality experience of the site for Egyptian and international visitors.

An integral component of the project was to first collect and process the archaeological baseline data for Memphis, particularly the area within which the eight archaeological sites of the circuit are located, but also the general southern Memphis vicinity. This was an integral component because a) we needed to fully understand the 8 sites of the circuit and b) we needed to develop wider narratives (using signage, website content, guidebooks etc) about the general Memphite area to maximize visitor engagement with the circuit.

A textual narrative of previous excavations (who excavated, when they excavated, where they excavated, and what they excavated) was produced by the Survey of Memphis, Egypt Exploration Society, and published as ‘Survey of Memphis I’ (Jeffreys 1985), after conducting extensive research (archives, maps, publications, photographs) and an extensive physical survey of Memphis. In order to map and catalogue each site of excavation, Jeffreys assigned each site an unique identifier code, using the first letter of the Kom (tell) or Birka (depression) that the site was on or near, followed by two letters (for example: RAA, RAB, RAC, RAD etc..). Jeffreys surveyed each site of excavation and then added coding, to produce a Historic Environment Record map (figure 1).

A Historic Environment Record (a catalogue or gazetteer) of sites geo-references and provides information on all known heritage assets (archaeological sites/historic sites and buildings/ historic and palaeo-environmental sites) within a given area. A Historic Environment Record enables all parties to view the location and types of sites within an area. This type of record is crucial for custodians of the Historic Environment and for any party who wishes to conduct research or development schemes. Prior to digital developments in the 1990s, Historic Environment Records were often paper based (for example in the UK), but have increasingly become far more accessible and queryable using databases and ArcGIS (for example). These formats also enable new entries to be added and accessed easily, so that the catalogue be kept up to date.

By using Jeffreys’ site codes and limits of excavated sites (figure 1) and georeferencing them in ArcGIS (figure 2) we were able to tie data tables that we produced in Excel, so that locations of sites can be easily viewed. The data tables include site code, site type,
description, who excavated the site, when it was excavated, whether the site is still visible, and the bibliography of each site. In this way data relating to the site can be easily accessed, and a user is signposted to further information. By assigning a ‘type’, types of site can be seen together (for example, viewing all ‘temples’, or all ‘domestic buildings’, etc). The descriptions of each site were mainly taken from Jeffreys 1985, Survey of Memphis I, but were also added to with our own research.
Figure 1. The previous excavations of Memphis South, with Area Code (Jeffreys 1985:figure 8)
Figure 2. The sites as seen now in the GIS, georectified, overlaid onto Google Earth, and tied to the data table. Map prepared by the GIS Specialist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site code (EES)</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Excavated by</th>
<th>Dates excavated</th>
<th>Features visible 2015/2016</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAA</td>
<td>Gate, Enclosure Wall, Approach, Temple</td>
<td>NK, PT</td>
<td>The western gate of the greater Ptah Enclosure and the western approach to the enclosure. The site comprises the western approach, pylon and hypostyle Hall. In 1800 the French expedition noted the presence of loose blocks of granite, limestone and other material. This was followed by some clearances of the site by Hekekyan, Mariette, de Morgan and Maspero. Then a detailed study by Daressy in 1901. The first real excavations here were done by Petrie in 1907-8, who published a plan. There were disparities though between Petrie's and Daressy's plans. Later, in 1955 Dimick reported that Petrie's plan of the monuments could not be completely made out on the ground. Up to 1965, the monument lay in a pool of water. The western part of the site was re-surveyed by the EES in 1982. During this time a granite threshold was recorded in the outer N wall - suggesting a N-S axis as well as the E-W axis. Also in 1982, an eastern approach was recorded, which corresponds with the to the ramp approach to the central aisle of the pylon. The approach leads down to the west. When overlaying the line of the approach over Daressy's plan it seems to lie across the line of a N-S m/b wall. There was no sign of this in 1982. Daressy mentions that this wall was associated with a foundation deposit of Thuthmosis IV. Petrie also found a foundation deposit of Thuthmosis IV nearby. The pylon and hypostyle are Ramesside. The west gate may have been part of a re-planning of the city during late XVIIIth/early XIXth dynasty – (continued...)</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan, Jacques de Morgan, Finders Petrie, Survey of Memphis</td>
<td>1854 (JH); 1892 (JM); 1908 (WP); 1987, 1992, 1994-5 (SoM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Altenmüller, H. et al. 1990. Informationsblatt der deutschenprägenden Ägyptologie 39.1, 18v; Altenmüller, H. et al. 1991. Informationsblatt der deutschenprägenden Ägyptologie 41.1, 17iv.; Brugsch, E. 1893. In: Griffith (ed), Egypt Exploration Fund Archaeological Report 1892 – 1893. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 23 – 25; Daressy, G. 1902. Temple de Mit Rahineh. Annales du Service des Antiquités de L’Égypte. Tome III, 22 – 31; Daressy, G.É.J. 1906. Statues de Divinités, Le Caire: Imprimerie de l'Inst. Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1905–1906. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire: 38001 - 39348, Volume 29, 116 - 117; ii.Pl.XXV; de Morgan, J. 1894. Compte Rendu des Travaux Archeologiques: Effectués par le service de antiquités de L'Égypte et par les savants étrangers: Pendant les années étrangers. In: Bulletin de L’Institut Égyptien, Series 4, Année 1893, 387 – 418; Dimick, M.T. 1956. Memphis: The City of the White Wall. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania; Dimick, J. 1959 Descriptive Text for the Survey Map of Memphis. In: R. Anthes, Mit Rahineh 1955. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania, 81 – 83. Legend no. 10 on the survey map; Farag, S. 1980. Une Inscription Memphite de la XII Dynastie. Revue de L'Égypte Ancienne, 32, 75 – 82; Garnett, A. 2011. The Like of Which Never Existed: The Memphite Building Programme of Amenhotep III. In: J. Corbelli, D. Boatright, &amp; C. Malleson (eds). Current Research in Egyptology 2009: Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Symposium. Oxbow Books, 53 – 66; (continued...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAB</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Architectural foundations of limestone, breccia and quartz, to the east of the Hyposyle Hall of the Great Ptah Temple. This site is Joseph Hekekyan’s ‘Excavation 3’</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1852 (JH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreyys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 35; Hekekyan MS 37458, 29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Blocks from an ‘axial sanctuary’ of Amenophis III and Amasis. Petrie suggests that these were in situ, but it is likely that they were not.</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1910 (WP)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreyys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>Findspot, Temple</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>The site where ‘the three colossi’ were found – 3 colossal statues in ‘sandstone breccia’, above their sand foundation beds. In this area there was evidence of two levels of pavement. This site is Joseph Hekekyan’s ‘Excavation 5’.</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1852 (JH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreyys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 35-36; Hekekyan MS 37452, 262 Ro - 271 Ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Location of a granite colossal statue of Ramasses II, that had been usurped by Ramasses IV. The colossus was moved to outside Midan Ramases station, Cairo, in 1955 and then to the Grand Egyptian Museum in 2006. According to Hekekyan’s drawings – it had originally faced south (possibly east), and fallen on its right side- head to the south. The double crown had been detached in antiquity, but was found nearby. The granite pedestal for the statue was also found nearby, founded on a bed of sand. The colossus was found by Hekekyan in 1852, in Hekekyan’s Excavation 6 area.</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1852 (JH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 36; Hekekyan MS 37452, 256 Ro - 259 Ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAF</td>
<td>Temple, Talatat</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Here Hekekyan found sections of the pavement of the Ptah Temple, and a few courses of a stone built entrance, facing east and a N-S row of 8 pedestals. Apart from the west gate and the hypostyle , this is the only part of the inner Ptah that is known to have survived. Cartouches on the in situ pedestals are Ramases II and Merenptah, and added cartouches of Ramases III. There was also a block bearing the late form of the Aten cartouches. This site is Hekekyan’s Excavation VII area.</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1852 (JH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 36; Hekekyan MS 37452, 261 Ro, 263 Ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAG</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Fragments of a colossal statue of red granite, seen by Hekekyan, and later by Petrie</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1854 (JH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 37; Petrie 1913, Tarkhan I and Memphis V, 33; Hekekyan MS 37452, 245 Ro_Vo; Petrie 1908, Memphis I, 2, fn4, pl.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAH</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Pieces of alabaster and granite found in trenches excavated by Tahrir</td>
<td>Ahmed Tahrir</td>
<td>1967 (AT)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAJ</td>
<td>Propylon</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Part of an in situ pavement of Ptolemy IV was found – dated by fragments of cornice and architrave near the eastern wall of the Ptah temple.</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1908 (WP)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 37; Petrie 1909 Memphis I, 14, footnote 42, pl. I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAK</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Here two large blocks of basalt were found, possibly reworked into a barque? 20m to the south of this, a row of 3 granite basins (originally column drums) were also found. This area was excavated by Mohammed Al-Hitta.</td>
<td>Mohammed Al-Hitta</td>
<td>1954 (MH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAL</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Group of VIth dynasty statues of kings and an OK libation vessel. royal statuary were excavated. Also, an OK libation vessel. These may have been later re-buried pieces, within a sacred pit, within a sand bed, to the north of Ptah Temple West Gate.</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1907 (WP)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffrey 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 37-38; Petrie 1908 EEF Archaeological Report, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAM</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A sunken limestone tank with concave ends and a stepped centre bar. This was re-used from a building of Nectanebo II. Documentation says it was found ‘halfway between the temple of Ramases II (BAA) and the SE corner of FAH’. As such BAM may have some association with the Apis site. To the north a cyclindrical vat was located (may also be connected with the Apis site).</td>
<td>Georges Daressy</td>
<td>1901 (GD)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffrey 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 37-38; Petrie 1909 Memphis I, 10, fn31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAN</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffrey 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Mohammed Al-Hitta</td>
<td>1967 (MH)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAO</td>
<td>Temple, Talatat</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Talatat of the Armana period were re-used in a pavement or wall foundation. Cartouches of an early form of Aten were also found. All were recovered from excavation pits cut by Hekekyan.</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1854 (JH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffrey 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 36; Hekekyan MS 37452, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAP</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Two blocks showing a striding royal figure, wearing a horned, feathered crown. The upper part of this figure was still in situ in 1983. The blocks were found by Hekekyan</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1852 (JH)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 36; Hekekyan MS 37454, 141; Jeffreys, Smith 1985 Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAQ</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Small research pit, excavated by Hekekyan, one of several hundred that he dug in and around Memphis</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1852 (JH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 36; Hekekyan MS 37460, 233 Vo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>Enclosure Wall</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>The northern enclosure wall of the Great Ptah Temple. Here, the full width of the enclosure wall can be seen, and the construction cut for the wall is clear. BAR represents two excavation trenches that Petrie excavated across the wall.</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1912 (WP)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 37; Petrie 1913 Tarkhan I and Memphis V, 32, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1852 (JH)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAT</td>
<td>Enclosure Wall, Findspot, Gate?, Hypostyle?</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Petrie recorded a 35m break in the northern enclosure wall of the Ptah temple. He excavated along the northern and southern faces of the enclosure wall and found many fragments of statues, including a lintel of and door jamb of Amenemmes III and a colossal granite sphinx inscribed for Merenptah. This lintel was probably re-used in the Ramesside construction. Here Petrie also found a N-S? colonnade, 5 m to the east of the lintel, and may have been part of a hypostyle? This location, as the northern gate lies considerably west of the main north-south axis. One interpretation of this is that a gate to the east would have only led to the 'sacred lake'. Another is that this gate is subsidiary.</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1912 (WP)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 37, fn317; Petrie 1913 Tarkhan I and Memphis V, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAU</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Georges Daressy</td>
<td>1920 (GD)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>Negative?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Trenches were excavated here by Tahir. DJ was unable to locate any information relating to these – perhaps because they did not contain anything</td>
<td>Ahmad Tahrir</td>
<td>1967 (AT)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAB</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Trenches were excavated here by Tahir. Inscribed blocs of granite were found, one with the cartouche of a Rammesside? King</td>
<td>Ahmad Tahrir</td>
<td>1966 (AT)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Cemetery (tombs)</td>
<td>FIP, MK</td>
<td>Here during preparations to run a road in this area in 1954, a group of brick-vaulted stone-lined tombs were uncovered. These are FIP or early MK. These were then exposed and partially excavated by Hitta. The tombs had a common east frontage (?street) that contained offering tables and 2 false doors set in recesses. These two false doors are exhibited in the Memphis Museum. This area was revisited by AERA in 2011, who excavated in FAD, but did not excavate in FAC. Unexcavated tombs continue to the north, west and south of Hitta’s excavation area.</td>
<td>Mohammed Al-Hitta</td>
<td>1954 (MH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 28; Lilyquist 1974, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 11, 27-30; El Hitta 1955, La Revue de Caire 33/175, 50-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAD</td>
<td>Domestic Buildings</td>
<td>MK, NK</td>
<td>Area of excavated Middle Kingdom settlement, comprising mudbrick buildings either side of an east-west street that appeared to access the cemetery (FAC). The settlement built up, to eventually cover the cemetery (FAC). The settlement was initially excavated by Ashery in 1981 and was then excavated by AERA in 2011. During the 2011 excavations boreholes were also dug within the area that contained Old Kingdom material, suggesting the presence of an Old Kingdom settlement/activity beneath the FIP/MK remains or within the vicinity.</td>
<td>Mohammed Ashery, Ancient Egypt Research Associates</td>
<td>1981 (MA), 2011 (AERA)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAE</td>
<td>Temple?</td>
<td>LP?</td>
<td>This building consists of a colonnaded forecourt and a gate opening east-west. The forecourt opens over a rectangular vestibule leading to a row of three or four contiguous small chambers. The architecture consists of mudbrick walls, originally lined with stone slabs, and stone-paved floors, which were very similar to the paved floors found within the Apis buildings (FAG). The building is commonly referred to as 'the Building of Shabaka', so called after blocks inscribed with the name King Shabaka (probably re-used blocks). The building was originally excavated by Petrie and later by the Apis House Project in The Apis House Project in 1982 and 1983. In 2015 during the cleaning of FAG in preparation of the Memphis walking circuit, AERA cleaned FAE at the request of the Mit Rahina tafteesh. AERA then recorded the structure in 2016 (internally coding the area as FAGII).</td>
<td>Fiinders Petrie, the Apis Project</td>
<td>1908 (WP), 1982-1983 (AP)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Petrie 1909 Memphis I, 10, fn31; Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 22-23; Jones 1983, “The Apis House Project at Mit Rahinah: Preliminary report of the second and third seasons, 1982-1983”, JARCE 20, 33-45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAH</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Colonnaded courtyard to the south of, but part of, FAG. This area was excavated by Petrie and may currently lie beneath the modern Saqqara to Bedreshein Road</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1908 (WP)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Petrie, W.F., 1909, Memphis I, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAJ</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Barry Kemp</td>
<td>1976 (BK)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAK</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Old Kingdom pottery sherds were noted in this area</td>
<td>Barry Kemp</td>
<td>1976 (BK)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 28; Kemp 1977 Antiquity 51, 192-194.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAL</td>
<td>Domestic Buildings</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Small excavation to the south of FAC, by Ashery. Here, mudbrick walls of the Late Period were found, 0.50m above the MK brick vaulting. Beneath these walls, tip lines were identified, containing XVIIIth dynasty pottery</td>
<td>Mohammed Ashery</td>
<td>1981 (MA)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAN</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Egypt Exploration Society</td>
<td>1983 (ES)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A structure or series of structures to the west of FAE, with mudbrick forming the core of its walls, faced with limestone slabs. A number of the spaces are paved with limestone slabs. The structure was excavated in c.1997 by the Ministry of Antiquities (Saqqara inspectorate), either by Adel Remon or Mohamed Hafras. In 2015 during the cleaning of FAG in preparation of the Memphis walking circuit, AERA cleaned FAP at the request of the Mit Rahina tafteehs. AERA then recorded the structure in 2016 (internally coding the area as FAGIII).</td>
<td>Ministry of Antiquities</td>
<td>1997 (MoA)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAA</td>
<td>Industrial Buildings</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Location of glazing ovens</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1886 (WP)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 19; Petrie 1911, BSAE Historical Studies 2, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>Building?, Industrial buildings?</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Location of Ptolomaic building that had suffered from fire damage</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1910 (WP)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 19; Petrie 19110, Meydum and Memphis III, 44, fn75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAA</td>
<td>Ptah Temple, Findspot</td>
<td>NK?</td>
<td>Area of well-laid limestone pavement, with lining blocks, vertically along the lines of mudbrick walls. Also an ‘altar’, comprising an oblong table supporting 5 cylindrical vases (possibly incense burners), with ash inside</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1854 (JH)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 38;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAB</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Fragments of basins, and ‘the lower parts of a building of Ramases II</td>
<td>Auguste Mariette</td>
<td>1871 (AM)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 38;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAA</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Part of the temple of Merenptah, and overlying 'complex stratigraphy'</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1908 (WP)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 19-20; Petrie 1909 Memphis I, 11-12; Fisher 1915, PUMJ 6, 78-84; Fisher 1917, PUMJ 8, 211-230; Fisher 1921, PUMJ 12, 30-34; Fisher 1924, PUMJ 15, 92-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAB</td>
<td>Palace</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>The Palace of Merenptah. The palace site now exists as 2 large hollows, excavated by Clarence Fisher. Here he identified 5 major post-Ramesside building phases, including XXVIth dynasty and late Roman. The palace was excavated and taken to the USA and is currently displayed in the University of Pennsylvania Museum.</td>
<td>Clarence Fisher</td>
<td>1916 (CF)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 19-20; Petrie 1909 Memphis I, 11-12; Fisher 1915, PUMJ 6, 78-84; Fisher 1917, PUMJ 8, 211-230; Fisher 1921, PUMJ 12, 30-34; Fisher 1924, PUMJ 15, 92-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAC</td>
<td>Palace</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>The Palace of Merenptah. The site of the palace was first identified by Edgar in 1914</td>
<td>Campbell Edgar</td>
<td>1914 (CE)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 19-20; Edgar 1915 ASAE, 97-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAD</td>
<td>Gate, Enclosure Wall</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>location of the South Gate of the Merenptah Complex.</td>
<td>Clarence Fisher</td>
<td>1915 (CF)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 19-20; Petrie 1909 Memphis I, 11-12; Fisher 1915, PUMJ 6, 78-84; Fisher 1917, PUMJ 8, 211-230; Fisher 1921, PUMJ 12, 30-34; Fisher 1924, PUMJ 15, 92-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAE</td>
<td>Enclosure Wall</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Mudbrick, southern wall of Merenptah Complex</td>
<td>Rudolf Anthes</td>
<td>1956 (RA)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Anthes 1965, Mit Rahineh 1956, 35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAF</td>
<td>Enclosure Wall</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Mudbrick, southern wall of Merenptah Complex</td>
<td>Rudolf Anthes</td>
<td>1956 (RA)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Anthes 1965, Mit Rahineh 1956, 35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAG</td>
<td>Church?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Stone apsidal building, next to the building, using re-used blocks bearing the cartouche of a Ramseside king. Blocks later removed by Tahir</td>
<td>Ahmad Tahir</td>
<td>1967 (AT)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 20; Petrie 1915 in R Engelbach, Riqqeh and Memphis VI, 34, fn80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAH</td>
<td>Enclosure wall, Lavabo</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Site of a small lavabo and the southern enclosure wall of the Great Ptah Temple. These were exposed in 1967 by Ahmad Tahrir, prior to extending the Memphis museum. Tahrir excavated either side of the southern wall of the Great Ptah Temple. The wall is still visible in the southeast corner of the museum</td>
<td>Ahmad Tahrir</td>
<td>1967 (AT)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 20;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAJ</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Ahmad Tahrir</td>
<td>1965 (AT)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAK</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Jean Champollion</td>
<td>1828 (JC)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAL</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Abd al-Karim Abu Shanab</td>
<td>1983 (AK)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAM</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Lintel of Merenptah found by Quibell. This discovery led to Petrie's excavation QAA of the Temple of Merenptah</td>
<td>James Quibell</td>
<td>1906 (JQ)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 19; Quibell 1907, ASAE 8, 120-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAO</td>
<td>Enclosure Wall?</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>A large mudbrick wall was visible during the EES survey, within a military trench.</td>
<td>Egyptian Army</td>
<td>1971 (EA)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAP</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Egyptian Army</td>
<td>1979 (EA)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAQ</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>French Expedition</td>
<td>1799 (FE)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAR</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1908 (WP)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAS</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Alabaster Sphinx, displayed in the Memphis Museum. Near to its current location in the Museum, Petrie found (in 1911-12), the alabaster sphinx, tipped to its left side. The sphinx is one of the largest monuments made of alabaster. Its forepaws appear to have later been cut off. Date uncertain (various suggestions range from Hatshepsut) to Ramases. 'The findspot of this statue is close to that of the collosi, standing before the south pylon of the Ptah temple enclosure'. (Jeffreys 1985:21). The sphinx appears to have originally faced east. Jeffreys suggests that it may have been associated with the east gate of the inner Ptah temple. Blocks were found in the vicinity (possible associated with the Sphinx) and used by Petrie to support the statue when raising it from the water. One of these, before the trench was filled in, shows a cartouche of a Ramesside King.</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1912 (WP)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 21; Petrie 1911, Roman Portraits and Memphis IV, 23; EEF 1912, Archaeological Report 1911-12, 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAT</td>
<td>findspot</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Site of the Stela of Apries, which was raised by Bagnold and left on this site (QAT), before it was moved to the Memphis museum</td>
<td>Arthur Bagnold</td>
<td>1886 (AB)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 20; Bagnold 1888, PSBA, 458.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAU</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Clarence Fisher</td>
<td>1915 (CF)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAW</td>
<td>Domestic Buildings?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I. The exposed mudbrick architecture was surveyed by Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA) in 2017</td>
<td>Abd al-Karim Abu Shanab</td>
<td>1984 (AK)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAX</td>
<td>Domestic Buildings?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>The site was excavated by the American Research Centre in Egypt (ARCE) in ?2003. The exposed mudbrick architecture was surveyed by Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA) in 2017</td>
<td>Americal Research Centre in Egypt</td>
<td>?2003 (ARCE)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAA</td>
<td>Domestic Buildings?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Area of settlement excavated? by Lepsius in the early 1840s, next to the later SoM excavation of RAT. Lepsius mentioned very little of this RAA excavation. However, Hekekyan drew some of this area in 1852, who mentioned that the excavations were 'along a kind of street'.</td>
<td>Karl Lepsius</td>
<td>1842 (KL)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Historic Environment Record (HER)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site code (EES)</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Excavated by</th>
<th>Dates excavated</th>
<th>Features visible 2015/2016</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAB</td>
<td>Temple,</td>
<td>NK,</td>
<td>A large area containing a Temple for Ptah by Ramases II and 22nd dynasty tombs of the High Priests of Ptah, excavated in 1942 by Ahmad Badawi. The temple lies beneath the Ptolemaic Ptah temple enclosure wall and comprises a Sanctuary, portico, court, and pylon (the pylon has a separate code RAC. The site was later excavated by Anthes who excavated within the sanctuary, the court, the pylon and adjacent areas to the west, north and south of the sanctuary. Anthes excavated and recorded a considerable stratigraphic sequence post-dating the Ramesside temple - comprising domestic buildings, industrial buildings and 21st dynasty cist burials, as well as establishing a clear relationship between the Ramesside temple and the great Ptah Temple enclosure wall - identifying a construction cut for the enclosure wall that cut through the temple and much later stratigraphy. Salt had been affecting the limestone, leading to an epigraphic study by Makek (for the EES) in 1982 along with planning and recording of the temple and visible stratigraphy. In 2015 the Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA) cleaned the site of modern rubbish and vegetation and surveyed all visible remains (including all fallen/displaced blocks) whilst implementing a Memphis walking circuit, of which RAB is part of.</td>
<td>Ahmad Badawi, Rudolf Anthes</td>
<td>1942 (AB), 1955-6 (RA)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 22; Badawi 1944, ASAE 44; Anthes 1959, Mit Rahineh 1955; Anthes 1965, Mit Rahineh 1956; Anthes 1956, University Museum Bulletin 20; Anthes 1957, Univeristy Museum Bulletin 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code</td>
<td>Site Type, Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Pylon, Temple, Domestic Buildings</td>
<td>The pylon belonging to the small Temple for Ptah by Ramases II (RAB). The north half of the temple pylon was discovered in 1950 by Labib Habachi, the southern half of the temple was exposed and overlying later settlement excavated by Anthes in 1956. In 2015 the Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA) cleaned the site of modern rubbish and vegetation and surveyed all visible remains (including all fallen/displaced blocks) whilst implementing a Memphis walking circuit, of which RAB/RAC is part of.</td>
<td>Rudolf Anthes</td>
<td>1955 (RA)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 22; Badawi 1944, ASAE 44; Anthes 1959, Mit Rahineh 1955; Anthes 1965, Mit Rahineh 1956; Anthes 1956, University Museum Bulletin 20; Anthes 1957, Univeristy Museum Bulletin 21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>Chapel, Enclosure Wall</td>
<td>Chapel built by Seti I, containing 3 statues - Ptah in the middle, flanked by deities of Memphis personified, with Seti I on their knees. In front of the chapel was a cult model of the tsmt (the Memphite tower). Labib Habachi recorded this chapel in 1950 which had been revealed during drain-cutting work. Subsequently the chapel was raised up 2m to protect it from ground water. In 2015 the Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA) cleaned the site of modern rubbish and vegetation and surveyed all visible remains (including all fallen/displaced blocks) whilst implementing a Memphis walking circuit, of which RAD is part of.</td>
<td>Labib Habachi</td>
<td>1950 (LH)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 22; Habachi 1965 in Anthes Mit Rahineh 1956; Smith and Jeffreys 1985, JEA 71; Berlandini 1984, BSFE 99, 29-52; Desroches-Nobelcourt 1959, BSFE 1; Perhkins 1949, AJA 53, 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAE</td>
<td>Enclosure Wall</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>A drain dug by the Irrigation department lay along the line of the southern enclosure wall of the Great Ptah Temple. In 1955 the Philadelphia expedition used this to record the structural details of the wall. The south wall and parts of the east and west walls, was visible in the early 19th century (appears on Lepsius maps, Bonomi and Hekekyan). Petrie had thought that the south wall was Ramesside since it abutted the pylons of the west gate. However Jacquet demonstrated that the south wall lay in a construction cut, cut from a level commensurate with, or slightly higher than the modern ground level. The Philadelphia expedition excavated 5 trenches along the south face of the wall.</td>
<td>Irrigation Department, Rudolf Anthes</td>
<td>1948 (ID), 1955-6 (RA)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 23; Jacquet 1959 in Anthes, Mit Rahineh 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Enclosure walls?, Coin Hoard</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3 trenches were excavated by the EES in 1982 when the Museum’s car park was extended in 1981-2. Here the EES recovered a coin-hoard, associated with a large mudbrick wall to the south. This wall diverges from the Ptolomaic wall, but aligns with the south portal of the Merenptah enclosure. The wall is post-Ramesside. More walls are visible along this alignment, to the east – to the south of the MoA’s magazines.</td>
<td>Rudolf Anthes, Egypt Exploration Society</td>
<td>1955 (RA), 1981-2 (ES)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 23; Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1984, JEA 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAG</td>
<td>Temple, Industrial buildings, Domestic buildings</td>
<td>NK, PT, RM</td>
<td>Temple dedicated by Ramasses II to Hathor. Found by the army in 1969 whilst digging air raid shelters. The north part of the temple courtyard was excavated in 1970 by Abdulla Sayed Mahmoud for the MoA. Post-Ramesside the interior was a workshop (glazing? Pottery?) – kilns were located in the SE corner of the court. The walls of the court were replaced in brick in late Ptolomaic/Roman periods. The kilns have not yet been excavated. Prior to this later use the south walls of the temple and some of the columns were taken down to only 1-2 courses high. The limestone of the western pylon is in place but the eastern half was taken down/quarried after the Late Period/Hellenistic Period.</td>
<td>Abdulla Mahmoud</td>
<td>1970 (AM)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 25-26; El-Sayed Mahmud 1978 A New Temple for Hathor at Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAH</td>
<td>Temple, Industrial buildings, Domestic buildings</td>
<td>NK, PT, RM</td>
<td>The southern part of the temple of Hathor (RAG). The southern part of the temple was excavated in 1978 by Huleil Ghaly for the MoA and in 1984 by Abd al-Karun Abu Shanab (RAU). Here there is a tripartite sanctuary, as well as overlying later (Roman) buildings.</td>
<td>Huleil Ghaly</td>
<td>1978 (HG)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAJ</td>
<td>Domestic Buildings</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Located to the WSW of the cemetery and excavated prior to building extensions. A series of small brick buildings – domestic in character – were revealed. These fronted a wide east-west street. At least two phases could be discerned – the later (upper) was characterized by small ovens. The earlier (lower) by granary bins. Both seemed to be NK. Jeffreys mentions that the floor levels of the building were c. 2m higher than the floors of the Ramesside temple floor levels (such as the temple of Hathor) ‘the strong implication is that any Middle Kingdom/early New Kingdom nucleus) to the city stretched at least as far south as this point’ (Jeffreys 1985:25).</td>
<td>Muhammad Rashid</td>
<td>1983 (MR)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Smith and Jefferys 1985, JEA 71; Jefferys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAK</td>
<td>Chapel?</td>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>The building of Siamun excavated by Petrie in 1908. The building is constructed using brick, and with limestone lintels and columns. The function of the building is unknown. The lintels show Siamun and high officials making offerings before Ptah and Sakhment and Ptah and Hathor. The building has been hugely robbed, and the area was filled in in 1978 and is now under cultivation land.</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie</td>
<td>1908 (WP)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jefferys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 24-5; Petrie 1909, Memphis I, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAL</td>
<td>Domestic Buildings?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Area of excavation was located in between the two cemeteries, and was a result of an application to extend the limits of the cemeteries. Here was a rectangular/square, brick structure – the sides of which were at least 16m long. There were internal cavities and compartments (possibly the platform for a peripteral temple). These were found up to 4-12 courses high. This structure was orientated N-S, E-W. Beneath this structure was a series of brick walls and limestone doorjams (houses?).</td>
<td>Mohammed Rashid</td>
<td>1983 (MR)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Smith and Jeffreys 1985, JEA 71; Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Mohammed Rashid</td>
<td>1983 (MR)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAN</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Site of statue of Ramasses II (holding a scepter), found during the digging of a well</td>
<td>Mustafa al-Amir</td>
<td>1940 (MA)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 27; Al Amir 1943, ASAE 42; El Amir 1946, DdE, 55-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAO</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Joseph Bonomi</td>
<td>1844 (JB)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>Middle kingdom sherds of pottery found in pits dug by ?Hitta, on the south side of the Saqqara-Bedrashein Road. The EES then observed the same within this area as well as the west end of RAT. The absence of pottery later than XXVIth dynasty suggests that this area had been abandoned by the Roman period - or a large reduction (modern or earlier) of this part of the mound</td>
<td>Barry Kemp</td>
<td>1976 (BK)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 26; Kemp 1977, Antiquity 51, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAQ</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Flinders Petrie?</td>
<td>1910 (WP)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAR</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Ahmad Tahrir</td>
<td>1966 (AT)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Ahmad Tahrir</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAT</td>
<td>Domestic Buildings</td>
<td>MK, NK, TIP</td>
<td>Area of SoM (EES) excavations, wherein a full stratigraphic, settlement sequence was excavated from Middle Kingdom to Post Ramesside. In the mid 13th century BC the area was an 'artisans' quarter and at this point the settlement was some 3m higher than the floor of the main Ptah Temple, showing a downward slope to the east and south of RAT, and indicating that 'the early city had grown into a tell before the late 18th dynasty' (Jeffreys, Malek, Smith 1987). Level II (late 18th dynasty) comprised houses and courtyards, with houses of the 'classic Amarna type'.</td>
<td>Egypt Exploration Society</td>
<td>1984 (ES)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Ashton, Jeffreys 2007, The Survey of Memphis III, Excavations at Kom Rabia; Jeffreys 2006, The Survey of Memphis V, Kom Rabia - The New Kingdom Settlement; Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1986, Survey of Memphis 1984, JEA 72; Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1987, The Survey of Memphis 1985, JEA 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAU</td>
<td>Temple, Industrial buildings, Domestic buildings</td>
<td>NK, RM</td>
<td>The southern part of the temple of Hathor (RAG). The southern part of the temple was excavated in 1978 by Huleil Ghaly for the MoA and in 1984 by Abd al-Karun Abu Shanab (RAU). Here there is a ?tripartite sanctuary, as well as overlying later (Roman) buildings.</td>
<td>Abd al-Karim Abu Shanab</td>
<td>1984 (AK)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAV</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>An area of exposed mudbrick architecture that was surveyed by Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA) in 2017 during the Memphis Site and Community Development Project</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBD</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys and Malek 1988, JEA 74</td>
<td>Egypt Exploration Society</td>
<td>1986 (ES)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Temple, chapel, street, findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Temple built by Ramases II for Ptah and Sekhmet, the pavement of the Southern Approach (road leading to what must have been the south gate of the Great Ptah Temple, and parts of structures that have been interpreted as way shrines (Jeffreys 1985:74-5). A series of statues (Ramases II) clearly lines the approach - including 2 colossi. The Sekhmet Temple was found in 1956. A granite triad of the king, Ptah and Sekhmet was found in the central chapel at the back (east) of the building. Statue now in Museum Garden. In 1907-8 Petrie cleared an area for his expedition house, during which he found a column standing 4m high, inscribed for Siamun, which must have stood to the NE of the temple.</td>
<td>Mohammed Al-Hitta</td>
<td>1959 (MH)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Jeffreys, Malek, Smith 1983, The Survey of Memphis 1981, JEA 69; Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 20; Petrie 1908, EEF Archaeological Report 1907-8, 16; Smith 1983, JEA 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>The original site of the Abu’l-hol Collossus (limestone colossus of Ramases II), which is now displayed within an enclosed area of the Memphis Museum. Discovery of colossus was made in 1829 by Caviglia and Sloane. There is no first hand account of the discovery. Four years later however, Lane and Burton gave accounts of the circumstances of discovery. There are a number of ‘views’ of the statue in its original position. Detailed and accurate accounts/observations were made by Horeau and Bonomi. The statue may have been partially visible prior to Caviglia. The upper surface of the colossus was heavily eroded so it may not have been recognizable. In 1852-54 Hekekyan excavated and recorded around the colossus, including plans and sections of the pedestal it originally sat on, and the subsequent surrounding pavements. These pavements show a rise around the statue. The pavements were also drawn/painted by William Prinsep in 1842 and by the Lepsius Expedition in 1843. Hekekyan saw 2 courses of the pedestal (there had originally been at least one more). The surviving top course had been removed when the statue was turned over and raised up. Mohammed Aly had given the colossus to the British, however due to costs, it was never transported to Britain. Bagnold, of the Royal engineers, raised up and flipped the colossus in 1888 and constructed a shelter and viewing platform around it. This was replaced in 1902. And then replaced again in 1958.</td>
<td>Giovanni Caviglia</td>
<td>1820 (GC)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 24; Jeffreys 2010, Survey of Memphis VII, The Hekekyan Papers; Bagnold 1888, PSBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site code (EES)</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Excavated by</td>
<td>Dates excavated</td>
<td>Features visible 2015/2016</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQC</td>
<td>No information</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Code given in, but no information in, Jeffreys 1985 SoM I</td>
<td>Joseph Hekekyan</td>
<td>1852 (JK)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
<td>Bath Building, Barracks</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Tahrir identified a bath building here, probably dated to the Late Ptolemaic period, which was almost complete. It consists of a square block containing a circular chamber with a corridor along the east side of the building. There are 3 oval footbaths, from which there was a conduit led out waste water to sump outside. There is also a square room with 2 reclining baths. The baths probably have a cultic connection (possibly with medical cult practices). Above this, a mudbrick building, gridded in plan was seen – possibly a Roman barraks</td>
<td>Ahmad Tahrir</td>
<td>1965 (AT)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Jeffreys 1985 Survey of Memphis I, 17;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

The site of the Ptah Temple West Gate (BAA) is not currently open to visitors. It is bounded by a 3.5-5m high modern enclosure wall with a double metal gate in the southwest that was constructed by the Ministry of Antiquities (MoA) in 2011. The site is 168 m N/S and 117 m E/W (widest points), covering an area 10.305m² and comprises the remains of the stone pylon and hypostyle hall of the Great Ptah Temple’s west gate. These remains are situated in a low-lying area 5.20 m below the modern street surface on the western side of the site.

The perimeter wall was constructed in spring and summer of 2011 and varies in height between 3.50 m and 5 m. It is constructed of a concrete (reinforced with steel) frame of rectangular segments (figure 1). Each segment is filled with large red breeze blocks. On the south, east, and majority of the north side of the wall was built in a c. 0.50 m foundation trench. The western and north-western part of the wall is constructed on the accumulated modern rubbish. In places the surfaces of the wall is coated with concrete.

![Perimeter wall on the southern side of the BAA site.](image)

*Figure 1. Perimeter wall on the southern side of the BAA site. Photo by the Overseer, looking SW. Photo no. 820096.*

The site has one entrance, situated in the south west (figure 2 & 3). It is 4 m wide and made up of two metal gates. On the southern side of the gate there is a small one room structure (see figure 2 & 3) with a rectangular opening with metal bars in the west wall (onto the
street). The aim for this structure which was built when the perimeter wall went in, was to be a ticket office. The entrance to the room is from the east, inside the site.

Figure 2. Entrance to the Ptah Temple West Gate (BAA) site, looking east. The small building on the southern side of the gate was going to be a ticket office when the site was opened to the public. Photo by the Overseer. Photo no. 819802.

Figure 3. View of the entrance to the site from inside, looking south west. The small building on the left was going to be the ticket office. Photo by the Overseer. Photo no. 820394.

On the left, as one enters the site there was a rusted metal sign (figure 4) which stated (in Arabic) that within this enclosure is the temple of Ptah. This sign was removed during the
first stage of our work at the request of our Ministry of Antiquities (MoA) inspector. The sign is stored on the site.

Figure 4. Sign that was situated inside the site on the left hand side of the gate as you went in. Photo by the Overseer, looking north. Photo no. 819781.

Apart from the would-be ticket office, the only other modern building on the site (western side was a one room construction of mudbrick (figure 5). It has three windows (east, north, and south) and one entrance from the east. It had not been used for a long time and the roof had collapsed into the room. It functioned as the site guard hut prior to the perimeter wall being built.
The cleaning and recording of BAA was carried out in the first year (August 2015 – August 2016) of the MSCD project. The majority of the work was done between the 21\textsuperscript{st} of September and the 10\textsuperscript{th} of December 2015\textsuperscript{1}. During this period the foliage and rubbish was cleared, transported away from the site, the visible remains recorded (photographed, surveyed, written records), and the students of the first field school (FS1) prepared content for a series of proposed signs for visitors, a visitor route around the site, and documented existing features on the site (existing signs, modern buildings etc.). During April and May 2016 a second stage of fieldwork took place. During this period the ground water level in the hypostyle hall of the BAA site totally receded, allowing for additional recording to take place. The results of these activities are presented below, along with the archaeological baseline data (previous excavations etc).

2. AERA’s Work – Stage 1: 2015 (21\textsuperscript{st} September to the 10\textsuperscript{th} December)

Broadly speaking, the work at BAA was a three stage process. To begin with the site was cleaned by a team of 30 workers. It was then possible for the visible remains to be sketched (not to scale), described, and where appropriate photographed. These records were finally

\textsuperscript{1} There was no site work from the 23\textsuperscript{rd} to the 27\textsuperscript{th} of Sept due to the Eid al-Adha – feast of the sacrifice.
used by the survey team to map the remains using a Total Station. The survey data was uploaded to GIS and locked into the UTM co-ordinate system.

When we started our work in 2015, the only parts of BAA that were visible from ground level were sections of the north pylon, northern extension, and collapse of these two features to the west (figure 6.). Movement around the site was fairly limited due mainly to the fact that the vast majority of the site was covered with dense reed and camel thorn growth.

From the roof of one of the neighbouring structures in the north we were able to get some good pre-cleaning photographs of the site which show the extent of the vegetation (figure 7.). In addition to the vegetation a very shallow (2 cm. deep) irregularly shaped pool measuring 11.50 m in length (N/S) by 8.30 m in width (E/W), surrounded by a much larger saturated area was situated immediately west (in front of) the north pylon (see fig 7.). The second pool was situated in the hypostyle hall east of the pylon. Due to the dense vegetation the true size and depth of this pool could not be obtained at the beginning of the season. As far as we could penetrate the vegetation, we managed to determine that the water had a depth of approximately 15 cm. and an average size of 25 m in length (N/S) by 20 m width (E/W).

**Figure 6.** Field Director (left), Surveyor (centre), and project archaeologist on the first day of work surrounded by the stone remains of the north pylon. Photo by Senior Archaeologist, looking northeast, photo no. 101041.
The low-lying area in which the west gate and ultimately the whole Ptah Temple occupies is the central of three large depressions (*Birka* in Arabic) that feature prominently in the landscape of Memphis (Jeffreys 1985, fig 4). As such BAA to varying degrees over the course of its lifetime has been affected by ground water. In more recent times (that is to say the last 25 – 30 years) there is not a time during the year when the low lying part of the BAA site is completely dry. In other words, the ground in which the BAA remains are situated is always saturated. The ground water generally speaking begins to make an appearance in August rising to a depth of c. 0.85 m before starting to recede in April/May. Due to the low level of the ground water at the beginning of the season it was possible to remove quite a large proportion of the vegetation without coming into contact with the water (figure 8.).
Taking into account the break for Eid al-Adha, it took 30 – 35 workmen four weeks to remove all the vegetation from the site, except for what grew in the pool in the hypostyle hall. Work on removing these weeds began on the 20th of October and the water was still low enough for the workmen to continue the clearance using rubber boots.

The vegetation had grown over and through a thick layer of rubbish mixed with silt and clay (figure 9). Making an effort to remove this material from the site became the next stage of the cleaning process. In an attempt to establish the depth of this material we dug two test trenches on the eastern-central part of the site and the material continued beyond 0.50 m. Ultimately, we did not have the sufficient resources or time to completely remove this material from the low lying part of the site. Time was against us because the ground water level was rising gradually by the day. We did our best though to remove as much of the plant roots as possible and make the site looked as clean and presentable as possible. Particular attention was paid to cleaning around the archaeological remains so they could be clearly recorded.
We stopped cleaning the site on the 4th of November and the workmen moved to the Apis House (FAGI) on the 5th of November. Once again, from the top of a building neighbouring the northern side of the side, we were able to get an overall post-cleaning photo (figure 10).

Figure 9. Workmen removing saturated rubbish mixed with plant roots. Photo by Senior Archaeologist, looking southeast. Photo no. 101360.

Figure 10. Post-cleaning view of the Ptah Temple West Gate. Compare with figure 2 above. Also note the level of the ground water in comparison to when work started. Photo by the Project Photographer, looking south. Photo no. 701521.
Recording of the visible remains of the BAA site started on the 05\(^{th}\) of October and ended on the 04\(^{th}\) of November. Due to the size of the site and scattered nature of the remains we decided to divide the site into six components to make the recording manageable (figure 11). With the main central entrance to the west gate being the dividing line, the gate is generally referred to in terms of the north and south pylon. For better control of the recording process we decided to clarify these two terms further. In plan, the gate has three entrances dividing the pylon into four parts. From south to north we referred to these parts as:

1. **The Southern Extension** – the construction forming the southern side of the south corridor.
2. **The South Pylon** – the large section forming the northern side of the south corridor and the southern side of the main central entrance.
3. **The North Pylon** – the large section forming the northern side of the main central entrance and the southern side of the north corridor.
4. **The Northern Extension** – the part form the northern side of the north corridor.

Our fifth component of the site was the whole area west of the pylon and the sixth component, the whole area east of the pylon.
Figure 11. Map of the BAA site showing the six components of the site for recording purposes; Southern Extension, South Pylon, North Pylon, Northern Extension, Western Area, and Eastern Area. Fig 7 from JEA 74, 1988.

Within each of these components we recorded every archaeological feature – all the stones (their type, possible function, condition, and whether or not they had an inscription) and other features such as cuts (e.g. robber cuts), fills, and deposits. Each feature was assigned a number with the site code as prefix, such as BAA23 and sketched (not drawn to scale) using figure 23 from SoM1 publication (figure 12). In total we recorded 1744 individual features over 99% of which were stone elements of the gate and hypostyle hall.
All the recorded features were then surveyed using a Total Station by the project surveyor. The survey was undertaken between the 07th of October and the 13th of December. In order for this to be done accurately a control grid comprising thirteen points was established using a DGPS around the sites included in this project by the topographer from the French Institute in Cairo. Three of these points were situated in the BAA site and coded BAA1, BAA2, and
BAA3. In addition to the features, the project surveyor also surveyed the perimeter wall and did a contour survey of the site.

The last time BAA was worked on, was in 1995 when the SoM team extended further south her previous season’s trench along the western side of the South Pylon and also across it. Due to the ground water and time constraints we were not able to locate any of the edges of the trenches excavated by the SoM team which had been backfilled once their work was finished. Also, excavating trench backfill was not part of our remit, which was to clean the site only.

A unique part of the site’s history is a ‘pillar’ of stratigraphy located on the Southern Extension (figure 13). It measures 1.92 m in height and 1.57 m across and it gives us a snapshot of the types of deposition that overlaid the ruins prior to their exposure. The uppermost deposit is concentrated palm tree roots with a tree bole. At an elevation of 21.54 m asl it gives us a guide to a surface level that once covered this part of the site.

![Figure 13. Pillar of stratigraphy on the Southern Extension. Photo by the Senior Archaeologist, looking south. Photo no. 101226.](image)

The other interesting deposit is the lowest which comprises concentrated limestone chips and occasional red granite chips mixed with silt and pottery fragments (figure 13). There is also a large rectangular block of red granite embedded in the ‘pillar’ at the same level as the lowest deposit. A very common feature on the site are regular lines of linear grooves cut into
the different types of stone (figure 14). These are tool marks related to secondary quarrying activity when the site was mined for its stone from Roman times up until 1830\textsuperscript{2}. It could therefore be, that what we have as the lowest deposit of the 'pillar' is the debris related to quarrying on the site.

![Figure 14](image)

**Figure 14.** Two sets of linear tool marks on a salt encrusted granite block. Photo by the Senior Archaeologist, looking southeast. Photo no. 101960.

Between 1985 and 1995 all the hieroglyphic inscriptions and statues at the BAA site were recorded. Each inscription and statue was assigned a SCHISM number (Systematic Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions and Statues at Memphis). Recent communication with the project epigrapher has established that all the SCHISM information is still contained on maps and in notebooks. It is hoped that this can be collated and typed up soon so that a comparison can be made with the inscriptions and statues recorded in 2015 by the MSCD project.

3. AERA’s Work – Stage 2: 2016 (12, 13, 27 April & 17, 19, 22 May)

In April and May 2016, even though our priority was to clean and record four further sites of the MSCD project, we had an opportunity to survey a number of stone blocks that we did not have time to do in 2015. In total we spent 19.30 hrs over a period of six days recording.

The vegetation (mainly reeds) had begun to grow back before we stopped working at the site on the 10th of December 2015. The growth is predominantly around the remains of the west gate (figure 15) and was not as extensive as we expected after four months. What was interesting about the vegetation, was that it was completely absent from the centre of the site, in the hypostyle hall. This is the lowest part of the site and the ground is always saturated and therefore the vegetation usually thrives here. For some reason, the vegetation in this central area was completely dead. This was very apparent when by the 27th of April the ground water had completely receded (figure 15 & 16). The absence of the ground water revealed 92 blocks of stone in the hypostyle hall. We took advantage of the situation, recording and surveying them. The results of our two seasons of work at BAA are shown in figure 17. We also took elevations across the whole site.

Figure 15. Minimal reed growth had taken place over the four months between December 2015 and March 2016. View of the hypostyle hall looking SE. Photo by the Field Director. Photo no. 301958.
Figure 16. No vegetation growth in the hypostyle hall of the west gate. Photo by the Field Director, looking west. Photo no. 301931.
Figure 17. Map of the Ptah Temple West Gate showing all the surveyed features from the 2015 and 2016 seasons at the site.
4. Archaeological Baseline Data - Research

The remains of the great Ptah Temple’s west gate and its approach are located in Hod al-Malah, on the eastern side of the modern village of Mit-Rahina south of Cairo. Hod al-Malah, is the central of three large depressions (Birka in Arabic) that feature prominently in the landscape of Memphis (Jeffreys 1985, fig 4). The west gate does not cover the whole surface area of the birka but rather the c.70 m (N/S) by c.100 m (E/W) central western side of it.

The site comprises a concentration of loose carved pieces of granite, basalt, quartzite, calcite, and limestone (Jeffreys 1985, 34 & fig 23), with a large number of these pieces being inscribed and decorated (for the distribution map and numbering of the decorated and inscribed pieces by the SoM team see Jeffreys 1988, fig 7; for a photographic sample of the inscriptions and carvings see Petrie 1909, PI XXI and XXII; Farag 1980, PI 3; Smith & Jeffreys 1985, PI 1.1; Jeffreys & Malek 1988, PI V 1 & 2; Giddy, Jeffreys, Malek 1990, PI II, III, IV; Malek & Quirke 1992, PI II, III; Jeffreys et al. 1995, PI I, II).

The west gate of the temple we see today was one of four axial main ones built during the reign of the 19th Dynasty king Ramesses II (c. 1279 – 1213 BC) as part of a truly massive enclosure to the god Ptah that measured 462m east-west by 632m north-south. From the west gate area there is an indication that a temple to Ptah existed in this area as early as Thutmose I of the 18th Dynasty (c. 1504 – 1492 BC) in the form of a tablet showing the king offering to Ptah and Sekhmet. This tablet was found by Petrie below the sand foundation of the Ramesses II gate (Petrie 1908, 15; Petrie 1909, 7, PI VII, 46). Petrie also found 40 perfect tablets and 150 fragments of tablets of the 18th Dynasty below the foundation sand. Another 18th Dynasty find, was a foundation deposit of Thutmose IV (c. 1400 – 1390 BC) (Petrie 1909, 8, PI XIX top left; also see Jeffreys 1985, 34).

Prior to the 18th Dynasty the temple (albeit on a smaller scale) may have existed just west on the higher ground of Kom Fakhry (see Grébaut in Maspero 1900, 8 – 10). This possible early temple may have still been in use during the 18th Dynasty after the Thutmose I building programme to the east on a lower level because an Amenhotep III stela which Grébaut bought is said to have come from the area. How the temple may have looked in the 18th Dynasty was sketched by Kitchen (1993, fig 2; Jeffreys 1985, 35) shown in Plate 5. After Ramesses II the west gate bears

---

3 Name of the basin where the site is situated. For an explanation of the basins of Memphis see Jeffreys 1985, 3 & fig. 4. Hod al-Malah is the middle (M) Birka, or basin in fig 4.
inscriptions that it was still in use during the reigns of Merenptah (Ramesses’ successor), Ramesses III of the 20th Dynasty (c. 1184 – 1153 BC) (Petrie 1909, 9, Pl XX & XXII top right), and Ramesses V (c. 1147 – 1143 BC) (Jeffreys & Malek 1988, fig 10). The temple as a whole was in use up until the reign of Ptolemy IV (c. 221 – 205 BC) (Dimick 1956, 9; Kitchen 1993, 92, Petrie 1909, Pl I), but no evidence of this period has to date been found in the west gate area.

The remains of the Ptah Temple West Gate have been recorded and excavated to varying degrees over the past two hundred years. The following is a synopsis of the investigative work that has taken place.

Edmé François Jomard, at the beginning of the nineteenth century described the archaeology of Memphis as part of the French expedition to Egypt ordered by Napoleon (Jeffreys 2010, 63 & 64; Jomard 1818, 31). Jomard, noted that at this site (BAA) was amassed in ‘confusément’ enormous blocks of granite upon which some were inscribed with hieroglyphs. No excavation took place at this time and it was not known that these remains were of the west gate to a temple of the god Ptah.

At the beginning of the 1840s engineer and surveyor, Otto Erbkam in the service of the German archaeological mission led by Carl Richard Lepsius, made a map (Plate 1) of the archaeological remains at Memphis (Jeffreys 2010, 62, 85; Lepsius 1849, Band I, Plate 9; Naville 1897, 202 – 204; Verner 2013, 100). The map produced by Erbkam is still an invaluable resource as it is the first detailed topographical map of Memphis that includes archaeological ruins observed at the time. Again, we do not believe any excavation took place at this time.

In 1852 and 1854, Armenian engineer Joseph Hekekyan began excavating at Memphis. Working for geologist Leonard Horner and the Geological Society of London, Hekekyan’s remit at Memphis was twofold:

1. ‘to ascertain the height of the ground surface above the low Nile level’
2. ‘to relocate the statue pedestal and thus determine the height of sedimentation since the XIXth Dynasty’ (Jeffreys 2010, 91)4.

He was also required to excavate test pits across the Nile valley, at the latitudes of Heliopolis and Memphis (Jeffreys 2010, 91). Naturally, during the process of digging the pits (‘research pits'

---

4 The pedestal referred to here is that of the colossal Ramesses II statue in the Memphis museum. For a discussion on the pedestal see Jeffreys 2010, 109 - 115.
in Hekeyan’s words) across Memphis large quantities of artefacts were uncovered. Where he encountered a large object, he extended the limits of the test pit to expose the whole monument.

Hekeyan produced seven sets of maps of Memphis, three of which are in the British Library manuscript volumes (Jeffreys 2010, 96). The maps were either drawn by Hekeyan himself, or under his supervision. Plate 2.1 is manuscript map MS 37458.29-30 which has been simplified in Plate 2.2. The map indicates the location of the Ptah Temple West Gate remains which Hekeyan referred to as Tel Moucalid, or Granit Point (Jeffreys 2010, 127).

Hekeyan’s excavation IV took place at the Ptah Temple West Gate. It was located at the base of the glacis (sloping down from west to east) where Tel Moucalid or Granit Point meets the low ground of the birka (Jeffreys 2010, 128). The surface area covered by excavation IV is unknown, but taking into account Hekeyan’s preponderance to extend his limits of excavation when he encountered large objects such as granite blocks, then in the case of the west gate his excavation IV could have covered quite a large area. At the base of the glacis Hekeyan noted that several granite blocks cropped out. He then mentions that afterwards, which means further towards the east, he made several small test pits in the lowest water line of the birka (Jeffreys 2010, 128). Masonry was encountered in ten of these pits. The test pits across the birka are shown in Hekeyan’s notebook (British Library MS 37453.42, also see Plate 3) and two of his maps located in the British Museum; EA 61.4-27.183 and EA 61.4-27.191.

Hekeyan notes that west of the excavation IV area granite blocks with rounded corners cover more than an acre of ground with many of them bearing emblems characteristic of the 19th Dynasty (Jeffreys 2010, 129). The area he was referring to is most likely the ruin field we see today of the west gate. Hekeyan also notes that these granite blocks do not extend very deep and certainly not to the depth of the three courses of cyclopean blocks (uninscribed) exposed in the excavation IV area (Jeffreys 2010, 129, fig 25). He thought that the cyclopean blocks possibly represented an earlier phase of the temple. Jeffreys (2010, 130) suggests that the lower blocks referred to by Hekeyan are probably the foundation of the west gate pylon. In addition to excavation IV, Hekeyan excavated a series of test pits along the axis of the Ptah temple enclosure between the western end and the east gate (Jeffreys 2010, 130). Apart from the test pits, Hekeyan does not appear to have removed or cleared away any part of the west gate.

It needs to be borne in mind that up until the time of Hekeyan the location of the Ptah Temple was still a matter of conjecture (Jeffreys 2010, 127, 128). This was due to a number of factors such as the size of the temple and the limited investigative work that had taken place at
Memphis, specifically the lack of what we may view today as systematic methods in archaeological research. Hekekyan was not an Egyptologist, archaeologist, or historian, and neither was he at Memphis to investigate the archaeology. However, his engineering skills and techniques employed, especially with regards to recording stratigraphy probably form the most detailed record of the sequence of deposition at Memphis carried out in the 19th century. It is due to this systematic approach and the results that we can possibly credit Hekekyan with resolving the debate on the location of the Ptah temple.

During 1871, 1872, and 1875 Auguste Mariette carried out excavations at Memphis (Maspero 1889, 7). Exactly where he worked is a little unclear and further work needs to be done to establish if he carried out any of this work at the west gate. Some of the inscriptions he found at Memphis relating to the Ptah temple are published on Plate 27 of the Maspero 1889 publication.

In 1888 French Egyptologist Eugéne Grébaut returned to the practices of Mariette at Memphis, as Maspero states, “with a budget richer than mine” (Maspero 1900, 1). Grébaut uncovered two, and purchased five sculptured pieces that appear to have originated just to the west of the Ptah Temple West Gate (Maspero 1900, 8 – 11, Pl VII – XII). Of the two uncovered pieces, one was a large calcite libation table (Maspero 1900, Pl VII (bottom)). The sides were decorated in palace façade design which led Maspero to infer that it was possibly of a pre-4th Dynasty date (Maspero 1900, 9). The piece was found by Grébaut several metres under the foundations of the 18th Dynasty Ptah temple and 20 metres away from the second piece, a limestone bas-relief of Amenhotep III with two variants of the god Ptah (Maspero 1900, Pl VII (top). This second piece is on display in the front garden of the Cairo Museum (Plate 4).

The five other sculptured pieces were royal statues, purchased from local merchants by Grébaut. The statue of Niuserre in red granite (Maspero 1900, Pl X) was bought for 80 LE (Egyptian Pounds), the rest for 1000 LE (Maspero 1900, 9). The other statues were, an inscribed statue of Khafre in calcite (op cit. Plate VIII), an inscribed diorite statue of Menkaure (op cit. Plate IX), an inscribed red granite statue of 5th Dynasty king Nusiere (op cit. Plate X) calcite statue of the 5th Dynasty king Menkauhor (op cit. Plate XI), and finally, a calcite statue of a king bearing no inscription which Maspero thought bore a strong resemblance to Khafre (op cit. Plate XII, pg 11). In attempting to find out where these statues had come from Grébaut spoke to local reis Mohammed Abou-Higgazzi who said the pieces came from a room / chamber to the west of the lake in the ruins of the temple of Ptah (Maspero 1900, 9 & 10). Abou-Higgazzi’s son and
successor apparently showed Grébaut the find location and intended to re-open the room in the hope of finding more statues. We are not aware of the location of this room / chamber.

Maspero suggests that the statues were part of an earlier temple to Ptah (4th and 5th Dynasties) and were buried in a cache when the temple was re-modelled in the 18th Dynasty (Maspero 1900, 10). What is interesting about the find location of the statues is that according to Maspero (1900, 9) they were situated below the calcite libation table (op cit. Pl VII (bottom)), which in turn was below the foundation of the 18th Dynasty temple. What was considered to be the 18th Dynasty temple foundation and why alludes us at present. The movement of the Nile during the 18th and 19th Dynasties made available virgin ground upon which Ramesses II could build the massive temple extension of which the west gate was a part of (Plate 4). Also see Kitchen 1993, 88 who discusses the possible early location of the Ptah temple.

In August of 1892, M. J. de Morgan carried out a light clearance of the Ptah Temple West Gate area for the Department of Egyptian Antiquities. It was during this work that two colossal statues of the god Ptah (Plate 6.1) and a boat in pink granite (Plate 6.2) were uncovered (Brugsch 1893, 24 – 25; Daressy 1906, 116 – 117, ii.pl.XXV; de Morgan 1893, 389). Of the two statues de Morgan states that they were the most beautiful of divine representations. He also states that he uncovered several smaller buildings of high interest. In the Egypt Exploration Fund (EEF) annual archaeological report of 1892 – 1893 (Brugsch 1893, 24 – 25), Brugsch states that in addition to the two Ptah statues and the barque, de Morgan uncovered a double statue of Rameses II with a divinity in red granite measuring seven feet high. He also noted, 'Besides these monuments there were found a great number of statues, more or less well preserved, on the same spot' (Brugsch 1893, 25). The two Ptah statues and granite barque\(^5\) are held in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. The statue on its side in the photo on Plate 6.1 is currently on display in the Cairo Museum. The Rameses II statue is also currently on display in the Cairo Museum (CG554, JE30167).

It is also interesting to note that Brugsch mentions that the temple built by Ramesses II rests on a much older temple (Brugsch 1893, 24). The evidence that there is an earlier phase to the temple is not mentioned by Brugsch. He may be basing this statement on work from other parts of the temple built by Ramesses II, but this requires further investigation. However, he appears to be referring to the west gate site where de Morgan was working in which case he may have been privy to Hekekyan’s work and that of Grébaut who intimate the presence of an earlier temple.

\(^5\) The pink granite barque is currently on display in the front garden of the Cairo Museum (Plate 5.2).
In 1902 Georges Émile Jules Daressy published the first detailed description of the west gate remains (Daressy 1902, 22 – 31; Plate 7). He mentions that the excavation of the site was incomplete and that the area was covered with trees [date palms] on mounds of earth (Daressy 1902, 22). The area was also completely under water during the annual inundation. This made it difficult, according to Daressy, to make any sense of the ruins of the west gate, but through careful study he was able to collect enough information to make a rough plan (1902, 22, 23). He did not carry out any excavation of the site, the aim of his article in the *Annales du Service des Antiquités de L’Égypte* being to provide a detailed description of the architectural layout of the west gate and publish the hieroglyphic inscriptions he encountered.

Between the end of January and the first week of May 1908 Petrie and his team\(^6\) excavated at Memphis under the auspices of the British School of Archaeology in Egypt. The task of excavating the Ptah Temple was given to Mr. Mackay (Petrie 1909, 1). An area of about forty to fifty feet in front of the west gate pylon was cleared along with the ‘body’ of the south half of the pylon, and all the southern half of the hypostyle hall (Petrie 1909, 5). This was the first large-scale excavation to take place at the west gate. Petrie’s discussion of the work undertaken falls broadly into three parts. The first is a description of the architectural footprint of the pylon and hypostyle hall. The second deals with the pre-Ramesses II remains, and the third deals with the 20\(^{th}\) Dynasty (Petrie 1909, 5 – 10).

In terms of the architecture, Petrie, like Daressy before him, produced a map of the gate’s ground plan (Plate 8). The main difference between the plans of Daressy and Petrie are the number of columns that occupy the hypostyle hall. In Petrie’s plan the hall is a forest of columns, whereas Daressy opted for a slightly more open layout with less columns. The reason for this difference is not mentioned, especially by Petrie. One could say that as Petrie excavated a vast part of the gate and hall he had a better insight into the layout, whereas Daressy’s plan was based purely on a visual investigation. Other differences between the plans include a far eastern north/south row of columns which appears on the Daressy plan but not that of Petrie. Daressy includes an east/west row of columns in the northern corridor, where Petrie allegedly only saw two rectangular features. On the whole however, the two plans are pretty similar.

The main point about the architecture of the gate, noted by Petrie is the skew west facing elevation of the structures frontage. Petrie, unlike Daressy also notes the skewed nature of the

\(^6\) The team comprised Mr. Ward, Mr. Mackay, Herr Schuler, Mr. Wainwright, Mr. Gregg, and Miss Herford (Petrie 1909, 1).
southern and axial passage in relation to their western entrances and the pylon itself. Petrie does not offer a satisfactory reason as to why the pylon and passages are less than symmetrical, stating, ‘The arrangement of the front is a curious study of accommodation’ (Petrie 1909, 5). The reason for this curious study of accommodation according to Petrie can be seen in his plan. Basically, in order for the hall to be square i.e. on a north-south/east-west alignment, which it pretty much is, the northern side of the hall must be further from the skew pylon frontage than at the south (Petrie 1909, 5). This however, does not explain why the west frontage of the gate was on a skew alignment on the first place. Were the builders of the Ramesses II pylon following the alignment of a previous structure? If this was the case then they would definitely have needed to alter the alignment of the east side of the pylon to accommodate a hall they wanted north/south aligned.

Something else mentioned by Petrie about the structure was that the temenos wall, in other words the mudbrick wall that forms the majority of the temple enclosure, abutted the pylon in the south. The temenos wall is shown on his plan as a thin addition to the southern side of the south tower of the pylon. It is due to this abutment that Petrie concluded that the temenos wall must be part of the stone gateway, hence the same period of construction.

The pylons were made of red granite with basalt casing the doors and on the hypostyle hall walls. Petrie also notes that the basement of the walls of the gate were built of red granite pyramid casing stones that probably came from Saqqara and Abu sir (Petrie 1909, 6). How these casing stones were used in the construction is best seen in Pl. XXI (bottom right) of his publication. Granite casing stones were also inverted to form column bases, and limestone casing stones were used in the rubble core of the pylons (Petrie 1909, 6). All-in-all material from temples, tombs and pyramids spanning the 5th to the 18th Dynasty was robbed and re-used in the construction of this structure. One of the most remarkable re-used finds was the complete granite doorway from the 5th Dynasty sun temple at Abu-Sir with the inscriptions of Ranuser. This doorway was taken to the Cairo Museum (Petrie 1909, 6, Pl III).

With regards to the 18th Dynasty and earlier finds, Petrie appears to have found possible evidence of an 18th Dynasty temple to Ptah below the foundation sand of the Ramesses II structure (Jeffreys 1985, 34 & 35; Petrie 1908, 15; Petrie 1909, 7 & 8). This possible evidence

---

7 Overall it is interesting to note that there is a difference in the alignment of New Kingdom Buildings versus those of the Middle Kingdom at Memphis. See RAB I, RAD and RAT.
came on the form of a large number of 18th Dynasty tablets and fragments of tablets; one showing Thutmose I offering to Ptah and Sekhmet, and a foundation deposit of Thutmose IV.

Of Petrie’s comments about the 19th Dynasty part of the structure, the most notable here is the inscription on the wall of the entrance to the gate by Ramesses III of the 20th Dynasty (c. 1184 – 1153 BC) (Petrie 1909, 9, Pl XXII top right). No post-Ramesses III material was found by Petrie at the west gate.

After Petrie, the next time the Ptah Temple West Gate was featured in a publication was 1937. A photograph of the ruins was featured in a book of a 165 photographs of Egypt by Clément Robichon and Alexandre Varille (Plate 9). The photo (no. 32 in the publication) of the ruins was taken looking northwest. Three photos were taken at Memphis and they had the caption:

‘Memphis, probably founded by Menes around 3200, the city had a famous temple of Ptah (photo. 32). Memphis reached its peak under the old empire [New Kingdom]’

A description of the Ptah Temple West Gate and a photo (looking north) then appears in the 1956 publication by Marion Dimick entitled, ‘Memphis: The City of the White Walls’. Dimick quotes an inscription by Ramesses II written in stone at the Second Cataract, translated by Brugsch, which describes his enlargement of the Ptah temple at Memphis (Dimick 1956, 17). The inscription says:

‘Thy sanctuary in the town of Memphis was enlarged. It was beautified by long-enduring works and by well executed works in stone, which are adorned with gold and jewels. I have caused a court to be opened up for thee on the north, with a splendid double-winged tower in front. Its gates are like the heavenly orb of light. The people offer their prayers there. I have built for thee a splendid sanctuary in the interior of the walled enclosure. Each god’s image is in the unapproachable shrine, and remains in its exalted place…..’

In 1955 as part of the University of Philadelphia mission, John Dimick noted that the remains of the Ramesses II statue at the southwest corner of the gate was visible. However, the column arrangement mapped by Petrie was no longer distinguishable (Dimick 1959, 82 point 10 of the survey map legend).

Around the beginning of the 1970s, Gerhard Haeny, Director of the Swiss Archaeological Institute told Labib Habachi, chief inspector of the Memphite area, of a big inscribed red granite stone in front of the Ptah Temple West Gate (Posener 1982, 7; Plate 10; Jeffreys 1985, 35). The
A slab of stone was face down and functioning as a pedestal for a colossal Ramesses II statue. In order to examine the text, the statue was displaced and the stone turned over. It measured 2m high by 2.50m wide, and had a thickness of 0.50 m (Farag 1980, 75). The inscription comprises 40 columns of text of which the last ten were in very bad condition (Posener 1982, 7). Both the beginning of the text on the right and the end of the text on the left was missing (Posener 1982, 7). An inscribed stone uncovered by Petrie at the site and in the 1970’s held by the Mit-Rahina inspectorate was found to belong to this stela (Petrie 1909, 6 & 7, 17 & 18, Pl V). The inscription on the larger stela has been published and commented as far as can be ascertained, on four occasions; By Sami Farag (1980), Georges Posener (1982), Altenmüller et al. (1990; 1991), and Malek and Quirke (1992).

The inscription in Malek and Quirkes’ opinion was probably part of a temple wall, rather than a stela (Malek & Quirke 1992, 13). In what appears to be chronological order, the text relates to events during the reign of the 12th Dynasty king Amenemhet II (c. 1911 – 1877 BC). The original location of the piece is uncertain and the text, as Malek and Quirke state, is not specifically Memphite in its contents (1992, 13). However, the possibility that it originated from a Middle Kingdom temple to Ptah, if one existed, should not be ruled out. The contents of the text under headings and including numerical data relate to expeditions abroad, either to procure materials and manufactured objects, or for military purposes. It also mentions temple donations with precise details of the recipient institutions (Malek & Quirke 1992, 13). The text is of extreme importance as no parallel as yet exists.

In 1981, to commemorate the centenary of the Egypt Exploration Society (EES) a project was set up to carry out an archaeological survey of Memphis. The aim of the project directed by David Jeffreys, which became known as the Survey of Memphis (SoM) was to make detailed archaeological maps of the city (Smith, Jeffreys, & Malek 1983, 30). In addition to this the stratigraphy of the city would investigated, elevations done of standing monuments, photography, environmental tests, and the copy of reliefs and inscriptions done (Smith, Jeffreys, & Malek 1983, 30). The Ptah Temple West Gate featured in this early work as part of an east-west profile across Memphis (Smith, Jeffreys, & Malek 1983, 35, fig 5; Plate 11).

In 1982 the SoM team re-planned the west gate to accurately map the difference noted by Petrie between the west facing elevation of the pylon frontage and the hypostyle hall (Jeffreys 1985, 69 fig 22 & 23; Plate 12 & 13). During this work the team noted a previously unrecorded granite approach to the gate and a red granite threshold base sill in the north wall (Jeffreys, Malek, &
Smith 1984, 25; Jeffreys 1985, 34). To the west of the pylon five trenches were excavated by Lisa Giddy and Jaromir Malek around the limestone and basalt approach to the gate. These trenches can be seen on figure 23 of Jeffreys 1985; also Plate 13 here). Also during the 1982 season a resistivity traverse by Ian Mathieson and his wife was carried out east-west through the centre of the west gate temenos. The results were what was expected from large blocks of stone and poorly earthed electrodes (Smith, Jeffreys, & Malek 1983, 28).

In 1985 Jeffreys published the first in a series of volumes about the Survey of Memphis (SoM) work at Memphis. With regards to the Ptah Temple West Gate he provides a synopsis of the previous work that had been carried out at the gate as well as work carried out by the SoM team (Jeffreys 1985, 34). This publication also includes two plans (fig 22 and 23) of the west gate by the SoM team. Jeffreys (1985, 69) also notes that a statue in red granite of a seated figure was moved to the Antiquities Organisation Magazine in 1984. The location of this statue is plotted on fig 22.

During the 1985 SoM season they also recorded the remains of a calcite colossus (of Ramesses II?) just west of the south pylon (Jeffreys, Malek, & Smith 1987, 19; Petrie 1909, 5 & 10 Pl XXIII (middle left)) uncovered by Petrie. All the hieroglyphic inscriptions and statues recorded by the SoM team were assigned a SCHISM number (Systematic Corpus of Hieroglyphic Inscriptions and Statues at Memphis). The calcite statue was given number 3702 and is plotted on fig 7 of Jeffreys and Malek, 1988.

During the 1987 SoM season four weeks were spent studying and recording the inscriptions on the west gate (Jeffreys & Malek 1988, 25 – 29). All the inscriptions were given SCHISM numbers and plotted on fig 7 of the 1988 publication. Of all the pieces recorded one of the most notable was of a previously unknown inscription of Ramesses V on a quartzite jamb (SCHISM no. 3818) found just to the west of the south pylon (Jeffreys & Malek 1988, 28 fig 10). Notable, because it pushes the date of additions to the gate past that of Ramesses III noted by Petrie.

In 1989 the epigraphic work of the 1987 season continued. To facilitate detailed planning and understanding of the west gate clearing of a restricted area was undertaken (Giddy, Jeffreys, & Malek 1990, 4). During this season 31 new blocks and sculptured fragments were uncovered and assigned SCHISM numbers. A plan of these new numbers is yet to be published. The most notable of the inscriptions uncovered are discussed on pages 4 – 7 of the 1990 publication. Of note here in terms of phasing is that it appeared that the quartzite threshold base sill at the western end of the central access point of the gate (unlike at the north and south entrances) was
added after the construction of the pylon. It may be associated with the rebuilding of the central ramp on its western side (Giddy, Jeffreys, & Malek 1990, 4). Also of note is that they found no trace of the enclosure wall (of Ramesside or Ptolemaic) abutting the south end of the south pylon recorded by Petrie (Giddy, Jeffreys, & Malek 1990, 7). The additional information gathered during the 1987 season not only helped to produce a more detailed plan of the central entrance but isometric representations of how the central entrance may have looked in Ramesside times. An elevation of the west facing pylon and a section through the south wall of the hypostyle hall were also done. See Plates 15 – 18.

In 1992 the SoM team recorded an additional 8 inscribed and decorated fragments from the west gate and given SCHISM numbers. The details of these are on page 79 of Giddy & Jeffreys 1993. A map of their locations is yet to be published. Lisa Giddy and Kathryn Eriksson also excavated a trench against the northwestern side of the south pylon tower (Giddys & Jeffreys 1993, 16 fig 2; Plate 19). The aim of the excavation was to make a study of the blocks of the four pedestals recorded by Petrie, especially to see if they contained re-used Middle Kingdom blocks. None of the three remaining pedestals had Middle Kingdom inscriptions. Whilst excavating they came across the limestone foundations of the box-like feature on Petrie’s plan interpreted as the fourth pedestal. The pedestal itself was not present and was either removed after Petrie, or he reconstructed it for his plan (Giddy & Jeffreys 1993, 16).

The 1994 – 1995 SoM season was the last to take place at the Ptah Temple West Gate. During this season Lisa Giddy excavated two trenches on the western side of the south pylon tower (Jeffreys et al. 1995, 4 – 5, fig 2; Plate 20). One was east-west and 2m by 25 m on the southern side of the 1992 trench. The other was a north-south trench again 2m by 25m along the western side of the surviving pedestals. The aim of the trenches was to investigate how the pylon was built and the state of preservation of the central pedestal. The trench through the south pylon revealed three superimposed courses of limestone blocks against the granite facing. The limestone blocks did not show any signs of earlier finished surfaces, but they may have been recycled from earlier structures like seen in numerous places around the pylon. The results of the two excavations better clarified the appearance of the pylon. The ground sloped away to the west from the pylon and the first course of the western granite face was set back 1m from the edge of the limestone block foundation. West of the pylon, 6.75m from the face of the pylon the foundation level of a limestone structure was uncovered. The structure was in line with the western end of the southern granite balustrade of the central entrance to the gate. The function of the structure is unknown but Giddy suggests that maybe it was a pedestal for another row of
statues, or a terrace or quay wall (Jeffreys et al. 1995, 4 & 5). Also, during the 1994 – 1995 season, another 48 SCHISM numbers were assigned to inscribed and decorated objects at the gate. Details of the most notable of these are discussed on page 5 and 6 of the 1995 publication. The location of these pieces is yet to be published.

No further work was undertaken at the Ptah Temple West Gate between 1996 and 2014.
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**Media**

The ruins of the Ptah Temple West Gate can be seen in the Egyptian film ‘The Postman’ from 59 min to 1:02min. See YouTube link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CBQ3LcO7k14

**Web resources**

Between 1942 and 1972 photographer Eliot Elisofon captured thousands of images of daily life in Egypt. As part of this work he also photographed historic monuments and sites. Between 1959 and 1965 he visited Mit Rahina taking photos of the Sphinx in the museum and the Ptah Temple West Gate, some of which are aerial shots. His photos are available online on the Smithsonian National Museum of African Art website, which can be reached via the following link:

http://sirismm.si.edu/siris/eepacountries.htm

then select Egypt from the choice of countries

then click on the Search tab at the top of the page and in the General Keyword space type Mit Rahina. This will bring up all the photos he took here.
Map of Memphis produced by Otto Erbkam. The remains of the Ptah Temple West Gate are indicated on the spit of land extending eastward into the *birka* (letter ‘o’ and framed in black).
Plate 2.

One of Hekekyan’s maps (top) of Memphis showing the Ptah Temple West Gate what he referred to as Tel Moucalid or Granit Point and where he carried out Excavation IV (Jeffreys 2010).
Plate 3

Sketch from Hekekyan’s notebook showing the test trenches being excavated across the birka. The remains of the Ptah Temple West Gate are below the label ‘granite fragments’ in the background. British Library MS 37453.42.
Limestone bas-relief uncovered by Grébaut in 1888 just west of the Ptah Temple West Gate. On display in the front garden of the Cairo Museum. Photograph by Dan Jones, looking east. Photo number 1010001. Also, see Plate VII (top) of Maspero 1900.
Plate 5

Theoretical reconstruction of Memphis in the New Kingdom by Kenneth Kitchen showing the possible location of the 18th Dynasty and earlier Ptah Temple (Kitchen 1993, fig 2).

6.2. The red granite barque uncovered by de Morgan is on display in the front garden of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. Photo 101003, looking south, by Dan Jones.
Plan of the Ptah Temple West Gate by Daressy. Black and solid lines indicate the parts of the temple visible to Daressy. The dotted/dashed architecture is interpretative. (Daressy 1902, fig 1).
Plan of the Ptah Temple West Gate by Petrie (1909, Plate II). Compare the differences between this plan and the one done by Daressy (Plate 7).
Plate 9

Photograph no. 32 of the Ptah Temple West Gate flooded (looking northwest) in the Robichon and Varille 1937 publication.
12th Dynasty inscription re-used as the southernmost pedestal base at the Ptah Temple West Gate (Malek and Quirke 1992, Plate II).
Profile east-west through the Ptah Temple showing surface elevations (Smith, Jeffreys, & Malek 1983, fig 5).
Survey of Memphis (SoM) plan of the Ptah Temple West Gate showing loose blocks with relief (Jeffreys 1985, fig 22).
Survey of Memphis (SoM) plan of the Ptah Temple West Gate showing the different types of stone employed in the construction (Jeffreys 1985, fig 23).
Survey of Memphis (SoM) map showing the SCHISM numbers assigned to the inscribed and decorated pieces of the Ptah Temple West Gate during the 1986 and 1987 season (Jeffreys and Malek 1988, fig 7).
Plate 15

Fig. 6. Plan of central gate of Pah temple west pylon and elevation of south side of approach ramp. (See fig. 8 for shading conventions.)

(Giddy, Jeffreys, & Malek 1990)
Plate 16

(Giddy, Jeffreys, & Malek 1990)
(Giddy, Jeffreys, & Malek 1990)
Plate 18

(Giddy, Jeffreys, & Malek 1990)
Plan showing the location of Lisa Giddy's 1992 trench (Giddy and Jeffreys 1993, fig 2).
Plan showing the location of Lisa Giddy’s 1994 trench (Jeffreys et al. 1995, fig 2).
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1. Introduction

The Apis House (FAGI) is currently not open to visitors. The site is situated on the northern side of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road 200 metres west of the Memphis Open Air Museum (QAS). The Apis House is currently one of three sites that occupies the area on the northern side of the road (figure 1). On the western side of FAGI is the so-called Shabaka Building or West Chapel (FAGII), partially excavated by Petrie (1909, 10 §31, PI XXV (bottom left), XXVII (top left))\(^1\). On the west side of FAGII is the Western Building (FAGIII) which was excavated by the Ministry of Antiquities (MoA) in the late 1990s\(^2\).

![Map of the three sites in the FAG area](image)

**Figure 1.** Map of the three sites in the FAG area

---

\(^1\) This building is only attributed to the Pharaoh Shabako of the twenty-fifth dynasty after a stone with his ka name inscribed on it was found by Petrie. Also, see Jones 1983, 37 & 38, fig 8. Michael Jones uncovered and mapped this building in 1983.

\(^2\) No publications of this structure currently exist. It was fully recorded, surveyed, photographed, and a 3D model made by the MSCD project during April and May 2016.
The codes for the sites at Memphis were assigned by David Jeffreys and the Survey of Memphis (SoM) team in the early 1980s (Jeffreys 1985, 2, 3, 79 – 84, fig 8). In the case of the Apis House, Shabaka Building, and Western Building, the ‘F’ stands for Kom el-Fakhry, with the next two letters denoting the specific site. As you will see below, different parts of the Apis House were excavated on three occasions. To differentiate between these three excavations the site was given three codes:

- FAF – for the Memphis Apis Project (MAP) directed by Michael Jones, 1982 – 1986
- FAG – for the excavations by Dr Ahmed Badawi and Dr Mustafa el-Amir, 1941
- FAH – for the excavations by Petrie in 1908

The site code FAE was given to the Shabaka Building. The Western Building was not uncovered when the SoM team worked at Memphis, and therefore didn’t have a code. For consistency, the MSCD project has continued to use and the site codes assigned by the SoM team. However, faced with having to allocate a code to the Western Building and having three codes for the Apis House, we decided to simplify the coding for this project. Our site coding for the area has therefore become:

- FAGI – for the whole Apis House site
- FAGII – for the Shabaka Building
- FAGIII – for the Western Building

The southern side of the FAG area is bounded by a metal fence with a brick and cement foundation (figure 2). This fence and foundation is 1.90 m high and made of a series of metal panels (1.18 m in width by 1.52 m in height), supported and connected by metal rod pillars. The metal part of the fence is in quite good condition with only a few bars missing from the panels. The only exception to this is the last panel in the east where most of the vertical bars are missing allowing access to the site. The foundation is also broken and missing in places.
Figure 2. View of the entrance to the Apis House site from the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road showing the boundary fence construction. The palm trees and buildings in the background mark the northern limit of the area. Photo by Field Director, looking north. Photo no. 201967.

This type of fencing is repeated in the north western part of the site, north of the Western Building (figure 3). Here, however, the metal panels are in bad condition with panels missing in places. The widest gap in the fence has been blocked with a line of three disused truck beds. A small gap in the middle of the fence also provides access to the site and is regularly used by local residents as a short cut to and from the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road.

The rest of the area has no official fencing. On the western side of FAGIII, the area is demarcated by a linear (N/S) high mound which is most likely the spoil from the excavation of the Western Building that overlies the west wall of the great Ptah temple. At the base of the western side of this mound are the remains of low metal posts cemented in the ground and barbed wire, indicating that this area may have been fenced off at some time in the 1980s. In the north, this mound curves east and forms the northern limit of the site, although the mound in the north is the spoil from the northern part of the Apis House. Immediately north of the northern limit mound are [yards of] residential buildings. Along the northern side of the mound are also over thirty mature palm trees (see figure 2).
Figure 3. Boundary on the north-western part of the site with three disused truck beds filling a large gap in the fence. Photo by project archaeologist, looking north. Photo no 301429.

The northe-eastern part of the area is bordered by a white brick-built wall of a residential yard that kept cows and goats. The limit of the eastern side of the area is demarcated by three different types of construction. In the north there is a section of white brick-built wall with a door allowing access to the site from a residential yard. At the southern end of the wall there is another door onto a yard. The middle part of the east limit is a fence constructed of split palm tree logs with numerous gaps in it, that forms the boundary of a residential yard and nursery school. The southern part of the eastern limit of the area is informally demarcated by a line of bushes and trees which connect with the southern metal fence of the site on the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road.

The area is officially accessed from the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road (figure 2) via a 3 m wide gateway, although only the pivots of the double-wing gate now exist. The main access to the whole area is therefore permanently open. Taking into account how most of the area is demarcated, access to the three sites is very easy. Even with no officially constructed boundary around the area, the overall limit has hardly altered in over thirty years since Michael Jones excavated the Apis House in the early 1980s.
There are no guard huts or any other modern buildings in the FAG area. However, on the southern side of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road – opposite the entrance to the FAG area, there is a guard hut that has stood there for many decades. There is direct line of sight from this guard hut and the FAG area.

There are five lighting posts on the site; two on the western edge, one at the official access point, and two additional ones on the eastern edge. These comprise metal pylons, with electricity wires threaded between them and crossing the road to the south. Only two of them are equipped with a lamp and bulb (North-West and South-East corners - photo 301431), the lamp of the third is missing (South-West corner: photo 301432), while a simple bulb has been directly hung to the post located at the entrance of the area (photo 301414).

2. AERA’s Work – Stage 1: 2015 (5th November to 17 December)

Broadly speaking, the work at FAGI was a three-stage process. To begin with the site was cleared of vegetation and rubbish by a team of 30 workers, who then fine-cleaned the remains of the Apis House with small brushes. It was then possible for the visible remains to be sketched, described, and where appropriate photographed. These records were finally used by the survey team to map the remains using a Total Station. In addition, we were fortunate to have the detailed records of Michael Jones who excavated the site between 1982 and 1986, as terms of reference. Initially, it had been the MSCD project’s remit to only clean the Apis House site, however the General Director of Mit Rahina, requested that we also clear the Shabaka Building area. Cleaning of this site took place when work at the Apis House was completed.

2.1. The Apis House (FAGI)

The Apis House Site has been subject over the past two centuries to a succession of excavations and restorations which, coupled with the on-going deterioration of the site, have progressively altered the initial aspect of its structure. This is now compromising not only the understanding but also the long-term conservation and legacy of this absolutely unique site. AERA’s archaeological site-assessment aimed therefore to determine the present-day state of the remains, especially their condition and the differences and alterations occurring since the last archaeological records of the site. This assessment aims to constitute a working base on which to build a plan for the protection, presentation and enhancement of the site, with a view to make the Apis House one of the must-see monuments of the tourist paths in
Memphis. This work has been achieved with the valuable assistance and kind co-operation of our MoA inspectors from Mit Rahina.

When we began our work, the whole FAG area was covered with dense vegetation. Unlike the Ptah Temple West Gate (BAA) area, just to the north where reeds were the dominant plant growth, the vegetation at the FAG area was dominated by halfa grass and camel thorn. The vegetation was so dense that from the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road, only the restored frontage of the Apis House was partially visible (figure 4).

*Figure 4.* View of the Apis House (FAGi) from the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road before cleaning started. Photo by project photographer, looking NW. Photo no. 702354.

Once you have fought through the vegetation and got to the Apis House, the structure was hardly recognisable due to the amount of plant growth (figure 5). Along the eastern and northern limits of the site there were also large amounts of residential rubbish from the neighbouring buildings.

*Figure 5.* Close-up view of the interior of the Apis House showing the extent of the vegetation within the structure. Room C is in the foreground. Photo by project photographer, looking NE. Photo no. 702370.
The clearing of the vegetation was done by a team of 30 workers (figure 6) which was piled-up next to the southern access, and then removed using a loader and trucks, and transported to municipal landfill (figure 7). A total of 252m³ of foliage was removed from the site.

Figure 6. Workers beginning the cleaning of the Apis House (FAGI). Photo by the Overseer, looking NE. Photo no. 827081.

Figure 7. Vegetation and modern rubbish being removed from the site. Photo by the Overseer, looking SW. Photo no. 821502.
Once the majority of the vegetation was cleared we were able to get a better picture of the structure’s layout and internal features. Our terms of reference for understanding the layout of the structure and the state of the site as a whole was a multi-context plan by Michael Jones in 1983 (figure 8).³

³ We are very grateful for the help and support given to us by Michael Jones during our time at the Apis House. He also made available to us of his primary archive from his 1980’s work at the site, which was an invaluable resource.
Figure 8. Multi-context plan established by M. Jones’s Memphis Apis Project (MAP). JONES 1983, plan I.
2.1.1. Missing and moved elements of the Apis House

On the whole, the Apis House building appeared, once cleared, in rather good condition with only few signs of deterioration:

- We observed that some of the re-used stone pieces sticking out from the core structure of Wall AB are gradually falling down on the southern side of the wall, including pole-socket 49 which was further found broken into two pieces.
- The modern platform built by the EAO in 1971 in Room A to display the set of small purification tables 43-46 (initially found reused in the nearby walls) was found damaged. The small purification table 46 was found lying, tipped over, in a hole dug inside the modern platform (figure 9); our workers managed to put it back in place upon the platform after having filled the hole.

Figure 9. Table 46 in Room A being retrieved from a hole. Photo by the Overseer, looking E. Photo no. 820956.

In contrast, however, the mudbrick casemate structure that forms the northern platform appeared considerably more altered through weathering and vegetation (figure 10). In particular, the mudbricks had eroded so much that the few in-situ stone elements remaining
from the original superstructure (as recorded by the MAP in 1984) had collapsed along the walls or at the bottom of the casemates; see in particular:

- the remains of stone paving originally found standing at the top of casemate M (figure 11);
- the door-jamb block found on wall KL, and now reported as lying at the bottom of casemate K (figure 12).

Figure 10. The casemate structure of the Northern Platform. Photo by project photographer, looking E. Photo no. 702658.
Figure 11. Remnants of the upper original stone paving in casemate M. Photo by project archaeologist, looking S. Photo no. 102000.

Figure 12. Doorjamb block found lying at the bottom of Casemate K. Photo by senior archaeologist, looking E. Photo no. 102003.

This contrast between the two areas – the main building and the northern platform – may be explained by the fact that greater care has obviously been taken during recent decades for maintaining the structure and content of the front courtyard and main building of the Apis House.
There, indeed, most of the archaeological elements found in position and some of the architectural features exposed by former excavators were still perfectly identifiable on site in 2015. In the front courtyard (figures 13-15), our team could observe:

- the foundation blocks of the two side entrance gates located east and west of the courtyard (6 and 8: figure 13);
- the assemblage of inscribed calcite blocks uncovered by H. Brugsch (7a-c: figure 13). These were found still standing upon the concrete platform built by the AHP in 1986; a pile of loose stones (FAG16-30, including inscribed block FAG23, see below: 2.2.2.) found immediately to the north of it may, however, correspond to the blocks and stone flakes excavated by M. Jones in the original foundation of this assemblage⁴;
- the eroded remains of the free-standing bank of stratigraphy examined by the MAP in the 1980s (recorded as section DE: figure 14). We should recall that this surviving portion of stratigraphy had first been identified wrongly by former excavators as the remnants of a wall outlining the front room of the Apis House (the mistaken room D: figure 15)⁵. Regrettably, this confusion is currently maintained on site through modern restorations which had been undertaken by the EAO in 1971 (FAG231-233), prior to M. Jones’s conclusions.

Figure 13. The front courtyard of the Apis House, with the foundations of its two side entrance-gates 6 and 8, and the assemblage of inscribed blocks 7a-c reported by H. Brugsch. Photo by project photographer, looking S. Photo no. 702623.

⁴ JONES 1988, fig. 8 (2).
⁵ JONES 1983, 36 and 1984, 16.
Figure 14. Showing bank of stratigraphy DE in the foreground, and the modern wall behind. Photo by project photographer, looking N. Photo no. 702636.

Figure 15. The northern section of the front courtyard of the Apis House, with the modern wall creating the mistaken Room D. Photo by the Overseer, looking W. Photo no. 820739.
Within the main building of the Apis House, we could find in quite good condition:

- the complete pavement of room C (figure 16), with its rectangular sunken basin 17 on the west;
- the series of big calcite and limestone purification tables 1-5 present in rooms C and A (figures 16-20);
- remnants of the successive building stages of the architectural structure of rooms B and A (though found severely denuded by former excavators: figure 17). This includes: the mud brick core and stone-lining of the walls (wall AB and the north and east outer walls); the foundations of the two entrance doorways leading from room B to room A (the central doorway AB, and the doorway opening over the southern part of table 4); the surviving portions of the paving of room A; the foundation material of this paving (including the reused tables 1 and 3); and the remnants of partition walls (including wall BA) and doorways which at some stage divided room A into three smaller chambers;
- the outlines of the excavation trenches dug by A. Badawi and M. el-Amir (1941) in the floor of room C, and by the AHP (1984) in the floor of room B. Part of their original archaeological content (for the first one, some scattered fragments of a circular basin [no number]; for the second, the stone square basin 18) was even found lying inside.

Figure 16. Room C in the Apis House, with paving and calcite table 5. Photo by project photographer, looking W. Photo no. 702646.
Figure 17. Rooms A and B in the Apis House, with the calcite embalming tables 3 and 4 in the foreground, and doorway AB and embalming tables 2 and 1 in the background. Photo by project photographer, looking W. Photo no. 702640.

Figure 18. Showing table 4 in Room A. Photo by project photographer, looking NW. Photo no. 703334.
Figure 19. Showing the northern side of table 4 in Room A, with its inscribed basin. Photo by project photographer, looking S. Photo no. 703946.

Figure 20. Showing tables 1 and 2 in Room A. Photo by project photographer, looking NE. Photo no. 703938.

Furthermore, our new assessment of the site showed that, since the 1980s, the main building underwent additional restorations (probably at the initiative of the MoA, unknown date). We observed that former restorations were maintained, some being strengthened, others being improved: in particular the restored front wall CD and partition wall BC, and the West Wall which forms the western edge of the building. Among those, a major restoration has to be noted: particular emphasis had clearly been laid on restoring the actual façade of the main building (wall CD: figure 21) with its central recess niche evoking a false-door. We observed that the elevation of the wall (already partially restored at the time of M. Jones’s record) had been, in the meanwhile, reconstructed at a higher level, which contributes today not only to
showcase the niche but also to give more prominence to the building’s frontage and its side entrance doorway.

Figure 21. The façade of the Apis House, with its restored wall CD. Photo by project photographer, looking N. Photo no. 702618.

The new survey undertaken by AERA in 2015 revealed instead that, while most of the archaeological features and architectural elements found in position by former excavators were still perfectly identifiable on site, a considerable amount of the “loose” elements mapped by the MAP appeared missing.

Further observation, though, rapidly revealed that these supposedly missing elements had more likely been relocated, as evidenced by the piles of stones set along the edges of the building. Further examination showed indeed that, while the biggest blocks and the elements still in position were left where they were found, the movable ones had been gathered on the immediate edges of the rooms where they had been uncovered. This was determined on the evidence of some of these stone elements, whose type and shape were typical enough to allow a reliable identification:

- A cornice (no number) found in the so-called room D could thus be identified by our team on the restored crest of the nearby East Wall (figure 14);
- Same for the series of blocks found lying on the north of the entrance BC and which had apparently been moved, here again, to the crest of the East Wall (as evidenced by a recognisable half of a column drum);
- Likewise, the pole - sockets 47-48 found fallen down at the bottom of wall AB (south side) by former excavators, and the red granite column elements 19-20 found lying in

---

6 Compare with Jones 1987, fig. 7 (the back face of wall CD and its central platform are visible on the background).
7 Jones 1983, 36 (this cornice may come from above the recess niche).
room A, were identified on the restored crest of the West Wall, together with stone basin 16 and several of the blocks exposed by the MAP when M. Jones explored the foundation compartments supporting the floor level of room B (1984)\(^8\). It has to be noted that these stone elements were gathered close to a broken basalt circular bowl (26), beautifully polished, which is still standing where M. Jones found it three decades ago (figure 22).

The others were probably removed to be gathered on the northern edge of the building, over the North Wall (figure 17). There, indeed, no fewer than 130 loose stone blocks of various sizes and shapes have been recorded. However, the exact provenance of each of them could not be determined.

Figure 22. Collection of stone elements found on the top of the West wall of the Apis House. Photo by project photographer, looking SW. Photo no. 703937.

2.1.2. *In-situ* graffiti and inscriptions

A new epigraphic assessment showed that a number of the inscriptions and graffiti recorded in the 1980s by the MAP, on blocks found in position, were reported missing in 2015.

\(^8\) Jones 1985, fig. 7. Among the most recognisable elements was a cylindrical tank (FAG312); these blocks coming from the foundation compartments, and the stone elements which were lying on the surface of the floor in room B and A (basin 16, sockets 47-48, columns 19-20), have probably been moved to their current location by the time of the excavations to facilitate the work of the archaeologists; as evidenced by the pictures published in Jones 1985, fig. 9 and 1987, fig. 7.
Some of these inscriptions seem to have been simply erased over time, since the blocks bearing them were positively identified by our team; this is the case of:

- the Apis bull *graffito* on block 52;
- the Greek *graffiti* on blocks 36, 37 and A39.

The other inscribed blocks were probably removed from site to be stored in a new location unknown to date (a MSA storeroom?); such is presumably the case of:

- the purification table 43 which bears a hieroglyphic inscription of Necho II (this was replaced on site by an uninscribed rectangular stone block of unknown provenance, FAG332: figure 23);
- the blocks 38 and 65 which bear fragments of hieroglyphic inscriptions;
- a block showing part of a ḫḳr-frieze (no number) and which may have been removed from the filling of wall CD when the masonry was restored.

---

**Figure 23.** Two of the small calcite tables (44 and 45) and the unknown block FAG332 in display on the modern platform built in Room A. Photo by project photographer, looking N. Photo no. 703920.

---

9 *JONES* 1983, fig. 3.
10 See respectively *JONES* 1982, fig. 4 and 5, and archives: Michael Jones Notebooks I, 23 and 29-31; II, 28; and III, 55.
11 *JONES* 1982, fig. 3.
12 See *JONES* 1983, respectively fig. 4 and 6.
13 See archives: Michael Jones Notebooks II, 11; and III, 63.
Our team could locate in 2015:

- the hieroglyphic inscriptions adorning the calcite blocks 7a-c of the southern courtyard\(^1\) (figures 24-25);
- the hieroglyphic inscription of Amasis embellishing the southern face of table 2\(^1\) in Room A (figure 26);
- a Greek *graffito* on block 36a\(^1\) outside Room A (figure 27);
- a possible cartouche on block A54\(^1\) in Room A (figure 28);
- the short hieroglyphic inscription mentioning the wʾb.t on the basin of table 4\(^1\) in Room A (figure 19);
- a winged sundisk on a paving slab (no number) located to the north of table 4\(^1\) in Room A (figure 29).

![Figure 24. Inscription on block 7c. Photo by project photographer, looking N. Photo no. 703983.](image)

\(^{14}\) Jones 1983, fig. 7; and 1990, pl. VI.1.
\(^{15}\) Anthes 1959, 77; see also archives Michael Jones Notebooks I, 17; and II, 1.
\(^{16}\) See archives Michael Jones Notebooks I, 24 ("home altar with flames rising from it"); and III, 68.
\(^{17}\) See archives Michael Jones Notebook I, 23 and 28.
\(^{18}\) Jones 1990, pl. VII.1-3.
\(^{19}\) See archives Michael Jones Notebook I, 22.
Figure 25. Inscription on block 7a. Photo by project photographer, looking S. Photo no. 703903.

Figure 26. Inscription on table 2. Photo by project photographer, looking N. Photo no. 703909.
Figure 27. Greek graffiti on block 36a. Photo by project photographer, looking W. Photo no. 703911.

Figure 28. Possible cartouche on block A54. Photo by senior archaeologist, looking down. Photo no. 102035.

Figure 29. Winged sundisk on a paving slab located north of Table 4. Photo by project photographer, looking down. Photo no. 703332.
Additionally, two new inscribed blocks were reported in 2015:

- a new hieroglyphic inscription was identified on calcite block FAG23, excavated by the AHP in the foundation layers of gate 7a-c in the front courtyard of the Apis House (figure 30, and see above: 2.2.1.);

- a limestone block (FAG358) found reused in wall FAG355/407 (figure 31, and see below: 2.2.3.) bears a depiction featuring a king and the god Ptah.

Figure 30. New hieroglyphic inscription identified on block FAG23. Photo by project archaeologist, looking S. Photo no. 101954.

Figure 31. New decoration identified on block FAG358. Photo by project photographer, looking down. Photo no. 703913.
It has to be noted that, with the exception of the large pieces of quartzite doorjams 61-64\textsuperscript{20} (figure 21, on the west of the Apis House), all the inscribed blocks that were found loose – either lying on the ground or re-used as filling material – by the MAP in the 1980s were not visible in 2015. These have probably been relocated to a MoA storeroom (exact location unknown); they comprise:

- block 28 which shows a relief featuring the lower part of a striding king in the front courtyard (originally coming from section DE)\textsuperscript{21};
- block 22 coming from the filling of the floor in room B and bearing the outline drawing of a female figure\textsuperscript{22};
- the four Shabaka blocks later usurped by Psamtik II (no number) in Room B\textsuperscript{23};
- block 86/14 which bears a fragment of hieroglyphic inscription (including the upper part of a serekh) in Room B\textsuperscript{24}.

2.1.3. Excavations since MAP

The new survey of the site undertaken by AERA in 2015 also revealed that further exploration had been conducted since the time of M. Jones’s records, and that additional excavation trenches were opened on the north and west sides of the northern platform of the Apis House by the Supreme Council of Antiquities in 1997 (according to M. Jones, personal communication; these results remain unpublished). On the west, these excavations revealed the existence of a north-south wall made of re-used limestone blocks (wall FAG355/407: figure 32-33), one of them bearing fragmentary decoration (block FAG358, see above: 2.2.2.). This wall shows two building phases.

- In the northernmost casemates (Q and Z), these excavations also revealed very denuded remains of walls, some of which still show remnants of a stone lining (figure 34). These probably constitute the remains of a former building predating the current Apis House.

\textsuperscript{20} JONES 1983, 37 and plan 1.
\textsuperscript{21} JONES 1987, 38 and fig. 4.
\textsuperscript{22} JONES 1983, fig. 5.
\textsuperscript{23} JONES 1985, fig. 10-12.
\textsuperscript{24} JONES 1988, fig. 7.
Figure 32. The casemate structure of the Northern Platform, the excavation trenches opened in the 1990s, and the north-south wall FAG 355/407. Photo by project photographer, looking N. Photo no. 702659.

Figure 33. Detail of the north-south wall FAG 355/407. Photo by project photographer, looking N. Photo no. 101987.
2.2. The Shabaka Building (FAGII) and The Western Building (FAGIII)

After a request from the General Director of Mit-Rahina, Ramadam Hashem we cleared the rest of the FAG area (west of FAGI), of vegetation. We knew the Shabaka Building or West Chapel (FAGII) existed in the central part of the area but were surprised to find an additional building on the western side of the area, which we called the Western Building (FAGIII) (see figure 1).

The West Chapel (FAGII) was subjected to detailed mapping by Michael Jones and the MAP project during their 1982 1983 season (Jones 1983, 37 & 38, fig 8). As this site was not part of the MSCD remit and due to time constraints, we could not carry out a detailed study of this structure. However, we did fully photograph it and note the general state of the structure as to how it has fared over the last 33 years. Overall, at first glance there seems to be little difference between what was mapped by Michael. The mudbrick walls have naturally, further degraded over the years not only due to their exposure, but the extensive plant growth through them. Of the limestone elements of the structure, nearly all are still in place. The exception to this is could be in the small north west room, where either all the stone slabs of the floor are now missing or could still lay beneath degraded mudbrick from the surrounding walls (figure 35 and 36).
Figure 35. View of the Shabaka Building, or West Chapel (FAGIII) in 2015, looking south. Photo by project photographer, photo no. 703306.

Figure 36. The limestone slabs floor of the NW room may be missing or below degraded material. Photo by project photographer, looking North. Photo no. 703310.
In the north east room of the structure Michael recorded a few remaining and fragmented limestone floor slabs (figure 37 and 39). In 2015, two further N/S rows of floor slabs were uncovered on the eastern side of the ones recorded by M. Jones (figure 39).

Between the West Chapel and the Apis House, M. Jones recorded an isolated area of limestone paving with two red granite basins (numbered 59 and 60 by the MAP project), and a large limestone threshold base sill (Jones 1983, 37 & 38). When we cleared the area in 2015, the two basins and only three of the limestone paving slabs remain (figure 38 and 39).

Figure 37. The additional limestone floor slabs are partially visible on the right of the photo. Photo by project photographer, looking West. Photo no. 703300.

Figure 38. Red granite basin 59 recorded by Michael Jones in the 1982/1983 season of the MAP project. Photo by project archaeologist, looking NE. Photo no. 821449.
Figure 39. Map of the West Chapel (FAG II) showing the visible and non-visible elements.
The surprise of the 2015 season was the discovery of a building on the western side of the West Chapel (figure 40). This building which we dubbed the Western Building (FAGIII) was not mentioned or mapped by Michael Jones when he worked on the West Chapel in the early 1980s. Michael was not aware of this structure and so its exposure and excavation must have occurred after the Memphis Apis Project (MAP). No publications exist of this excavation and the only information we could get at the time, which was from our inspector, was that the area was excavated in the late 1990s.

![The Western Building (FAGIII) in 2015. Photo by project photographer, looking West. Photo no. 703313.](image)

**Figure 40.** The Western Building (FAGIII) in 2015. Photo by project photographer, looking West. Photo no. 703313.

Although the large square building is the prominent feature in this area, there are the remnants of mudbrick walls and several hydraulic(?) installations made of limestone (assemblage of basins: figure 41) lying to the north, possibly part of another structure. The eastern wall of FAGIII also extends further to the south, and again, there are denuded walls on the southern side of FAGIII. This suggests that there is possibly another structure in this area. All the features of the FAGIII area are situated within the Great Temple of Ptah. The Western Building and the possible building on its southern side appear to be separated from the West Chapel by a broad street measuring 5.40 m in width by 21.37 m in length.
The layout of the Western Building, albeit partly denuded on its northern edge, shows a set of rooms clearly aligned on and adjoined to the nearby West Chapel. Those rooms were found partially paved and lined with stone slabs, and contained a few stone architectural elements still in position (figure 40). No inscriptions, or markings were uncovered to give any indication as to the function or period of this structure.

Due to time limitations, these new buildings, though interesting and unpublished, could not be taken into account this season in our new survey of the site; only a quick topographical survey has been conducted to record the outlines of the West Building. Consolidation work has also been undertaken to strengthen and stabilise, with a thick layer of sand, the base of the westernmost wall of the building.
3. AERA’s Work – Stage 2: 2016 (17, 18, 19, 27 April & 22 May)

In April and May 2016, even though our priority was to clean and record four further sites of the MSCD project, we had an opportunity to survey a number of features that we did not have time to deal with in 2015. In total we spent 22 hrs over a period of five days recording. Over that time, we surveyed 145 features recorded in 2015, as well as 14 new ones. We also, took a series of levels across the whole site.

Over the four months since we had last been to the site, minimal modern rubbish had been dumped on the site in the north and east. The vegetation growth was also relatively minimal, especially within the structure (figure 42 and 43).

![General view across the site on the 3 April 2016. Photo by Field Director, looking NE. Photo no. 102343.](image)

**Figure 42.** General view across the site on the 3 April 2016. Photo by Field Director, looking NE. Photo no. 102343.
Figure 43. View across Room A and the northern side of the site. Photo by Field Director, looking NE. Photo no. 102358.

Figure 44. Our team of workers giving the Apis House a light clean. Photo by the Overseer, looking NW. Photo no. 824333.
The famous and beautiful calcite lion table (MAP 4; FAG189) in the north west corner of room A was photographed comprehensively in order to create a 3D model.

One of the components of the MSCD project is to establish paths between the eight sites\textsuperscript{25}. There are a number of narrow well-established footpaths that criss-cross the land surrounding the sites south of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road. There are also some wider paths that allow for horse and donkey drawn carts and \textit{tuk-tuks} to travel on. These paths are free of vegetation due to the regular people traffic that uses them.

In order to test a surface material for the paths that would keep the vegetation at bay we created a path (XAC1) on the western side of the Apis House. This path on the north side of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road, was made using \textit{tafla} gravel, again bordered with split palm tree logs (figure 45). This material hardens after repeated wetting and how it fares as a surface material for the paths will be monitored over the coming months. The results of our two seasons of work at FAG I are shown in (figure 46). We also took elevations across the whole site.

\textbf{Figure 45.} Red \textit{tafla} path (XAC1) bordered by split palm-tree trunks running between the Apis House and the Shabaka Building from the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road. Photo by Field Director, looking NE. Photo no. 201968.

\textsuperscript{25} Ptah Temple West Gate (BAA), Apis House (FAGI), Memphis Open Air Museum (QAS), Ramesses II Chapel (RABI), Tombs of the High Priests (RABII), White Walls Chapel (RAD), Hathor Temple (RAG), Sekhmet Temple (RQA).
Figure 46. Map of the Apis House (FAGIII) showing all the surveyed features from the 2015 and 2016 seasons at the site.
4. Archaeological Baseline Data Research

The Apis House (FAGI) as well as the Shabaka Building (FAGII), and the Western Building (FAGIII) are located in the south-west corner of the Ptah temple precinct, at the south-eastern edge of Kôm Fakhry, within the modern settlement of Mit Rahina. The whole archaeological area is currently bordered on the south and west by the modern Saqqara to Bedrashein road of leading to the open-air Museum of Mit Rahina, and on the north and east by private houses and by a line of palm-trees which probably constitutes the only remnants of the palm-tree orchards which originally covered the tell before its excavation\(^{26}\). At present, access from the road to the site is prevented by a wire mesh fence built by the Ministry of Antiquities (MoA); this fence is pierced on the south with a single entrance permanently left open to visitors. The enclosed area measures 110m (N-S) by 92.60m (E-W; 754m\(^2\)).

When our work began, the site and surviving remains were found entirely covered by encroaching vegetation and scattered domestic rubbish coming from the nearby modern settlement. However, we know from former archaeological surveys that the remains of the Apis House include:

(1) a main rectangular mudbrick building whose walls were found lined with stone and its floors paved with stone slabs. This building was standing at the top of a mudbrick platform accessible from the south, which is a common architectural feature of religious buildings during the Late and Greco-Roman periods. This monument is known for the numerous reused stone blocks it comprises, among which a lot were still bearing inscriptions; it is also particularly famous for the set of beautifully carved calcite lion-bed tables which has been found inside it. The layout of this building consists of a set of three parallel oblong rooms (Dimick’s rooms A, B and C\(^{27}\)), aligned on a north-south axis, and connected with each other through a series of doors. These rooms were probably roofed with mudbrick vaults\(^{28}\). In the centre of the façade of the monument (south), the structure of a platform adorned with a tripartite niche evoking a false-door had been installed, presumably in what used to be at

\(^{26}\) We know from former excavators that before its discovery the site consisted of a tell covered by orchards of palm trees, and that it has been used during modern times by the local population as a source of sebbakh leaving a lot of “pockmarks” over the landscape: see JONES 1987, 37.

\(^{27}\) The numbering of the architectural spaces and elements established by J. Dimick in the 1950s has been kept and used by later excavators and commentators: see ANTHES 1959, 75-79 and pl. 41 and remarks in JONES 1982, 54, note 3. For the reader’s convenience, we will make use of this same numbering system in the present report.

\(^{28}\) JONES 1987, 43-44.
some point an actual central doorway\(^{29}\); the monument is now only accessible through a side doorway on the east of the front wall CD. At a later stage, the back room was divided in two smaller chambers with a wall (BA) pierced by a door (E/W, from which only the foundation remains), the eastern one being reshaped by adjoining a small courtyard in the north so that a large calcite (purification?) table (4) can be accommodated with its steps and collecting basin; likewise, a door has been opened in the eastern end of wall AB to give access to table 4. As mentioned above, this building contains a set of calcite lion-bed tables beautifully carved. Among them: the tables 4 and 5 which are still in situ (it has to be noted that table 2 was re-shaped to be re-used as a lustration slab). The other two, tables 1 [limestone] and 3 were found re-used as filling material for founding the paving of room A.

(2) a front courtyard located south of the latter building, which was originally adorned by a colonnade and accessible through two twin gates (8 and 6) facing each other and opening east-west. This courtyard has first been wrongly interpreted as another set of rooms (Dimick’s rooms D, E, F) because of the presence of free standing banks of earth and collapsed mudbricks (stratigraphy) which were identified by former excavators as remnants of walls\(^{30}\).

(3) another higher mudbrick platform, only partially exposed by the excavators of the site, but which had obviously been adjoined at an unknown date (contemporary or later) to the north of the former one in order to compose a double terrace structure. This platform was made of at least two ranges of casemates, whose walls were used to support a massive building of which almost nothing has survived, except fragments of stone-paved floors, a few doorjambs and remains of wall-lining stone-slabs.

It is widely acknowledged that this set of buildings was part of the sacred complex devoted to the accommodation and worship of the Apis bull, documented by Late Period inscriptions and Greek writers, and perhaps to its embalming as well, or at least to the purification ceremonies which occurred prior to the funerals of the bull-god and to his burial in the Serapeum at Saqqara\(^{31}\). To date, the site of the Apis House is the only place in Egypt where the sacred premises of a living bull-god has been uncovered; this site also constitutes a very interesting counterpart to the Serapeum necropolis in Saqqara, where these sacred bulls were buried once dead. This makes The Apis House an entirely unique place.

\(^{29}\) JONES 1983, 36.

\(^{30}\) Especially section DE, see JONES 1983, 36 and 1987, 36-40.

\(^{31}\) About the identification, dating and purpose of this monument, see JONES 1982, 53-54, and conclusions in JONES 1990, based on archaeological record.
The current structures probably correspond to the complex observed and described by Strabo when he came to Memphis ca. 25 BC. According to the archaeological record, this complex was erected at a late date, presumably during the XXXth dynasty\(^{32}\), a date which would coincide with the period of national revival and intensive rebuilding which characterised the reign of Nectanebo II, who we know inaugurated in Memphis a new “Place of Living Apis” “for the temple of his father Ptah” and made a series of additions to the w’b.t of Apis\(^{33}\). The current monuments have presumably replaced an earlier set of buildings which had been described by Herodotus in his time\(^{34}\). The present-day structures have probably been in use for centuries, with very few changes during Ptolemaic times\(^{35}\), until the I-II\(^{th}\) centuries AD (late Roman period) when the site was destroyed by stone robbers presumably for producing lime\(^{36}\).

Even if those buildings constitute indisputably the most prominent monuments of the Apis House, these are not the only remains present on site. The archaeological area, as currently bounded by the MSA wire mesh fence, also includes on the west half of the site another set of stone-lined mudbrick religious buildings (FAE) whose exact purpose is yet to be determined. These are commonly known as the remains of a “Shabaka Chapel”, following an interpretation formerly proposed by Petrie; in the following pages, we will simply refer to these buildings as the West Chapel and its surrounding premises.

Not surprisingly, the site displays all the features of a long-established temple area showing intensive building and rebuilding activities. The uncovered buildings all include re-used building material presumably coming from dismantled monuments located in the vicinity. Some of these blocks still bore inscriptions and, although they do not provide direct evidence for dating our buildings, those inscribed blocks testify:

- building activities in the Apis premises from the reign of Ramesses II;
- intensive building activities under the XXV\(^{th}\) dynasty (Shabaka);
- later usurpation under the XXVI\(^{th}\) dynasty (Psamtik II);

\(^{32}\) As evidenced by two discoveries which provided \textit{termina post-} and \textit{antequam}: see JONES 1985, 20; 1987, 44; 1988, 107-110; and 1990, 145.

\(^{33}\) See a quartzite stela found re-used in Saqqara: \textit{PM III}\(^{2}\), 779. It has to be noted that an installation found in position inside one of the buildings excavated on Site 2 precisely bears an inscription referring, likewise, to the w’b.t of Apis.

\(^{34}\) JONES 1990, 146-147.

\(^{35}\) JONES 1983, 34: re-use of elements of a doorway bearing Greek \textit{graffiti}.

\(^{36}\) JONES 1988, 107. For more details, see the analysis of the stratigraphic sequence of section DE preserved in front of the building in the Southern courtyard and the identification of the pits dug by stone robbers in JONES 1987, 36-40.
and the final rebuilding of the area under the XXXth dynasty (Nectanebo II) characterised by the re-use of material belonging to former building phases.

Previous Excavations

The Apis House was probably first visited by C.R. Lepsius in 1842 when he mapped the whole Memphite area. It has been recorded and excavated to varying degrees over the past two centuries.

H. Brugsch

Its discovery started in the 1870s when H. Brugsch uncovered three calcite blocks (eastern side of FAH: blocks 7a-c according to M. Jones record) which dated from the reign of Ramses II and Sheshonq I. These bore inscriptions mentioning the Apis bull (both as a living bull and as an Osiris bull) and its “purification place” (w’b.t). No further excavation took place at this time, but H. Brugsch suspected that these blocks were part of an actual building rather than loose blocks. He already envisaged the possibility that this site could correspond to the “Apieum von Memphis”.

An accidental discovery

North of it, midway between the West gate (BAA) and Brugsch’s blocks (FAH), the Antiquities Service in the early XXth century cleaned an area where an inhabitant from Mit Rahina had accidentally exposed part of a small monument built with reused stone blocks from Nectanebo II (BAM). These formed a massive oval tank divided in two by a central double step (internal measurement of the tank: 5,35 x 1,74 m; depth 1,02 m). This tank was still sunk into a pavement made of irregular stones. Close to the edge of the paving floor was found a circular well, lined with limestone blocks (internal diameter: 2,05 m), with four protruding stones presumably intended for supporting a system for fetching water (it should be noted that at the time of the discovery, the structure of the well had been re-used to support a shaduf). Close to the tank, but outside the paving floor, were found a sunken vat made of red pottery (internal diameter: 0,95 m), and a broken limestone trough (length 0,80 m) no longer in position. Around this assemblage of elements were found scattered limestone blocks. The purpose of this monument has not been identified yet, but it seems clear that the tank and the well may have been part of the same complex, the latter being used to supply the former with water. No datable material have been found during

37 BRUGSCH 1878, 37-43 and Thesaurus.
38 DARESSY 1901, 240-243.
excavations, but G. Daressy suspected a Roman date. According to M. Jones\textsuperscript{39}, the blocks reused for building this monument may have been removed from the Apis House when the site was looted during the I-II\textsuperscript{nd} centuries AD.

\textit{W.F. Petrie}

Then, in 1908, W.F. Petrie began the clearance of the area\textsuperscript{40}. On this occasion, he exposed:

- a portion of the West chapel (FAE), which he called the “building of Shabaka” on the evidence of a unique inscribed block (now lost but which appeared eventually as having been reused);

- a portion of the colonnaded courtyard (FAH) adorning the southern front of the Apis house (made of re-used blocks, notably from Ramses II). This colonnade is not visible any more and might lie today beneath the modern 19\textsuperscript{th} – 20\textsuperscript{th} C road which surrounds the southern edge of the site;

- the first structures composing the southernmost part of the Apis house (FAH), where Brugsch’s blocks had been found. At that time, W. Petrie observed that this building was made of mudbrick masonry and reused blocks, and he came to the conclusion that this building might have belonged to “a late date”.

\textit{Another accidental discovery}

In 1914 and 1920, local farmers exposed a set of six quartzite blocks, among which four doorjambs and a block bearing a depiction of king Amasis (XXVI\textsuperscript{th} dynasty)\textsuperscript{41}. These constitute “the remnants of two sets of matching pairs of jambs” (61-64) which also seem to match with the gate foundations found in the Southern courtyard of the Apis House in FAH\textsuperscript{42}. In 1982-1983, the doorjambs were found by the AHP (see \textit{infra}) lying on the west of the Apis buildings (between FAE and FAG), while the two blocks had been moved to the Institute of Egyptian Art and Archaeology at Memphis, Tennesse, where they are still kept\textsuperscript{43}. Their original finding spot remains unknown though.

\textit{A. Badawi and M. el-Amir}

In 1941, A. Badawi and M. el-Amir started to dig for Cairo University at the palm tree-covered mound located north of Brugsch’s blocks\textsuperscript{44}. On this occasion, they exposed most of the Apis

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{JONES1990} Jones 1990, 146-147.
\bibitem{PETRIE1909} Petrie 1909, 10 [§ 29 and 31], 12-13 [§ 38], and pl. XXV [bottom left], XXVII [top left] and XXX [bottom right]).
\bibitem{DARESSY1920} Daressy 1920, 167 and 171 [7].
\bibitem{JONES1983} Jones 1983, 37.
\bibitem{FREED1983} Freed 1983, 51 [33].
\bibitem{NOTESANDNEWS1941} Notes and News 1941, 165; El-Amir 1948, 51-56.
\end{thebibliography}
building (FAG). The discovery of inscribed blocks mentioning the living and the deceased Apis bull, calcite lion-bed tables which they interpreted as offering tables, and stone basins which could have been used as mangers and troughs, led them to identify the monument with the Apis stall or sékos known from Greek travellers’ texts. The excavation was then abandoned due to the lack of funding which followed the Second World War.

**The University of Pennsylvania Expedition to Mit Rahinah**

From 1954 to 1956, a joint expedition in Mit Rahina led by R. Anthes – the University of Pennsylvania Expedition to Mit Rahinah – and involving successively J. Dimick, J. Jacquet, H. Gordan (-Jacquet), and L. Habachi, undertook new investigations within the Apis premises.\(^45\)

In 1954 and 1955, J. Dimick conducted new soundings in the main building (FAG, Rooms C and A according to his naming system), and managed to establish that the current building had been erected upon a brick platform (ca. 2 m deep below the building’s floor level).\(^46\) He envisaged the possibility that the floors and structures built upon the brick platform on the northern part of the building may have belonged to a later building phase (Necho/Amasis) with a view to raise the building above the water level: according to J. Dimick, the same level as the Apries palace located further north in Kôm Tuman (TAA); while the structures found in the southern part (Brugsch’s and Petrie’s finds in FAH), built at a lower level, would have belonged to an earlier building phase (Ramesses II - Sheshonq: according to J. Dimick, same level as XIX\(^{\text{th}}\) dynasty temples (RAB) and XXII\(^{\text{th}}\) dynasty crypts (RAB)). J. Dimick concluded from his observations and interpretation of the archaeological record that el-Amir’s identification of the building with a stall or stable for the Apis bull was acceptable, especially considering the absence of evidence for roofing\(^47\) and the possible presence of pole-sockets for a canopy used to shade the bull; conversely, he preferred to locate the embalming house of the sacred bull in Saqqara necropolis, close to the Serapeum, in an up-to-now undisclosed area.

\(^45\) **ANTHES 1956, 21-23, and 1959, 75-79 and 1965, 60-65.**

\(^46\) **See soundings 1, 14 and 18 in ANTHES 1959, pl. 41.**

\(^47\) **For another opinion, see JONES 1987, 43-44 (who argues in favour of mudbrick vaults).**
The Apis House Project led by M. Jones

From 1982 to 1987, the Apis House Project in Mit Rahina (AHP), led by M. Jones at the suggestion of J. Dimick and on behalf of the University of New York, undertook a new survey and recording of the area, as well as a series of targeted soundings and further excavations on the north and west of the building. On this occasion, a new detailed plan of the area was produced. This was complemented by an architectural survey, by a study of pottery and small finds, and an epigraphic record of the inscriptions and graffiti. Those new investigations helped to better the understanding of the successive building phases of the area, to propose an average dating for the current remains, to uncover additional buildings and to clarify the purpose and functioning of the whole group of monuments.

- During the first three seasons of the project (1982, 1982-1983, 1983), the AHP conducted a new survey of the so-called Apis house, together with a study of the available photographic archives bequeathed by former excavators (el-Amir/Badawi in 1941 and J. Dimick in 1955). M. Jones and his team also started to explore the western and northern areas located in the immediate vicinity of Apis building.

- The survey of the Apis building itself started in 1982, resulting in a large-scale mapping of the whole area and of its contents and in an architectural study of the monument and its building phases. This enabled M. Jones to confirm J. Dimick’s observations that the current building was actually standing upon a mudbrick platform. A thorough comparison between the remains then visible and the picture archives led to identify two destruction phases:

(a) the latest one, when the site was exploited as a quarry by stone robbers, possibly for producing lime (as evidenced by the amount of limestone chips found over the site and by the fact that the calcite tables escaped the destruction);

(b) the earlier one, which occurred prior to the current monument, when an earlier building (of which only few sections are still visible) had been partially demolished and reused to accommodate the new one. On this occasion, it seems that its mudbrick structure has been partially reshaped and its stone blocks re-employed as building/filling material. Several sections of this earlier mudbrick structure were thereby identified (Room A: walls N and E + walls BA and AB, all levelled for accommodating a new stone lining). Among the blocks reused, we can cite the tables 1, 3 and 43-46 which have been re-used as foundation material for the paving, as well as the broken basin 56, the door-sockets 47-50, and the

---

basin 18 (wrongly identified as a manger by el-Amir) which have been all re-used as foundation packing together with a crushed fill of limestone chips, plaster, mortar and crumbled mudbricks. It has to be noted that this latter basin (18) matches perfectly with the northern end of table 1 which had been re-employed as building material too. Likewise, a set of blocks coming from a dismantled doorway has been reused for building the section of wall located on the north of tables 3 and 4; these were still bearing Greek graffiti which provided a terminus post quem and argued in favour of a late dating for the last building phase of the monument. A series of four small lion tables 43-46 found re-used in the section of wall AB (close to tables 3 and 4), and which had been relocated by the MSA (then known as the Egyptian Antiquities Organisation (EAO)) in 1971, were found by M. Jones on display over a small platform built in the middle of Room A.

- In 1982-1983, the AHP also undertook the survey of the area located immediately to the west of the Apis building. In this occasion, the four quartzite doorjambs uncovered by local farmers before 1914 were found lying on the surface of the ground. Their original find spot is unknown but M. Jones suspected that they could have been part of the remains of the two entrances located east and west of the front courtyard of the Apis building, based on the dimensions of these doorjambs which perfectly match with the in situ foundations of the two gates. During the clearance, the remnants of a building perfectly aligned with the West chapel had been exposed. They consisted of a set of low mudbrick walls, a damaged threshold and two large red granite basins (59 and 60) found sunk into a paved area composed of two layers of stones (the upper one corresponding to a smooth pavement; the lower one presumably its foundation layer). The purpose of this area was not identified but it seemed clear to the excavators that this set of architectural features used to be part of the West chapel complex.

- In 1982-1983, the MAP has also conducted new excavations further west, in the West Chapel (whose forecourt had formerly been partially exposed by W.F. Petrie in 1908), in order to complete the mapping of the monument. Though severely denuded on its eastern part, the building’s layout was greatly clarified on this occasion. This building actually consisted of a colonnaded forecourt, preceded in the south by a denuded area where the remains of a gate opening east-west were uncovered; this forecourt was open on its north

49 JONES 1983, 35-36.
50 EL-AMIR 1948, pl. XV [3].
51 JONES 1984, 16.
52 JONES 1983, 38 and plan 1 (north-west of the quartzite doorjambs 61-64).
side over a rectangular vestibule leading to a row of three or four contiguous small chambers. The architecture of the building was made of mudbrick walls, originally lined with stone slabs, and stone-paved floors which were very similar to the paved floors found within the Apis buildings. During the recording of the monument, it was reported that the inscribed block after which W.F. Petrie dated the monument (Shabaka, XXVth dynasty) was missing.

- In 1982-1983 and 1984, the MAP also excavated the area immediately on the north of the Apis building. Before excavation, this area was characterised by the presence of two parallel trenches running east-west (which may have been the work of sebbakhin or the soundings of former excavators) and by a modern cut which defines the limit north and north-east of the site. There, the team exposed another larger mudbrick platform made of casemate walls, whose cells were found filled with a “loose, spongy fill, densely packed with sherds” (from Old Kingdom to Late Period) together with what appeared as industrial refuse: charcoal, ash, bone, small objects (flints, beads), natural pebbles, discarded chips and flakes, moulds for small objects, a glass bowl (Greco-Roman Period) and an ostracon showing Ptah in his shrine. The superstructure which used to stand at the top had totally disappeared; with the exception of few scattered remnants of the stone paving (standing directly over the loose fill described above) and of the stone lining of the walls (which apparently followed the same plan as the casemates). A series of depressions in the walls separating the southern line of cells, and the discovery of a stone base for a doorjamb, suggested that a line of doorways opening east-west initially connected each cell with each other. Another base for a doorway have also been found on the southern wall of the easternmost cell of the North platform. A comparison with archive pictures taken by el-Amir and Badawi in 1941 show that a deep layer of collapsed material (1-2 m), probably mudbrick debris coming from the superstructure, used to cover the whole platform; this had probably been removed both by former excavators and by sebbakhin during the XIXth and early XXth centuries. Deeper excavations conducted in cells G, J and K have shown that this platform, despite being built with uniform material (same form of bricks), was erected on a very uneven surface of rubbish heaps which had not been levelled beforehand (the same material as the filling material of the platform). These excavations also revealed the presence of an earlier mudbrick building beneath the North Platform which show a different orientation.

- In 1984, further work was undertaken on the Apis House building to clarify the nature and chronology of its flooring. It was observed that the last paving floor of rooms A, B and C was

---

54 JONES 1985, 20.
55 JONES 1985, 21.
composed of stone slabs, and that this paving was standing upon a thick layer of foundation material composed of hard-packed mud in which were incorporated re-used purification tables (1 and 3) and loose blocks of various sizes and shapes (tanks, basins, wall blocks, etc.) coming from dismantled monuments. In room A, it seemed clear that the paving was standing quite high, upon tables 1 and 3, and that it reached the level of the threshold of door AB. In room B, only one single paving slab was found in situ (the whole room had apparently been dug below paving level by former excavators), at the same level as the floors of rooms A and C. The absence of the original paving enabled M. Jones to excavate below the surviving pavement slab and to better the understanding of the architecture of the monument: he observed that the paving was here again standing upon a filling material made of mud and reused stones (among which slabs coming from an inscribed doorway of Shabaka, later usurped by Psamtik II\(^{56}\)), and that this foundation material was filling the compartments formed by mudbrick walls found below the floor surface\(^{57}\). In the filling, a few small finds were uncovered, among which were a bronze knife, a faience box and a mould for a bnw-bird figure.

- The mission of 1984-1985 was devoted to the study of the pottery and of the small finds coming from the excavation of the Apis House\(^{58}\). This provided valuable information for dating the monument and its different phases of (re)building, (re)occupation, abandon and destruction.

- In 1985, a remaining stratigraphic section (DE), located on the south of the Apis House, was examined\(^{59}\). This provided further information about the chronology of the site, and especially about the latest stages of the occupation and abandonment/re-occupation/destruction of the monument. For instance, it helped to clarify the archaeological pattern and sequence revealed by the other rare remnants of stratigraphy found all over the site and which had escaped to the work of previous excavators\(^{60}\).

- In 1986, further excavations have been conducted in the northern area of the site, revealing that the North platform was actually expanding further north and west. A new excavation area was opened to the north of the southern row of cells (excavated in 1984) revealing wall HQ and cell Q. This area was found still covered by collapsed mudbricks coming from wall HQ, the top of which had been disturbed by modern agricultural activity and by pits dug

---

56 JONES 1985, 26-27 and fig. 10-12.
57 JONES 1985, 22 and fig. 6 and 7; see also JONES 1988, fig. 1.
58 JONES 1987, 44-46.
59 JONES 1987, 37-40 and fig. 3.
60 JONES 1987, 40-43.
by stone robbers\textsuperscript{61}. The discovery of a hoard of silver coins of Athenian style but Memphite origin (local mint) was made over the top of wall HQ at the same level as the floor of the superstructure which originally stood at the top of the North platform. Numismatic analysis of the hoard had shown that these silver coins, besides having been produced locally in Egypt, were dating of ca. 340 BC\textsuperscript{62}. Considering that this hoard may have been a foundation deposit, this provided a useful \textit{terminus post quem} for the erection of the building supported by the North platform. The excavation has also exposed a layer of “yellowish buff taff” which may have been of the same nature as the bedding layer found in room B, beneath the paving. Over the taff, and beneath the brick debris coming from the collapse of the structure (which sealed the stratigraphic sequence), a few finds have been uncovered among which several could be dated from early Roman period (fragments of calcite and faience vessels, pottery lamps, potsherds). Further excavations conducted in the compartments found below the paving level of room B revealed that the mudbrick walls forming the edges of those compartments descended 2.12 m below floor level, expanding beneath walls AB and BC. These excavations demonstrated that those partition walls were actually standing upon “a wall or bank with sloping sides (Wall BX)” which may have been a demolished wall belonging to an earlier mudbrick structure\textsuperscript{63}. This eastern compartment was found filled with a layer of mudbrick rubble and sherds, and a random mix of re-used limestone blocks of the same nature as the material found in the western compartment (see 1984 excavations); in this occasion, more inscribed slabs from Shabaka’s doorway were found (see 1984 excavations)\textsuperscript{64}.

- In 1986, M. Jones took action for building “a waterproof concrete platform” on which the three calcite blocks 7a-c firstly exposed by H. Brugsch could be displayed more safely. Their temporary removal allowed additional excavation which led to a series of observations\textsuperscript{65}. This revealed that: (1) block 7c (Sheshonq I) actually bore another inscription dated to the XXII\textsuperscript{nd} dynasty; (2) the group of blocks 7a-c stood over two more layers of calcite blocks and flakes; (3) these lower blocks had been re-used several times prior to being assembled here; (4) the fill between the blocks contained pottery dated to the late Ptolemaic and early Roman periods. It has to be noted that this assemblage of blocks seems to have been used as a foundation for an architectural feature about which we know nothing.

\textsuperscript{61} JONES 1988, 111: see numerous fragments of stone elements bearing inscriptions.
\textsuperscript{62} JONES 1988, 107-110 and fig. 3a-b.
\textsuperscript{63} JONES 1988, 112 and fig. 1 and 5.
\textsuperscript{64} JONES 1988, 113.
\textsuperscript{65} JONES 1988, 113-116 and fig. 8.
4.1. Site Narratives

This section presents additional data that has been encountered during research, that could be used during the creation of content (websites, guidebooks etc.) to be produced during the course of the project.

Greek/Roman Accounts of the Apis House.

There are a number of accounts of the Apis House provided by visitors during the Greek and Roman periods. These are provided below (taken from Jeffreys 2010):

**Herodotus** (c. 450BC – therefore Late Period) writes Psammetichos I ‘made the southern outer court of Hephaistos’s temple at Memphis, and built over against this a court for Apis, where Apis is kept and fed whenever he appears; this court has an inner colonnade all round it and many carved figures; the roof is held up by great statues twelve cubits high for pillars’ (Herodotus 2.153 from Godley 1971-5). Jeffreys suggests that Herodotus’s reference to the colonnade may refer to the Ptah temple and not the Apis House (2010:9).

**Strabo** (c. 25BC – therefore Roman Period) writes ‘Memphis… contains temples, one of which is that of Apis, who is the same as Osiris; it is here that the bull Apis is kept in a kind of Sanctuary, being regarded, as I have said, as god; his forehead and certain other small parts of his body are marked with white, but the other parts are black, and it is by these marks that they always choose the bull suitable for the succession, when the one that holds the honour has died. In front of the sanctuary is situated a court, in which there is another sanctuary belonging to the bull’s mother. Into this court they set Apis loose at a certain hour, particularly that he may be shown to foreigners; for although people can see him through the window in the sanctuary, they wish to see him outside also; but when he has finished a short bout of skipping in the court they take him back to his familiar stall’ (Strabo XVII.1, 31 – Jones 1967).

**Pliny** (70AD – Roman period) writes ‘in Egypt an ox is even worshipped in place of a god; its name is Apis. Its distinguishing mark is a bright white spot. It is not lawful for it to succeed a certain number of years of life, and they kill it by drowning it in the fountain of the priests…. When the successor is found it is led by 100 priests to Memphis. It has a pair of shrines, which they call bedchambers (thalanos), that supply the nations with auguries: when it enters one, this is a joyful sign, but in the other one it portends terrible events. It gives answers to private individuals by taking food out of the hand of those who consult it….. it turned away from the hand of Germanicus Caesar, who was made away with not long after’ (Pliny VIII.71
-184-5 – translated from Eicholz and Rakham 1938-62). The routine killing may be a misunderstanding (Jeffreys 2010:17).

Pliny writes ‘At Memphis there is a place in the Nile which from its shape they call Phiala (goblet); every year they throw there a gold and silver cup on the days which they keep as the birthdays of Apis (VIII.71 (186))

Plutarch (100AD) writes ‘There are in Memphis certain bronze gates called the Gates of Oblivion and Lamentation, which are opened when the burial of Apis takes place’ (Plutarch 362.29 – translated from Babbit 1936.)

Ammianus Marcellinus (370s AD) writes in a letter to Julian ‘from the Governor of Egypt, reporting that after the laborious search for a new Apis bull, they had finally been able to find one. The new Apis, when found, is taken to Memphis, a populous city, famed for the frequent presence of the god Aesculapius. And when he has been led into the city… and conducted to his chambers, he begins to be an object of worship; and is said that by manifest signs he gives indications of coming events’ (XXII 14, 6-7 – translated by Rolfe 1937).

Anthes, R., 1956, “A first season of excavating in Memphis”, PUMB 20/1, 3-25.
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Introduction

The Memphis Open-Air Museum (site code QAS) is currently the only archaeological site open to visitors within Mit Rahina. The museum displays a collection of artefacts (statues, columns, sarcophagi, stelae) that originate from sites within Memphis. Some are displayed within the ‘open air’, and others within an enclosed museum structure (including the limestone colossus of Ramesses II). The museum grounds also house: the Ministry of Antiquities Inspectorate of Mit Rahina, of which there are currently 7 inspectors, 1 Director and 1 General Director; tourist police; and museum administrative staff. These groups/individuals have offices within the grounds.

AERA’s work at the museum, alongside work at the Ptah Temple West Gate, formed the first part of the MSCD Project’s on site work program. Work at the museum began on 28th September 2015 and continued through to 17th December 2015, and in April 2016. During this period the archaeological and heritage baseline was recorded, forming the basis from which developments could be measured. This work included: recording all the objects within the museum (numbered, photographed, researched, written up); surveying all features within the museum (objects, fences, signs, structures, trees, benches etc.); recording all existing features (such as visitor facilities, using written records and photography); some interviewing of individuals working within the museum grounds; and some visitor observations (recorded using pro-forma sheets). During this period, the students of Field School 1 also developed the content and design of proposed signage for the museum. Outside of the ‘on site’ component, research was conducted on the objects and archaeological remains within the museum. The methodology and data collected from all these activities are presented below.

Methodology

The methods devised and then employed in the recording of site QAS differed from those used in the recording of the other MSCD sites. At site QAS, site recording focused on:

1. **The survey**, with Total Station, of all features within the museum – kiosks, platforms, plinths, curbs, trees, modern buildings, fences and fence poles, guard huts, bins, benches and of course displayed objects. Each surveyed
feature was tagged with a feature type code and in the case of the objects, with a Museum Object number (MO 20 for example). The survey data was then imported into GIS and the feature types (and Object numbers) are included within the GIS data tables, so that data can be easily accessed and queried.

2. The Creation of an Object Catalogue. Each object displayed within the museum was assigned a Museum Object (MO) number, from MO1 through to MO87 (87 displayed objects in total). Each object was described (type and material), each object was researched (provenance, translation of text, any published literature sought and synthesized), and each object was photographed (as record and publication-quality photographs). Some of the objects already had numbers assigned by the Open-Air Museum, these numbers are noted in the catalogue. The museum also provided us with a copy of their own catalogue. Literary, image (photographic research within image collections, film), other data research was also conducted on the objects displayed within the museum. A basic catalogue was created using this information and photography. Between May and August Aude Grazer conducted further, and far more robust, research on the objects and, with Ali Witsell transformed, the catalogue into a publishable version. This can be viewed as a separate Information Packet (the Museum Catalogue).

3. The photographs of objects within the museum were taken by the Project Photographer using a full-frame camera (Nikon D610) and two lenses – 24mm and 60mm. The objects were photographed from four sides, where possible, and from the top (also, where possible). The Project Photographer used a 60mm lens, apart from detailed shots, where she used a 24mm lens. Because the objects are displayed and therefore photographed outside, she used two silver reflectors and plastic sheets as light diffusers. Because the use of scaffolding during photography was not possible, there were difficulties in photographing the larger objects (such as the colossi). Ladders were used where possible. Also, because it was not possible to move objects some objects could not be photographed from all sides (particularly those in the covered museum).
The photographs were taken and downloaded in RAW NEF format. The Project Photographer then processed these using Adobe Lightroom and Adobe Photoshop. As part of the processing the backgrounds around the objects and scales were blacked out. The images were then exported as high resolution jpegs, which could be used in publication.

A selection of these photographs are included within the catalogue (see separate packet).

4. **Existing Features.** All existing features connected with visitor experience of the site, such as modern building, interpretative signs, visitor facilities and visitor routes, were recorded using pro-forma forms and photography, by the MoA field school students (FS1).

5. **Other Archaeological Research.** Given that the Museum is located within the ancient city of Memphis, the site itself contains *in-situ* archaeological features, including the southern wall of the Ptah Temple. Literary, image and archive research was therefore conducted on the Museum as an archaeological site. As far as was possible, research was also conducted on the history of the museum — since no literary sources were available on this.

6. **Daily Activities.** During the course of the 2015 season (September through December) non-field school activities such as survey and object recording, conducted at the museum were recorded using pro-forma daily activity sheets. These forms are archived on the AERA server.

**Description of the Site (including survey data)**

The museum is located on the south side of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road, bordered on all sides with a metal fence (figure 1). The main (and only visitor) access is via a gate located at the western end of the museum, which leads into the museum's car park. There is a second gate in the southeastern corner of the museum, which is used by museum personnel. The museum 90m (N-S) by 174m (E-W; 11,986m2) and the car park is 33m by 37m, 1,166m2.
The ticket kiosk is located within the western fence of the museum (in the south-west corner; figure 2) - tickets are therefore purchased from within the car park. The western access into the museum consists of a person scanner in the center, and an open access to the north. The covered museum, housing the colossus is located to the south, immediately as one enters the museum. At the top of the steps to the covered museum there is an office to the left (east), in which the General Director and Director of Mit Rahina work, and an office to the right (west) for police personnel. Access to the covered museum is ahead to the south. The museum consists of a ground floor and 4 stairways up to a mezzanine. The ground floor is dominated by the limestone colossus, which is displayed face up, with its head to the west as found. The colossus lies on a rectangular platform in the centre of the floor, with a roped border. To the north, south, west and east of the colossus a series of objects are displayed, some on plinths/small platforms. From the ground floor there are two staircases leading up to the Mezzanine floor – one to the east and one to the west. The staircase to the east is wider, with objects displayed either side, on the stairway. Once on the Mezzanine level, there is a balcony around the inner perimeter of the structure, so that a visitor can look down onto the colossus from all sides. The roof of the museum is supported by pillars so that visitors on the Mezzanine can also view outwards on all sides. There are also four outward-viewing platforms on this level: one to the south-east with views of the open-air part of the museum and the land to the south; one to the northeast with views of the open-air part of the museum; one to the north-west with views of Mit Rahina; and one to the south-west with views of the Southern Approach and the land to the west and south.

Within the Open-Air part of the museum the alabaster sphinx dominates, with its head facing east. To the north of this there is an east-west row of 13 kiosks (KO 1-13; figure 3). To the south-east of the sphinx there are a further 2 kiosks (KO 14-15). The museum objects are displayed within two zones – one located to the south of the sphinx, and one to the east. The former is organized into three east-west rows, on three linear east-west platforms. The objects are displayed on plinths, each with a small sign, presenting the material type and dynasty and/or period of the object.

The second zone is organized into two east-west rows, with a path in between. At the eastern end of the row there is striding colossus of Ramesses II. To the north, east and south of this there are paths, areas of grass, and established trees. A guard’s
hut is also located to the east, adjacent to the eastern boundary fence. To the south of this there is an east-west platform, which has no objects currently displayed on it. Further to the south the ground level rises up – representing a surviving and visible section of the southern mudrick wall of the Great Ptah Temple. To the south of this along the southern perimeter of the museum is a guard station and a scatter of objects.

In the very southwest corner of the museum, behind the enclosed section (colossus) there are a series of structures, including a small mosque, an un-used (unfinished) bathroom block\(^1\), a used bathroom block and two small Inspectorate offices.

\(^1\) The new bathroom block was opened in May 2016 and is now the main bathroom block used by visitors to the Museum
Figure 1 Map showing location of the Open-Air Museum in relation to other sites that formed part of the MSCD project. Map prepared by the GIS Specialist.
Figure 2 Map showing all the surveyed elements at QAS, with different ‘types’ of modern features indicated. Map prepared by the GIS Specialist.
Figure 3  Map showing the location and numbering of the museum objects. Map prepared by the GIS Specialist
Existing Features (detailed).
The Field School 1 students recording the existing features within the museum as falling within four categories: interpretative signs; modern buildings; visitor facilities; visitor route.

Interpretative Signs
The first category was further subdivided into interpretative signs for artefacts and interpretative signs for monuments (the larger objects – the Egyptian alabaster sphinx and 3 colossi - being considered monuments). A total of 22 signs were recorded, displaying information on 22 displayed objects. 60 displayed objects did not have a sign. The signs comprise paper label, inside a frame made of wood and covered in glass. These are attached to metal holders that are cemented into the floor next to the object. The signs are 20cm by 15cm. In many, the paper had wrinkled up behind the glass and the written text showed signs of having been faded by the sun (figure 4). Dust that is lodged between the paper sign and the glass also makes them difficult to read. The texts are written in both English and Arabic and generally state the material of the object (granite, alabaster, limestone etc.), the type of object (statue, box, column, sarcophagus), the period or dynasty and occasionally additional information is provided. Some of the signs are damaged, including broken glass (figure 5) or unscrewed sign (figure 6).

Figure 4. An example of a sign in the Museum Garden. For object MO 29.
The English text on the 22 signs reads as following:


MO 24. ‘Tablet of Apris. 26 Dynasty. Sandstone’
MO 23. ‘Statue of Ramsis II. Granite Stone. New Kingdom. 19th Dynasty’

MO 22. ‘Statue of Ramses II. Alabaster. New Kingdom’

MO 21. ‘Statue of Ramsses II. 19th Dynasty (1290-1224) BC’.

MO 20. ‘Pink Granite Sarcophagus of a prince of New Kingdom’.


MO 18. ‘Statue of Ramesses II & God Ptah. Granite Stone. New Kingdom – 19th Dynasty’

MO 17. ‘Box with lid. Sand Stone. New Kingdom’

MO 27. 'Mummification bed. Alabaster’

MO 28. Sign present, label missing.

MO 29. ‘The lower part of a statue of the God Ptah – Basalt’

MO 30. ‘The lower part of a statue of the King (Shtep-ib-Ra) Basalt’.

MO 31. ‘Tablet for a person. A prince. Lime stone’

MO 32. ‘False door. Limestone’

MO 33. ‘False door. Limestone’

MO 34. ‘Pink granite piece of Ramases II infront of the God Ptah’

MO 13. ‘Column Lime stone – New Kingdom’

MO 8. ‘Sarcophagus. Granite stone. New Kingdom’

MO 9. ‘Base of column. Lime Stone’

MO 11. ‘Seated …..’ unreadable

MO 3. ‘Jar. Granite. New Kingdom’

Three of the larger objects (‘monuments’) have signs (MO1, MO14, MO 85). The material, format and layout of signs associated with MO 1 and MO 85 are identical to those already mentioned. The sign for MO14, the Egyptian Alabaster sphinx, is different – the sign is entirely made of metal, measures 13cm by 25cm, and is written in English (without Arabic) (figure 7).
The English texts (read as follows):

MO 1 ‘Statue of Ramses II. Granite Stone. New Kingdom’.

MO 14 ‘Sphinx of Memphis. Dyn 19. 1341-1200 BC’

MO 85 ‘Statue of Ramses II, Limestone, New Kingdom

Figure 7. Sign for the Egyptian Alabaster sphinx (MO 14)

**Modern Structures**

The modern buildings were subdivided into seven categories: museum building, entryways, guard stations, offices, ticket office, walls and other.

The museum grounds are bounded by an iron fence, c. 2m high, erected on concrete foundation wall, c. 0.50m high (figure 8). There are 3 entryways: an ‘open’ entryway in the north-west corner for visitor access and egress, c. 25m wide, which contains an x-ray? machine for visitors to be scanned as they enter the museum. A second entryway – a metal gate - (closed to visitors) is located in the southeast corner (figure 9), and a third in the southwest corner, for museum employees.
The museum building is constructed using bricks and concrete and comprises two floors, housing objects MO 52 to 85. The only access in and out is in the northern side of the museum.

Figure 8  The concrete foundation and metal fence that bounds the museum grounds. Photograph taken from the outside, along the northern boundary. East-facing

Figure 9. The metal gate in the southeast corner of the museum garden, closed to visitors. East-facing
There are 5 tourist police huts within the museum grounds and one just outside, next to the ticket office. These are wooden structures, without or with shallow foundations that measure c.1.5m by 2m (figure 10).

Figure 10. One of the six tourist police guard huts. South-east facing

There are 5 offices within the museum grounds, of these 2 are offices for Ministry of Antiquities (inspectorate) personnel, 1 for administrative staff, 1 for the manager of the tourist police and 1 for the director and manager of the museum, who also the General Director and Director of the Mit Rahina Antiquities Inspectorate. The inspectorate offices are located behind the Colossus Shelter, these are built of and roofed with wood, and measure c. 2.5m by 2.5m (figure 11).
The administrative office is a room within the Enclosed Museum, in the south-east corner, next to the Inspectorate Offices. The room has one door (figure 12). The offices for the Tourist Police Manager and the Museum Manager are located at the front of the Enclosed Museum, and face each other. Both offices are c. 3m by 3m and constructed using bricks, and roofed with concrete.

There is one ticket office within the museum grounds, located within the southwest corner of the site. The structure of ticket office is located within the museum (figure 13), the grating from which visitors buy tickets faces out into the car park (figure 14). The office is built of wood and measures c. 2m by 2m.
Figure 12. The grey door in the south-east corner of the Enclosed Museum is the access to the administrative office. North-facing

Figure 13. The wooden ticket office, within the museum grounds. West facing
Other buildings within the grounds include a c. 3m by 3m gardener's shed, located in the northeast corner of the site, and built of wood (figure 15), and a c. 6m by 3m mosque in the southwest corner (figures 16 and 17). The walls of the mosque are brick and its roof is wooden. The building is internally divided into two sections – one for males and one for females.
Figure 16 The mosque, located in the south-west corner of the museum grounds. South facing

Figure 17 The interior of the mosque. South-east facing. Built by Petrie in 1900s for workmen

There are four storerooms, accessible from within the museum grounds, but physically located outside the southern boundary wall of the museum (built by Petrie...
in the 1900s for workmen). These are built of bricks and roofed with wood (figure 18). There are additional storerooms located to the east of the museum.

Figure 18. Storerooms in the south-east corner of the museum.

Visitor Facilities

Visitor restrooms are located in the southwest corner of the museum grounds. There are two restroom buildings, one that is in use, and one that has recently been constructed, but is not yet open (see note below). The in-use building comprises two restrooms, one for males and one for females (figure 19). Each contains two toilet cubicles and two sinks (figure 20). Although there is a WC sign directing visitors to the building, the restrooms are not labeled so it is unclear which is female and which is male.

The unopened restroom building contains a restroom for males, a restroom for females (figure 21), each containing two sinks and two toilets, and a restroom for wheelchair users, with an access ramp (figure 22).

---

2 These restrooms were opened in May 2016. These new male and female restrooms are labeled ‘male’ and ‘female’ and are the restrooms now used by visitors to the Museum.
Figure 19 The in-use restrooms. South-facing

Figure 20 Inside the restroom for females.
21 The unopened ‘new’ restroom building\(^3\). South facing

Figure 22 The wheelchair ramp accessing the unopened toilet for wheelchair users.

\(^3\) Completed and opened in May 2016
There are three wooden benches within the Open-Air section of the museum grounds. These are not permanently positioned in a particular spot. It is unclear whether the benches are intended for visitor use or for the owners of the kiosks (figure 23). There is no other seating provided for visitors.

Figure 23. One of the three wooden benches located in the Open Air Museum (north-facing).

There are 15 wooden kiosks located within the museum grounds. The kiosks are operated by individuals local to Mit Rahina, these individuals are connected to two or three family lines. The wares sold on the kiosks are artifact/statue replicas, jewelry, tapestries, and some clothes (hats, scarves).

There are six garbage bins within the museum grounds. These are made of metal, painted yellow and are attached to a metal pillar, secured into and cemented into the ground (figure 24)
There is a considerable amount of managed foliage within the Open Air Museum, particularly in the eastern half of the museum, and around the northern boundary fence line.

**Existing Infrastructure**

There are a total of 12 introductory and instructional signs within the museum grounds and attached to the western fence line, visible to visitors as they enter through the visitor entryway. These include the following:

1. 1m by 1m metal sign located next to the ticket office. Sign reads: ‘Entry (sic) Fees. Tourist 25L.E. Student 25L.E’. The amounts however have been scratched out. The text appears only in English.
2. 2m by 3m rusted metal sign located on the corner of the car park, visible as visitors drive into the car park. Sign reads ‘Memphis Museum’.
3. There are 4 signs attached to the western boundary fence, to the right of the visitor entryway (figure 25). From right to left these are:
4. A 1m by 1m wooden sign with a glass cover, which is cracked, that reads ‘Help us to keep the area tidy’.
5. A 1m by 1m wooden sign with a glass cover that reads ‘Visiting time 8am: 4pm’.
7. A 1m by 1.5m painted wooden sign that reads originally read ‘Antiquities Police’. The sign is in particularly bad condition

Inside the museum grounds there is sign next to the office door of the Museum Director, in a wooden frame with a glass cover (sign 7), 30cm by 30cm, that reads ‘The Director of the Museum’. In front of the restrooms (behind the Enclosed Museum) is a wooden WC sign (sign 8), 0.50m by 0.50m (figure 26), attached to a metal post driven into the ground. Elsewhere there are directions for the restrooms, as chalk and an arrow drawn on walls (signs 9 and 10) (figure 26). Above the mosque there is a sign written in Arabic (figure 26) (sign 11). And next to the south-east (closed to visitors) entry way there is a sign, with wooden frame and broken glass cover, 0.50m x 1m that reads ‘No entry’ (sign 12; figure 27).
Sign 1. SE facing

Sign 2 SW facing

Sign 3. East facing

Sign 4. East facing

Figure 25. Instructional signs (signs 1-4)
Figure 26. Instructional signs (signs 5-9)
The paths within the Open-Air museum are mainly ‘dirt paths’, their presence indicated by the space between platforms or curbs (figure 28). There are two wheelchair ramps – a steep ramp leading up the enclosed museum (figure 29) and another to the east of the enclosed museum building (figure 30). Outside the museum there is a ‘hard-core’ floor within the car park and surfaces that lead through the access into the museum.
Figure 28 The ‘dirt paths’, created as spaces between curbs or platforms. East-facing

Figure 29 The steep ramp leading up to the enclosed museum. South-facing
Other Archaeological Evidence.

As well as displaying objects excavated from within Memphis, the museum itself sits on known archaeological remains. The Open Air Museum sits on the southern mudbrick wall of the Ptah Temple West Gate. Part of this substantial mudbrick, Ptolemaic wall is presently visible in the southeast corner of the museum, as a ‘brown’ mudbrick mound. Without considerable cleaning to expose the faces of the wall and the mudbricks within the structure it is difficult for a visitor to identify these feature as a wall (figure 31). However, given conservation considerations (that cleaning and subsequent erosion will deflate this feature further) the project decided not to work on this feature.
Figure 31 Showing the empty platform on the left and the rise of the southern mudbrick wall of the Ptah Temple on the right. East-facing. Photograph by Project Photographer .702782.

The southern wall of the Ptah Temple and parts of the eastern and western wall had been visible in the early 19th century (appearing on Lepsius maps, Bonomi maps and Hekekyan maps). In 1955 (?and 1956) the Philadelphia Expedition were able to look at the enclosure wall (area code RAE) after a drain dug by the Irrigation Department had exposed a portion of the wall's face (?northern). In addition, the Philadelphia team then went on to excavate and record another five trenches, against the south face of the wall (figure 32).
Figure 32 Map showing the location of soundings that the Philadelphia Expedition excavated to investigate the southern enclosure wall of the Ptah temple (Anthes 1965:figure 1). Note that the furthest east is a few meters to the west of the shelter housing the colossus, however this particular sounding did not reveal any traces of the wall (Anthes 1965:33).

The easternmost sounding however, a few meters to the north-west of the colossus, did not reveal any trace of the enclosure wall. Anthes writes ‘strangely, no traces of any wall were found either in the easternmost hole close to the colossus or in the excavation which the Department of Antiquities undertook for the foundation of a new museum just to the north of the shed, although both these spots were located in the line of the Enclosure Wall’ (Anthes 1965:33).

In 1982 the EES conducted three further soundings along the line of the southern wall (Jeffreys 1985: 23) when the Museum’s car park was extended in 1981-1982. This area was given area code RAF. Here, the EES recorded a second large, mudbrick wall, running NW-SE, also post-Ramesside (figures 33 and 34). Possibly associated with this, the EES recovered a coin hoard (Jeffreys 1985:23).
Given that the limestone colossus, and its pedestal, was found initially a little to the south of its present location (see below), with other colossi (see below), and a north-south (approach) pavement, which must have been the southern approach into the Ptah Temple, Jeffreys (and others) have argued that the southern pylon (gate) of the Ptah Temple must have been sited within the area of the present enclosed Museum. Similarly, Jeffreys argues that ‘since this statue [colossus MO 85] faced south and is very close to its original find-spot, outside the south gate of the Ptah temple enclosure…, it is virtually certain that the “Ptolemaic” wall would have abutted an (unlocated) Ramesside pylon, just as it does at the west gate’ (1985:23). However, both the Philadelphia Expedition’s sounding and an exploration by the MoA prior to the construction of the present Enclosed Museum (see Anthes quote above) did not reveal any sign of a stone gate structure. Jeffreys suggests that this ‘may well have been because all that remained of the stratigraphy was undifferentiated fill over a (largely robbed) stone pylon’ (Jeffreys 1985:23)
Figure 33  Showing the location of the divergent mudbrick wall, recorded by the EES when archaeological deposits were disturbed during the extension of the museum's car park (Jeffreys 1985: 16).
Figure 34 Detail of southern enclosure wall of the Ptah Temple and the divergent NW-SE wall, as recorded by the EES after archaeological deposits had been disturbed during the extension of the Museum’s Car Park (Jeffreys 1985: figure 17).
In 1967, prior to extending the museum grounds Tahrir excavated within the area (QAH): excavating around the sphinx (MO14); in the northeast corner of the open air museum where he found a small lavabo (possible part of a stone apsidal building that may be part of a church - coded as QAG); and along both faces of the mudbrick southern enclosure wall of the Ptah temple. Photographs of these excavations (SPA file 68, 28; file 48, 83; file 58, 11-25) indicate that during Tahir’s excavations the ground level in the western part of the Open Air Museum was taken down by c. 1m (Jeffreys 1985; note 160).

Near to its current location in the Open Air Museum Petrie found (in 1911-12), the alabaster sphinx (MO 14), tipped on its left side (figure 35). Petrie then used blocks which he found within the vicinity (and possibly associated with it) to raise it up out of the ground water (figures 36 and 37). The sphinx itself is not inscribed, so the date and king/queen that it depicts, is uncertain, ‘with suggestions ranging from Hatshepsut to Ramesses II’ (Jeffreys 1985:21). One of the blocks used by Petrie to support it had the cartouche of a Ramesside king (figure 37). See Object Catalogue for further information on MO14.

Taking its original location as found, the sphinx appears to have faced east, within the Ptah temple enclosure, close to the southern wall of the temple and the southern gate. Jeffreys (1985:21) suggests that it may have been associated with the east gate of the inner Ptah temple and suggests that there is a possibility that the sphinx ‘is a XVIIIth dynasty monument re-sited by Ramesses II or one of his successors during the Ptah temple rebuilding programme’
Figure 35 showing the alabaster sphinx tipped over on its left side (PUM 76400).
(Petrie: 1906)
Figure 36 Showing the sphinx raised up, by Petrie, using blocks found within the vicinity (Petrie:1906) PUM 4016
To the west of this, 3 trenches were excavated by the EES in 1982 when the Museum’s car park was extended in 1981-2. Here a coin-hoard was found, associated with a large mudbrick wall to the south. This wall diverges from the Ptolemaic (Ptah Temple) wall, but aligns with the south portal of the Merenptah Enclosure (figures 30 and 31). The wall is post-Ramesside. More walls are visible along this alignment, to the east – to the south of the MoA’s magazines.

**Contexts and ‘Object Histories’**

This section attempts to present ‘known’ narratives, histories and contexts for objects within the museum (the limestone colossus and the ‘Memphis’ red granite colossi for example) and objects associated with Memphis (such as the Ramesses II ‘Ramesses Station’ colossus). The intention is that the baseline data research can be used/considered, and made easily accessible in the creation of content of materials (websites, guidebooks etc), to be produced during the course of the project.

**The Limestone colossus and the Southern Approach**

Any account of the limestone colossus (MO 85) requires a full account of the excavations within the ‘Southern Approach’ (RQA) – the context within with the colossus was originally located/associated with. Furthermore, any account of the limestone colossus should include an ‘object narrative’ as far as is possible. Such a narrative is attempted here. For further details on the colossus see the Object Catalogue Information Packet.

The current siting of the limestone colossus, face up with its head to the west, within the Museum Enclosure, is close to its original (found) location. The discovery of the colossus is attributed to Giovanni Battista Caviglia, a Genoese shipbuilder, working for Henry Salt in the early 1800s, excavating various sites – including the Sphinx and pyramids at Giza (Jeffreys 2010:71). Caviglia worked one season for his sponsor Sloane at Memphis, excavating the colossus in 1821. He termed it ‘Father of Terror’ – Abu’l-Hol (like the Giza Sphinx). Consequently it is frequently referred to as The Abu’l-hol Colossus. There are no first hand accounts of the discovery. The statue
may have been partially visible prior to Caviglia. The upper surface of the colossus was heavily eroded so it may not have been recognizable. Some years later James Burton (antiquarian) and Edward Lane (Arabist) describe the colossus in situ:

Burton (1822) writes ‘head at N75 degrees W, what remains of its legs rests upon a large block stone, in which on the western side is a cavity’ (Burton 9V, taken from Jeffreys 2010:75)

Lane (1825) writes ‘Started at sunrise from before the village of Sheykh Atma’n, and soon afterwards made fast the boat to the western bank, towards the southern extremity of the site of Memphis. Landed and walked to the village of Bedreshey’n. To the west of this is the village of Meet Rahee’nih. Instead of proceeding straight to this village I went rather to the left of it to see a colossal figure which has lately been uncovered. I found it in the place it had been described to me, in a grove of palm trees. It is a hard white stone marble. The face is very beautiful, and quite perfect, as far as I could see; but the back is much decayed. The feet and part of the legs broken off. Close by it, in the same hollow, is a smaller statue of red granite almost entirely buried. A little further us another statue of red granite lying on its side in the place where it was discovered under the ground. It is apparently the figure of a youth; but of colossal proportions’ (Lane Diary 35, taken from Jeffreys 2010:77).

Joseph Hekekyan’s first full-scale excavation at Memphis was at the site of the colossus (in 1852). In 1852-54 Hekekyan excavated and recorded around the colossus, including plans and sections of the pedestal it originally stood on, and the subsequent surrounding pavements (figures 38-41). These pavements show a rise around the statue. The pavements were also drawn/painted by William Prinsep in 1842 and by the Lepsius Expedition in 1843. Hekekyan saw 2 courses of the pedestal (there had originally been at least one more). The surviving top course had been removed when the statue was turned over and raised up.

Joseph Hekekyan’s work, by analysis of his ‘papers’, has been a subject of study by David Jeffreys. ‘By 1852 Hekekyan had already more than doubled the area of Caviglia’s original clearance. The statue lay roughly E-W with the head to the west, and before long the remains of the pedestal were revealed beneath the legs to the SE, the statue having fallen face down to the west, across the line of the southern
approach road to the (presumed) south pylon. No trace of the feet and base of the statue has ever been recorded, and it is quite possible that they were removed in antiquity along with the pedestal casing and most of the surrounding pavement, these being all of a convenient rectangular shape and of limestone, which was desirable as a building material and for slaking lime. As preserved, the pedestal comprised two incomplete courses of limestone blocks, laid on a "bed of fine argillaceous sand from the desert" (Jeffreys 2010:110).

There are a number of ‘views’ of the statue in its original position (figures 42-43).
Figure 38 Drawing of the colossus 'virtually' restored on pedestal by Hekekyan (37458.38-9) modified by Jeffreys (2010 figure 14).
Figure 39 Painting of fallen colossus. Hekekyan MS 37458.31 (from Jeffreys 2010:figure 15)

Figure 40 Plan of colossus’ pedestal, Hekekyan MS 37453.47. Modified by Jeffreys (2010: figure 16)
Figure 41 View (Hekakyan) of pedestal and fallen colossi, modified by Jeffreys (2010: fig 17)

Figure 42 Photograph of colossus in original position taken between 1821-1852. Photograph taken from Facebook. Posted on Mit Rahina – Ancient Memphis (facebook group, November 2, 2015)
Bagnold and the raising of the colossus

The colossus was raised, turned onto its back, and housed in a shelter with viewing platform by A H Bagnold of the Royal Engineers in 1887. An excellent account of the whole process is provided by Bagnold (1888).

The colossus had been given to the British by Mohammed Ali (Baedeker, Lower Egypt: 361). However due to the cost it was never transported to Britain. Consequently, ‘for fully sixty years tourists have seen only a weathered portion of the back emerging from a pool of water’ (Bagnold 1888:453). Several attempts had been made to raise the colossus prior to Bagnold – by Mr Garwood (Locomotive superintendent of the Egyptian Railways) and by a Mr Anderson (Bagnold 1888:453).
In 1887 The Graphic Newspaper (a weekly British newspaper) published a sketch of the colossus (figure 44), showing it how it could be seen face down in a pool of water during the inundation, and the resulting letterpress then ‘taunted the British army with inaction in the matter, and our gallant General [Sir F. Stephenson] informed his Commanding Royal Engineer that wished the statue raised’ (Bagnold 1888:454)

Figure 44  The sketch of the colossus, face down in a pool of water, as it was published in The Graphic Newspaper. Sketch by Mr H Wallis (Bagnold 1888).
First the water was pumped (day and night), to reveal the hole – 'this hole, the excavation made by the original discoverer was 100 feet long by sixty feet wide at the top; the statue measured thirty-eight feet six inches in length and twenty-seven feet in girth, and its head was considerably lower than its legs. The centre of the back, showing the faint remains of hieroglyphics on a large scale, was six feet nine inches below the average inundation level, the statue being seven feet six inches thick at this point.

Bagnold arrived by steamer – to Bedrasheiin, bringing – 200 fir blocks (12''x12''x12'6''); 300 railways sleepers; 2 20-ft. baulks; 4 8-ft baulks; a chain pump with horse gear; two 30-ton hydraulic jacks, four 40-ton hydraulic jacks (lent by the Governor of Malta), two 100-ton hydraulic jacks (lent by the railway administration of Egypt); 12 double-headed iron rails; and other tools and appliances (Bagnold 1888:454). All the equipment used by Bagnold is listed on pages 462 and 463 (1888).

Between the 4th February and the 16th April, using sleepers, timber platforms, and jacks the colossus was raised 17 feet. As the colossus was being lifted, the voids were filled with broken up pot sherds (500 cubic yards of this material; figure 45). Bagnold records 'the number of native workmen varied from 10 to 30 according to requirements, exclusive of a small army of village boys which was employed collecting broken potsherds from the ruins of Memphis hard by' (1888:454).

The colossus was then turned on its back using jacks (figure 46 and 47). 'Subsequently, two very large stones which had formed part of the ancient pedestal were placed under the statue, as shown in the plate; these stones were themselves bedded in cement concrete, the statue itself being bedded in concrete upon the stones (Bagnold 1888:457).

An enclosure wall was then built around the colossus, of mudbrick (figure 48-50). At the eastern end of this structure a two-roomed house was constructed to be used by a ghaffir. Doors and locks were inserted as was a viewing gallery (accessed by wooden steps), above and across the end of the beard. A galvanized corrugated iron roof was then fixed over the head and breast. A charge of 2 Egyptian piastres for visitors was then levied on visitors.
Figure 45  Sketch by H. Wallis showing the raising of the colossus (Bagnold 1888: 448-450)

Figure 46  Photograph of the colossus as it was being turned over. 1888? Photograph by J P Sebah. Accessed from Griffith Institute (www.griffith.ox.ac.uk), accessed 10th February 2016. Egyptian Mirage Collection, number gi00380a.
Figure 47 Photograph of colossus – after lifting and turning. 1888? Accessed from Mit Rahina – Ancient Memphis (facebook group, posted April 27 2015)
Figure 48 The structure that Bagnold created in 1887 to house the colossus (Bagnold 1888: 458-459)

The viewing platform was replaced in 1902 and then again in 1958 (Jeffreys).
Figure 49  Colossus MO85 within its shelter, 1920-1933 (note, the viewing platform has been replaced since Bagnold’s construction). Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Matson Photograph collection. Photo id. 289122
Figure 50 Photograph dated 1891 showing visitors outside the original shelter. Accessed from Mit Rahina – Ancient Memphis (facebook group, posted May 21 2015)
The Ramesses Station Colossus.

The limestone colossus (MO 85) and the alabaster sphinx (MO 14) are currently the two major attractions for tourists visiting Mit Rahina. Although the existence (and provenance) of the limestone colossus is relatively well known to visitors (although perhaps not..), the red granite Ramesses II colossus that prior to its recent move to the GEM stood in front of Cairo’s Ramesses Station, is far better known – particularly to those living in Cairo. What is less commonly known is that the red granite colossus is from Memphis, probably associated with the east gate of the Ptah Temple, in the same way that colossus (MO 85) likely stood in front of the south gate. An account of the Ramesses Station colossus is included here as a potentially useful narrative that could be used to engage visitors to Memphis (and colossus MO 85) and to engage the Mit Rahina community.

A Pathé News clip from 1955 posted on You Tube (www.youtube.com/watch?tv=Yt5KN1nDDAM - accessed 8th February 2016) entitled ‘6,000 Year Old Statue Moved’ shows the colossus being moved from Mit Rahina to Ramases Station. The news reader reads ‘angry crowds follow the trailer….protesting at the move. The statue they claim, used to bring thousands of sightseers to Mit Rahina and thus increase their trade’. The reader also states that ‘2 bridges en route had to be strengthened to take the weight’ of the statue and trailer (figures 51-53).
Figure 51 A still from the Pathé News clip showing the statue being lifted up and placed onto the transport at Mit Rahina

Figure 52 A still from the Pathé News clip showing ‘angry crowds’ at Mit Rahina protesting the move.
The colossus remained in front of Ramesses Station for 51 years. After various studies showed that the statue was suffering from traffic vibration and pollution the statue was moved, on the 25th August 2006 to Giza, to stand in front of the Grand Egyptian Museum (under construction). For his latest journey, the statue was moved, standing up, within a steel cage. The journey (convoy) began at 1am 'tens of thousands of people lined the streets for the event, which was broadcast live on Egyptian television'. The journey took 10 hours, to move it 2 km (figures 54-62). Authorities had previously rehearsed the journey, using a replica (www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in-pictures/5286288.stm - accessed 8th February 2016).

See also new archive (AP News) – www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yt5KN1nDDAM for engineers discussing the transportation.
Figure 54 The Colossus in front of Ramesses Station (after 1955). Postcard being sold on www.delcampe.net

Figure 55 Photograph of the Colossus in front of Ramesses Station in 1979. Photograph by Ullstein Bild. Getty Images. Accessed 8th February 2016
Figure 56. Photograph of the Colossus in front of Ramesses Station in 1987. Photograph by Gerrigye Engelen. Downloaded from Flikr 8th February 2016.

Figure 57. The colossus in front of Ramesses II Station prior to move in 2006 (www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in-pictures/5286288.stm)
Figure 58 The colossus being moved in 2006. (www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in-pictures/5286288.stm)

Figure 59 The colossus being moved in 2006. (www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in-pictures/5286288.stm)
Figure 60 The colossus being moved in 2006. ([www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in-pictures/5286288.stm](http://www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in-pictures/5286288.stm))

Figure 61 The colossus being moved in 2006. ([www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in-pictures/5286288.stm](http://www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in-pictures/5286288.stm))
Figure 62 The colossus being moved in 2006. (www.news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/in-pictures/5286288.stm)
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1 Introduction

The Ramesses Temple is currently not open to visitors. The temple area comprises a pillared hall, three chapels, a columned portico and pylon (figures 1 and 2). These sit at the base of a large excavation trench, excavated in 1942 and in 1955 and 1956 to expose the temple.

Ahmed Badawi (Antiquities Service) discovered the temple in 1942 during his excavation of the 22nd Dynasty tombs (RABII) to the west (figure 1). By the end of this excavation Badawi had cleared the interior and exposed the façade of the pillared sanctuary and chapels of the temple (Anthes 1959). High ground-water levels led to a ditch being cut in 1948, running east to connect with a larger ditch to the east. This operation turned out to be not much use in reducing the level of water. However, during this work the walls of the Seti (FAD) chapel were exposed. In 1950, whilst Labachi worked on the Seti I Chapel, he exposed parts of the northern side of the Ramesses II temple’s pylon (as well as the north face of the Ptah temple enclosure wall; Labachi in Anthes 1959:4-5).

In 1955 and 1956 the Temple was exposed and the area surrounding it, by a collaborative mission comprising the University of Pennsylvania and the Antiquities Service (Anthes 1959:1). During the 1955 season excavation took place in four separate locations. 1) Area A – an area to the southeast of the Sanctuary; 2) Area B – a trench excavated against the external western face of the Ptah Temple; 3) Area C – a trench cut across the Ptah Temple Enclosure wall; 4) Area E – a trench encompassing the eastern Gate to the Ramesses II temple (figure 3). In 1956 excavation took place in 7 separate locations: Area A (a trench excavated adjoining the previous years ‘A’ excavation – to the south of the Sanctuary – NB, below we refer to A (1955) and A (1956) to differentiate the two areas); Area D West (a trench excavated across the Court, adjoining ‘A’ from the previous season and the large Ptah Temple mudbrick wall. The eastern section of this trench (across the Court) was planned; and elsewhere. The excavations appear to have followed a ‘level’ methodology, where the archaeological features were removed in levels (or general phases?), with each level then mapped.
AERA’s work at the Ramesses II temple formed part of the MSCD Project’s on-site work program – to clean and record the site in advance of opening a Memphis Walking Circuit. Work at the temple began on 4th April 2016 and continued through to 13th May 2016. A team of 30 workmen cleared the site of vegetation (figure 1). A team of archaeologists recorded the visible and existing archaeological features (photography, written records, survey, 3-D modeling). Apart from the onsite component, research was also conducted on the excavation history of the temple and area around. The methodology and data collected from these activities are presented below.

2 Methodology

2.1 Cleaning
The site was covered in dense and extremely high vegetation, so much so that barely any of the temple was visible. A team of 30 workmen removed the vegetation over the course of 35 days as well as soil containing modern debris that had accumulated since the excavations in the 1950s. Within the sanctuary we cleaned off c.20cm of soil, with modern debris. Similarly, around the pylon we cleaned material that had slumped down on to it, slumped from the surrounding sections. This slumping had occurred after the excavations of the 1950s. And in the area between the temple and the southern wall of the Ptah Temple enclosure wall, we cleaned off c.50cm of slumped material that had slumped from the enclosure wall on to the foundations of the northern wall of the temple. Again, this material had accumulated since the 1950s excavations.

The team did not clean the walls of the temple or the walls of the pylon. These walls are extremely degraded, so much so that any brushing would result in pieces of the walls flaking off. For the fallen blocks (scattered within and outside of the temple), these appeared to be far more robust and we consequently able to clean these using brushes.

2.2 Site Survey and Recording
The detailed Anthes plans of the temple were georeferenced by surveying corners of the monument in UTM, enabling the GIS specialist to digitize the published Anthes plans. Since only the standing architectural parts of the temple had previously been planned
(both by Anthes and SoM) we then needed to survey all other elements (fallen blocks etc.). This was done by taking previous plans of the sites (Anthes and SoM I) and sketching the locations of additional elements (fallen blocks and features etc..) and numbering them. These elements were then surveyed using their appropriate numbers. In tandem, each element was recorded using bespoke record sheets, recording ‘type’, ‘description’, ‘condition’, ‘inscription y/n’ etc. These record sheets were then imported into the GIS to enable the data to be queried and viewed. In addition, all inscribed pieces were individually photographed (figure 4).

Further survey of the site includes all previous excavation limits, all modern structures (buildings, electricity posts etc), trees, and the full extent of the area that we cleared.

2.3 3-D Models
Although the Survey of Memphis conducted a full epigraphic study of the monument in 1982 (Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1984), this data has not yet been published. Unable to conduct an epigraphic study ourselves (due to absence of appropriate time, resources and expertise) we decided to trial 3-D recording of the monument using Photo Scan Pro, which also serves as part of the conservation baseline data. We produced 4 models – one of the temple sanctuary, one of the pylon, and two of the north-facing sections created by Anthes’s excavations.
Figure 1. Location of RABI and the other sites on the MSCD circuit. Also shows recorded/laid paths as of end of December 2017.
Figure 2. The elements of the Temple of Ramses II – Chapels, Pillared Hall, Columned Portico, Pylon, Southern Enclosure Wall. All elements, apart from the Southern Enclosure Wall (which we did not expose), were cleaned and recorded by AERA. Note, that although the Great Ptah Temple Enclosure wall is shown here, this belongs to a much later phase – built after the temple had gone out of use. Map prepared by GIS specialist.
Figure 3. Figure showing the 1955 and 1956 excavation areas (Anthes 1965:plate 1)
Figure 4. Screen capture showing the survey and recorded data integrated in the GIS. Each element (wall, column, fallen block etc) has a number, the element is surveyed (so geo-referenced), and the information recorded for each element integrated into the geo-database. Map prepared by GIS specialist. Showing the record sheet in GIS, with the elements numbered.
3 The Site

The site is located south of Saqqara-Bedreshein Road, southwest of the Seti I chapel and covers an area 5298m². The site is bounded to the north by the Saqqara-Bedrashein Road, to the northeast by the Seti I Chapel site (RAD), the west by the Tombs of the Priests site (RABI) and to the south and east by 5m high excavation sections (figures 5a and 5). The site itself is complex, with a number of elements visible, including parts of the Ramesses II temple (chapels, pillared hall, portico, pylon) at the base of a 5m deep excavation trench, the southwest corner of the Ptolemaic Ptah Temple enclosure wall there are four 21st dynasty cist burials, 5m high sections showing the remains of settlement that had covered the temple, mudbrick structures relating to settlement later than the temple between the pylon and portico, and a series of deep excavation trenches.

Because the site sits so low the only access points are located to the northeast and north. A gaffir's hut is located to the north of the temple, on an area of high ground, and comprises an enclosed building and patio. Because of its positioning, the hut (the gaffir) services the temple (RABI), the Tombs of the Priests (RABII), Seti I Chapel (RAD) and the Apis House (FAG). A north-south trodden pathway leads from the gaffir’s hut to an opening in a fence that separates the Saqqara-Bedrashein Road and the Antiquities Area to the south. A further modern building – an open shelter – lies to the north-west of the site, which may have been used as a police look-out point. This structure is no longer used.

The topography of the site reflects the excavations of the 1940s (Badawi) and the 1950s (Anthes) (figure 6). The 1940s east-west drainage channel can also still be seen within the topography of the site.

In the following section the existing and, to some extent, visible features, are described first, including: the temple; the 21st dynasty tombs; the kiln strata; and the Ptolemaic Ptah Temple enclosure wall. This is then followed by a description of excavated features – namely the settlement sequence excavated by Anthes.
Figure 5a Plan showing location of sites (HABI, HABII, FAG, HAD), archaeological remains and modern features. NB. the paths shown were laid by the MSCD project in 2016. See figure 5 for close up of RABI showing historical limits of excavation. Map prepared by GIS specialist.
Figure 5. Plan showing all architectural remains within area RABI (both existing and excavated). The Anthes limits of excavation are also shown – these limits correspond to the existing topography (see figure 6). Anthes area codes are also marked. Map prepared by GIS specialist.
Figure 6. showing the topography of RABI in 2016, representing 1940s and 1950s excavation trenches. East-facing. Photograph 201263
4 The Temple

The temple comprises the Pylon, the Court, and the Sanctuary (chapels, pillared hall and the columned portico). The southern limit of the temple is formed by a substantial east-west mudbrick wall; the western limit is unknown, and the northern limit is presumed to exist beneath the southern wall of the Ptolemaic Ptah Temple enclosure wall.

4.1 The Pylon

The pylon survives 16.50m by 4.25m, the southern portion of the northern pylon survives 3.70m high (figures 7-8). Although the northern pylon is better preserved than the southern, the northern extent of the northern pylon has been cut away and damaged by the construction of the southern enclosure wall of the Great Ptah temple (Ptolemaic). Jeffreys's isometric drawing (figure 9) shows this clearly and extrapolates its original northern extent.

The pylon consists of limestone slabs forming the faces of the structure, and a mudbrick core. The southern end of the southern pylon has two torus moldings on its corners. The south-western molding is unfinished (Anthes 1957: 19). The original structure then appears to have been added to, as can be seen from the northern pylon, where additional limestone architecture has been added to the original south face. The east and west faces have a batter – 16cm per meter. The northern face of the southern pylon also had additional limestone architecture added, as evidence by grooves in the foundation stones (see figure 10), but this addition had been removed in antiquity, down to foundation level (at 96.17m). Prior to the addition the doorway was c.7m wide. After the addition, the doorway would have been 3.54m wide. Within the doorway there is an offset in the masonry on the south face of the northern tower, next to this offset (1.60m above the floor level), there is a square hole in the masonry.

Both Jacquet (in Anthes 1956) and Jeffreys saw and recorded the mudbrick core filling the southern pylon. This was not seen by AERA in 2016 since we deliberately avoided exposing mudbrick components unnecessarily for conservation reasons. And Jacquet produced an extremely detailed plan of the pylon (figure 11).
Figure 7. The pylon as seen in 2016, after removal of vegetation and garbage. North facing. Photograph by Field Director. Photo 102683.
Figure 8. The pylon as it looked in 1956. Facing north (Anthes 1957, figure 2).
Figure 9. Isometric drawing of the pylon (Jeffreys 1985: figure 36).
Figure 10. showing the doorway of the pylon in 2016, facing east. Note the grooves in the foundation stones on the right, indicating where the north face of the southern gate would have been located. Also note the foundation stone and threshold stones in the doorway. Photograph by project surveyor. Photograph 302198.
Figure 11. The pylon as it was recorded in 1956 (Anthes 1965: figure 6)
Figure 12. Figure of the Pylon, with elements numbered, including scattered blocks in the vicinity, with inscribed pieces indicated. Map prepared by GIS specialist.
An east-west mudbrick wall, 4m wide, abuts the torus moulding on the corners of the south face of the pylon (figure 12). This wall was clearly exposed by Anthes in 1956 and formed the southern limit of the temple precinct. Again, in 2016 because we purposefully avoided exposing mudbrick architecture that had previously been recorded, we did not fully expose this feature. As Jeffreys notes, this precinct enclosure wall would normally have abutted the west face of the pylon, not the torus moldings of the south face – as if the pylon had originally been intended for a smaller, or narrower enclosure wall (Jeffreys 1985:72).

Other, additional, peculiarities are that the pylon is not parallel with the façade of the Sanctuary (but forms a 3 degree 30 with it (Jacquet 1965:52-54), and the doorway is not on exactly the same alignment as the doorway through to the Sanctuary, but differs by 6 degrees. Jeffreys writes ‘the temple evidently underwent radical change during the planning stages: this is most clearly seen in the “wrong” alignments of the sanctuary and pylon, in the disproportionate length of the court, and in the later limestone infills which were made against the inner jambs of the pylon and halved the width of the entrance’ (Jeffreys 1985:72). And that ‘it is noteworthy that only the sanctuary follows the same alignment as the Hellenistic enclosure-wall of the greater Ptah temple (and the original Ramesside one?); the alignment of the pylon, by contrast, is closer to that of the west enclosure-wall and the front line of the west gate (BAA)’ (Jeffreys 1985:72).

At the start of the 1955 by Anthes, only the northern part of the East Gate was visible, clearly destroyed by the construction of the southern Ptah Temple enclosure wall. At this time the southern part of the pylon was covered with 5m of stratigraphy (Area E), which was then excavated in 1956. The results of the excavation of this 5m stratigraphic sequence were not published by Anthes. Jacquet notes that the interior of the pylon must have been used as a habitation at some point (Jacquet 1956:54).

Inscriptions in low relief are preserved on the east, south and west faces of the northern pylon. A description of each is provided below – with the description and translation taken from Habachi (1965).

East face: On the projecting part of the eastern face, which formed the facade of the portal, the lower part of the figure of the king faces Ptah in a kiosk. Between the two there is a vertical line that reads "... to his father, he made (the ceremony of) given· life"
(see E1 on figure 13-17). A part of one of the upper registers was found on scattered blocks. Below the figure of the king there is a horizontal line which gave the name of the portal (E 2). To the north of this there is a horizontal line of inscription in large signs giving the beginning of the titulary of the king as follows: "[May live] the Horus, the strong bull beloved of Maat, master of sed-festivals is [like his father Ptah] (E 3). ‘This Horus-name of the king should have been followed by his other four names, or at least his two cartouches, then most probably by a dedicatory inscription showing how he made a temple to his father Ptah’ (Habachi 1965:61). Above there are parts of a scene preserved, showing a goddess facing right, with the king (of whom only his cartouche, followed by ‘given life’ is preserved (E 4). The scene to her left shows the god Heh holding in each hand a palm branch ending with the tadpole and the sign of eternity; above the god is the name of the king, then perhaps his Ka seizing in one hand the w3 sceptre.

South Side: On the eastern projecting part of the southern face only the lower part remains. Here, there is a vertical line of inscription " •• • Ramessu-meramun, beloved of Ptah, Lord of Truth" (S 1 in figure 13, 18). To the west of this there is a scene showing the king offering the figure of Maat to Ptah, who stands in his kiosk. This action is described in the words reading: "Giving Maat to the Lord of Maat, given life" (S 2). Under this inscription is a table laden with different kinds of offerings. Underneath there is a bouquet of flowers on each side. Behind the king is a vertical line " ... king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Usermare-setepenre, Son of Re, Master of Diadems, Ramessu-meramun, beloved of Ptah, the great one, who is south of his Wall [given life]" (S 3). Underneath is a horizontal line running as follows: "May live the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands Usermare-setepenre, Son of Re, Lord of Diadems, Ramessu-meramun, son of Ptah-Tatenen..." (S 4). Above the king there is the sun-disk from which hangs on each side the uraeus with the sign of life. Then the names of the king "[The King of Upper and Lower Egypt] Lord of the Two Lands Usermare-setepenre, [Son of Re, Master of] Diadems, Ramessu-meramun" (S5). Opposite is the speech of the god consisting of two vertical lines reading: "(1) [Utterance:] I give to thee the kingship of Horus ... (2) [Utterance:] I give to thee the period of Re in...(3)..."(S5 left; see, however, Fischer's interpretation of this inscription on account of the sign preserved at the end of the first line, in the " Additional Notes on Fig.
Inside the kiosk and above the god is a horizontal line reading "Beloved of Ptah-of-Ramessu-meramun" (S 6). This could only be taken as referring to the king, while one expects to have just the name of the god, but perhaps it was intended to show how the king was so closely related to that form of Ptah, usually adored in the Delta Residence’ (Habachi 1965:63).

West Side: On the western side, we have two registers, the upper one of which has the lower part of a king before a god. The god promises the king "... provision and food " (W 1 right in figure 13, 19), while the king was undoubtedly officiating before the god as it is said in front of the former "... (to) his father, he makes (the ceremony of) given· life" (W 1 left). In the lower register the king offers to the god Ptah. Above the king is the sun-disk from each side of which hangs a uraeus with the sign of life. In two lines in front are his names reading: " Lord of the Two Lands, Usermare- setepenre " and " Son of Re, Master of Diadems Ramessu -meramun " (W 2). Ptah is here qualified as " Beautiful of face who is upon the Great Seat" (W 3). The king opposite offers in his right hand a libation vase and in his left the incense vase. In front of him is an inscription which describes his action as it says, " Making incense and libation to his father, he makes (the ceremony of) given - life " (W4).

'Underneath is a horizontal line, which is important as it gives us the name of the portal or pylon. This reads, " The Door (called) Great is Ramessu-meramun Embellishing the House of Ptah Like Re" (W5). It is known that temples, statues, and portals were usually given names and here we are lucky to find the name of the entrance to the temple’ (Habachi 1965:63). Anthes and Fischer however, translate this differently, as ‘The great gate (called) Ramessu-Miamun (-is-the-one)-who makes-the-House-of-Ptah-efficient-like-Re’ and suggests that the pylon and not the door is named and the ‘House of Ptah’ refers to the Great Ptah Temple and not RABI (Anthes 1965:5).

Anthes notes that the direction of Ptah and the King in the representation on the west face of the pylon is at odds with their representations elsewhere in the temple. Here on the west face the king comes from the north – from within the court, and Ptah turns his back on the middle axis (Anthes 1965:5). For this reason Anthes wonders 'if this means that the court belonged to a dwelling place of the king as well as the God’s sanctuary’ (Anthes 1965:5).
Figure 13. Inscriptions on the northern pylon (Habachi 1965: figure 4)
Figure 14. The east face of the pylon. West facing. Photograph by project surveyor. Photograph 302224

Figure 15. The east face of the pylon. West facing. Photo field school graduate Photograph 302303
Figure 16. The east face of the pylon. West facing. Photograph by field school graduate. Photograph 302305

Figure 17. The east face of the pylon. West facing. Photograph by field school graduate. Photograph 302306
Figure 18. The south face of the pylon. North facing. Photograph by project surveyor. Photograph 302224

Figure 19. The west face of the pylon. East facing. Photograph by project surveyor. Photograph 302197
The Court

The area between the pylon and the portico of the Sanctuary is considered to be the court. The area of the court is 34m by 15.50m and bounded to the south by a mudbrick wall that abuts the south face of the pylon. During the 1955 and 1956 excavations the height of the water level meant that the floor of the court could not be reached. However, some trial trenches were excavated, in these, no surviving court pavement was found (Jacquet, in Anthes 1965:5). The level of the floor however is indicated by the slabs next to the western face of the southern tower (pylon; at 95.84m), in one spot next to the western face of the northern tower (pylon) and at one spot on the eastern face of the basement supporting the colonnade in front of the Sanctuary (at 95.50m). These levels, according to Jacquet, suggest that the pavement slanted inward toward the longitudinal axis and in the direction of the Sanctuary (Jacquet, 1965:55).

The court currently contains stratigraphic sequences that post-date the use of the temple (at the eastern end; referred to as Area D (east) by Anthes; figure 20), and a lower, excavated area (at the western end; referred to as Area D (west) by Anthes). At the base of this area (Area D - west) Anthes’ excavations reached a phase of occupation comprising kilns and other mudbrick architecture. This is discussed below.

During the 1956 excavation, Anthes excavated an east-west trench adjacent to the southern mudbrick wall of the court (within the court), checking if there were structural divisions within the court. None were found (Jacquet, 1965:55)
The court as it appeared after cleaning in 2016. The upstanding area corresponds to Area D (east), the lower area as Area D (West). Northwest facing. Photograph 201254.

The Sanctuary

The sanctuary is constructed entirely of limestone and comprises the following elements: the Portico; the Pillared Hall; the Chapels.

- The Portico

The Portico stands on a raised terrace, 66cm higher than the floor of the Court, between the Court and the Pillared Hall. The Portico would have been supported by 4 columns, of which only three column bases are visible (Figures 21 -23). Part of what is presumably the 4th is out of alignment and may not be in situ. Part of the column (shaft) of the second column from the south, remains, and is decorated with the leaf motif (figure 22), characteristic of the papyrus column (4 leaves partly covering 4 other leaves). The column survives 90cm high, its east and south faces are damaged. The terrace paving-stones have not survived, except for RAB 289 (the paving next to column base RAB 290).
Figure 21. Plan showing the Portico, with scattered blocks, inscribed blocks indicated and numbered. Map prepared by GIS specialist.
Figure 22 West face of portico and sanctuary, showing the column bases and the design on column RAB 292 (Anthes 1965:plate 3)
A staircase or ramp would have connected the Court to the Portico with a width of 4.85m (Jacquet, 1965:56; figure 21).

In 2016 AERA recorded a number of non in-situ limestone blocks scattered within the portico and just in front of the portico. Some of these elements may have fallen from the Pillared Hall façade and portico, been placed after the temple went out of its primary use, placed there by Anthes’s team during their excavations, or placed there subsequently. A photograph of each inscribed piece is included here:
Figure 24 Inscribed limestone block RAB236. North facing. Photo 301738

Figure 25 Inscribed limestone block RAB235. Showing the king and a goddess in two separate scenes. West facing Photo 301717
Figure 26 Inscribed limestone block RAB234. Showing the king and a goddess in two separate scenes. North facing Photo 302294

Figure 27 Part of a limestone column RAB233. North facing. Photo 301723
Figure 28 inscribed limestone piece RAB 248. North facing. Photo 301726.

Figure 29 Inscribed limestone piece RAB 229. East facing. Photo 301733.
The Pillared Hall

The Hall is 8.75m (long) by 9.90m (wide), supported by 4 pillars – one of which is no longer present (figures 30-32). At the eastern end of the Hall there is doorway, 2.80m wide, and at the western end of the Hall there are 3 doorways that lead into 3 chapels (see below). The walls of the Hall are at different levels of preservation. The eastern wall (the façade) is relatively well preserved, up to 7 courses high, and its foundation is only partially exposed/visible in 2016. The south face of the northern wall is preserved up to 5 courses high, but the northern face of this wall has been destroyed/removed almost down to foundation level by the construction of the southern wall of the Great Ptah Temple (Ptolemaic) – its construction cut, having clearly cut through the northern wall of the Pillared Hall. The north face of the southern wall is preserved up to 5 course high, but the south face is preserved c. 2 courses high, and is abutted by the architecture of a later tomb (Tombs Y and, see below). The southern edge of the wall may originally have had a connecting wall, to the mudbrick, southern wall of the precinct, through which there may have been an access, through to a corridor. The same may have been true of the northern side (Jacquet 1965:57).

Figure 30 The Sanctuary (Pillared Hall and Chapels) after cleaning in 2016. South facing.
Figure 31  Showing inside the Pillared Hall, photograph taken in the southwest corner, facing northeast. Photograph 102710
Figure 32 Showing The Pillared Hall with inscribed blocks marked (numbered), walls and pillars numbered. Map prepared by GIS specialist.
The floor of the Hall is also no longer present – but appears to have been lower than 95.86 (probably c, 95.77). There appears to be an in-situ block (RAB 298) in the southwest corner. Jacquet suggest the ceiling of the Hall would have originally been at least 4.60m above the floor (Jacquet 1965: 57). Throughout the floor of the Pillared Hall (excavated base of the Hall) there are non in situ blocks (some inscribed). Some of these appear to have been purposefully placed (by Badawi and later by Anthes) - see for example the east-west line of blocks in the central axis) – so that the 1950s team could access the temple when the ground water was high. A 1955 photograph taken at the beginning of the 1955 excavation season indicates this – showing a) the level of the water and b) that the blocks do not seem to be present (figure 33).

Figure 33 1955 photograph of the Pillared Hall after Anthes’ team had cleaned the area. Note the level of the water within the Hall. Dimick 1956.
Other historical photographs of the Pillared Hall include Badawi’s published photograph of the temple after work in 1942 (figure 34), and a photograph by Dimick showing what the site looked like in 1955 prior to Anthes’s clearing (figure 35).

Figure 34  The Sanctuary after Badawi’s excavations/exposure of the area in 1942 (Badawi 1944)
Figure 35. 1955 photograph of the Pillared Hall before Anthes’s team had cleaned the area (Dimick 1956).

There are three surviving pillars within the Hall, the two northern pillars being the best preserved. A line of text containing the cartouches of Seti II is sculptured around the bases of the pillars. The names of Seti II was also added to spurs of masonry near the entrance to the Hall and to the low ledges of the Central and northern chapels (Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1984: 30).

The doorway into the Pillared Hall is 2.80m wide. The recess on the southern side is rounded and the recess in the north jamb is angular, suggesting that the pivot of the door (single-leafed) was on the southern side. The original sill is at 95.85. This had been destroyed at some point and covered with a later sill, 37cm higher.

In 1982 the Survey of Memphis conducted a study of the temple, including epigraphic work (Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1984). However, the epigraphic work is yet to be published. Below we illustrate the depictions and epigraphy on the temple walls as
photographs, a Survey of Memphis drawing of the eastern façade, and brief descriptions. These can also be viewed in 3-D, as the attached pdf. The scenes fall into 2 thematic categories: on the pillars Ramesses is shown receiving the djed (dd; symbol of stability), was (w3s; symbol of power, and ankh (nh; symbol of life) from Ptah and other deities; in the other scenes Ramesses II is shown offering to the gods (Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1984: 30). In all scenes (apart from the Pylon scene mentioned above) the orientation is consistent – the king facing the interior of the temple.

Two forms of the nomen of Ramesses II are used: R'-ms-sw mry-'lmn and R'-mss mry-'lmn ntr hq3-'lnw. The first is used in the chapels, the Portico and the Pylon (Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1984: 31).

- **Inscriptions in the Hall and on the façade.**

  *Façade RAB 141 and RAB 142 (figures 36-39).*

The limestone blocks of the southern portion of the eastern wall (RAB 141 and RAB 142) vary in size, but are c. 105cm x 45cm x 45cm. The condition of the blocks vary considerably – with some being well preserved and others being severely degraded (possibly depending on the quality of the individual limestone pieces east face of the Sanctuary (the façade). The northern portion of the wall (RAB 138) is far less well preserved.
Figure 36 Survey of Memphis drawing of the east façade wall, RAB 141, 142, 138 (Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1984: 27)
Figure 37  RAB 141 and 142, the eastern façade of the Pillared Hall (southern portion). West-facing. Photograph 201457.

Figure 38  RAB 138, the eastern façade of the Pillared Hall (northern portion). West-facing. Photograph 201455.
Figure 39  South face of RAB 137, Ramesses II holding an Ankh, facing-west. North facing. Photograph 201938

North Face of RAB 143
The north face of RAB 143 is in a poor state of preservation. There are only two scenes currently visible (without cleaning the wall), one at the eastern end of the wall showing Ramesses with his arm outstretched, offering to Ptah (figure 40), and another in the central area of the wall, showing the king offering to the west, with only his body surviving (figure 41)
Figure 40 North face of RAB 143 (eastern end) showing Ramesses with his arm outstretched, offering to Ptah. South Facing. Photograph 201927

Figure 41 North face of RAB 143 (central), showing the king offering to the west, with only his body surviving. South facing. Photograph 201928
West face of RAB 137

Figure 42 West face of doorjamb RAB 137. East facing. Photograph 201937.

South Face of RAB 148
The south face of RAB 148 is not well preserved, and although there are faint signs of scenes and inscriptions these cannot be well made out without cleaning.
There are carved holes within the wall that may have been used to hold flags or as tethering holes, possibly where animals were tethered after the structure no longer functioned as a temple (figure 43).

**Figure 43** The south face of wall RAB 148, showing faint scenes and inscription and the possible tethering holes. North facing. Photograph 201934

*Pillars RAB 160, RAB 161 and RAB 162.*

The northern pillars RAB 161 and RAB 162 are the best preserved in terms of height and scene details. These showing Ptah holding the ankh to Ramesses II (figure 44)
Figure 44 The eastern face of north-east pillar RAB 161, showing Ptah and Ramesses II. West facing. Photograph 201939

- The scattered blocks on the floor of the Hall

Blocks are scattered throughout the Hall (see figure 32). A selection of photographs of some of the more interesting pieces are presented below (figures 45-49)
Figure 45  Scattered block on the floor of the Hall, RAB 65, Photograph by field school graduate, Photograph 302432.

Figure 46  Inscribed block RAB 62, with separate small limestone basin object (RAB 63) on top. East facing. Photograph 301571
Figure 47  Limestone architectural object RAB 106. Photograph 301606

Figure 48  Part of a column RAB 80. Photograph 301582
The Chapels (figure 50)

In the southern chapel, only the doorsill (and socket that would have received the pivot of a single leaf door) and 2 paving stones remain. The rest of the chapel had been destroyed by the construction of a later tomb – Tomb V (see below). The central chapel (the principal chapel) is a little wider than the other 2 side chapels, and has all of its floor surviving. A pedestal, with a ramp is built against the back wall, ‘similar to that on which the god Ptah is represented standing in bas-reliefs’ (Jacquet 1965:57). The side of the pedestal is decorated with a moulding, and a stone bench is built against both sides of the pedestal and to the same height – this runs around the 3 sides of the room (figures 51, 52). Upon this bench offerings or cult objects may have been placed. The bench and pedestal sits on the pavements, and the entrance would have had a double door as evidenced by two door sockets. Jeffreys writes ‘the raised altar in the central chapel of the sanctuary, with its ramp on the east side, strongly resembles the pedestal on which the figure of Ptah is commonly shown standing. The
cavetto around the top, although eroded, is still visible, and four circular recesses were noted in each corner of the upper face of the covering slab. We suggest that the `altar` is in fact a plinth for a lifesize (or larger) standing statue of the deity. Two examples of such statues in sandstone were found at the west gate of the greater Ptah enclosure’ (Jeffreys 1985:73, figure 53).
Figure 50 Figure of chapels, with architecture and inscribed pieces indicated (numbered). Map prepared by GIS specialist.
Figure 51 The central chapel, showing two door sockets either side of the doorway. South facing. Photograph 201394

Figure 52 The pedestals and ramp in the central chapel. North facing. Photograph 201380
The threshold and part of the floor are preserved in the northern, side chapel. A bench also wraps around the walls, but less well preserved (figure 54). The entrance would have had a double-leaf door.
Figure 54 The northern chapel, showing the bench wrapping around the sides. SW facing. Photograph 201412.

- Re-used blocks

Many of the stones used in the Sanctuary are re-used blocks. For example RAB 156, RAB 157, RAB 158 and RAB 159, used in the western wall RAB 155 (figures 55-56). Some have the reliefs of the 18th dynasty – including one with the name of Amenophis III. In addition, other blocks are of an illogical size for their use (so re-used), and some have features (dovetails for example) that were clearly not part of the sanctuary's design.
Figure 55 Re-used block RAB 159. South facing. Photograph 102578

Figure 56 Re-used block RAB 158. NE facing. Photograph 102579
Function

Anthes writes that based on the decoration of the temple the ‘sole purpose was the daily early morning service for the cult figure of the god by the king or his substitute, the priest, with the offering of flowers and incense, unguent, and cloth. However, an additional employment of the sanctuary developed soon, hardly later and perhaps earlier than the death of Ramesses II. Then the sanctuary was used by the people as a depository for votive objects’. (Anthes 1957: 4-5).

- Votive Objects

A number of votive objects, which according to Anthes, proves the Sanctuary to be the place in which the ‘common man’ prayed to Ptah were found inside and in front of the Sanctuary. These include replicas of the wall (cat. nos. 1-3), and the figurines of Thoeris/Tawaret (cat. nos. 5-8). An additional votive object (cat. no. 4) was found in the court (Anthes 1965:4). All of these objects ‘were found virtually on floor level’ (Anthes, Bakry, Simpson 1965:72).

Wall and tower replicas (Cat nos. 1-4):

This group of votive objects, found within/near the sanctuary and in the court (including a basin – Cat. nos 1) were, according to Anthes ‘dedicated in the temple either to express thanksgiving or in support of some prayer’ (Anthes 1957: 5). These objects (particularly the basin – Cat. Nos 1) are well published. See Anthes 1957: 4-8; Anthes 1957: 24-25; Anthes, Bakry, Simpson 1965:72-79; Wall 1958: 161-175; Jacquet 1958: 161-175).

The inscription on a wall model (a basin, Cat no 1) shows that this group (1 and 4) of finds was meant to represent the great enclosure wall of the Great Ptah Temple. The shapes of objects 2 and 3 suggest that they represented towers (where the wall and tower was represented alternatively; Anthes, Bakry, Simpson 1965:72). ‘The fact that a tower was represented alternately with a wall may suggest that the Great Enclosure Wall was furnished with a tower-like gate similar to the High Gate of Medinet Habu’ (Anthes, Bakry, Simpson 1965:72)
- the ‘hearing Ptah’. Ptah as the one who hears prayer and the use of ears to represent this can be further researched in:
  a. the stelae with ears and their inscriptions (which Petrie found in the Great Ptah Temple (West Gate). See Petrie, Memphis I, pp 7-8, plates 10-12.
  b. M. Sanderman Holmerg, 1946 The God Ptah (page 70)
  c. “Ptah who hears prayers (nhwt), from Pap.Sallier vs 1.4-5

- Basin, Cat no. 1 (figure 57, 58):
Libation Basin of Amenemhet, the son of Neb-waoui, Limestone. H. 32 cm. Location: Sanctuary, its uppermost edge on level 95.75. Mit. 655. The exact location was about 1.60 m. to the west of the northern half of the door leading into the pillared hall, within the limits of the space covered by the opening of the door. The basin had fallen.

Rectangular basin with kneeling man behind one of the short sides, peering over the edge. His raised hands rested at the wall of the basin adjoining its edge. Figure almost completely destroyed. Outside of basin represents fortress walls with battered turrets, almost vertical recesses, and battlements. The battlements are also indicated between the hands of the figure. Inscriptions on top of basin, on the recesses of all its walls, and on the base of the figure. Ears in sunk relief on salients. Inscriptions face front of basin, ears face inscriptions and figure of donor on both sides and on the back of basin. Ears and inscriptions on front face; central ear faces right. Inside smooth. Upper parts of inner walls sloping, corroded by water. Lower parts and bottom reworked, slightly widened, and not damaged by water. Bottom slightly sloping to circular opening in center. Bottom outside not finished, with rim of hole tapering toward inside. Object well preserved except the figure in the round of the donor and some breaks at edges. Inscription on top much obliterated by water.

As to the following translation, I may refer to the translation and commentary by H. Wall in her paper quoted below; the few questionable hieroglyphs in lines Band D of the top inscription are presented there in a variant reading, which does not make any difference, however. A-B-D (top): "Htp-dy-nsw. Ptah, who resides to the south of his wall, who hears the prayer of everyone, may he give life, prosperity, health, gaiety on following
one’s(?) Ka(-desire), 8a good funeral after old age on the west of Mn-nfr· Me-phís, for the
Ka of the scribe, Amenemhet, engendered by the s3b-official, the scribe ・・・・・"  A-C-D
(top): " Htp·dy-nsw. Ptah, who resides to the south of his wall, lord of ‘nh-t3wy, who
comes’ immediately (being the one?) who hears the petitions of whoever prays to him, may he give whatever comes forth on his offering table every day, for the
Ka of the scribe, Amenemhet."
A1. "Praise to you in Ht-k3-Pth-Memphis, the noblest of all cities."
A2: "Praise to you at the great enclosure wall (as) this is the seat of hearing
(or, of the one who hears) prayer."
B1: "Praise to you, Ptah, lord of eternity, who makes everyone live by his beauty."
B2: Praise to you, Ptah, when you shine forth in your bark of millions."
B3: “Praise to you. Ptah, who raises the sky, who prepares the portions of gods."
C1: “Praise to you, Ptah, lord of Maat, who hears (as a judge) so that both
(parties) are at peace.”
C2 : "Praise to you, Ptah, he with beautiful face, the god, the beloved one." C3: "
Praise to you, Ptah, he with gracious heart, the noble one, who determines Maat,”
D1 (to the right of figure): "Giving praise on the part of the scribe,
Amenemhet, engendered by the scribe, Nbw-wr.”
D2 (to the left of figure): "Kissing the earth on the part of the scribe,
Amenemhet, of the dockyard.”
Figure 57. The basin (Cat nos 1) as a, b, c, Cat No 4 (as d), from Anthes 1956, plate 25
Figure 58 The basin, Cat no.1, from Anthes 1956, plate 24
Figure 59 Cat. No 2 (a and b), Cat No 3 (c and D) from Anthes 1956, plate 26
Thoeris (Cat. Nos 5-8): These were fragmentary painted limestone figurines of the goddess Thoeris (Taweret) – a pregnant hippopotamus worshiped as domestic protectress (Anthes 1957: 5; figure 60).

Figure 60 Thoeris figurines Cat. Nos. 5-8 (Anthes 1965: plate 27)
Ground water

The high water level within the temple has been noted since its discovery. Anthes reported that the water level was at its lowest in 1955 and 1956 between December and January and in July (Anthes???).

In 1984 Michel Wuttmann also reported on the state of the monument. He writes ‘This sanctuary and the pylon which fronts it have been excavated to the ancient ground level; the walls are no longer encumbered with baulks of humid soil. At its lowest level the water-table laps the bases of the pillars; at its highest it reaches a third of the height of their lowest course of masonry. If we take the north-west pillar of the court as an example, the surfaces of the blocks of the first course and the lowest third of those of the second appear to be the zones where salts are being actively deposited, as is evident from the fine, diffused, and continuous which coating. The upper part of the second course is well preserved. The third course, and, To a lesser degree, the lower part of the fourth are an old zone of crystallization; the surface, encrusted in salt, has fallen away piecemeal, leaving a pulverized mass mixed with crystals of salt. Above, the salts disappear, the surface in intact, but the stone is fissured in many places, mainly vertically. This sequence is typical for the walls and pillars of the sanctuary. Certain blocks are too fragile to be moved without suffering damage. The first step in conservation should be the cleansing of these blocks of salt and pulverized stone, and their consolidation. The fissured and broken blocks of the upper courses should simply be collected and rejoined. As it seems impossible to eliminate the cause of the crystallization by lowering the water-table (such a measure would require the excavation of a drain lowering the water-table by more than 3m, which appears impracticable), the only satisfactory solution consists in taking down the monument and re-erecting it at the level of the unexcavated surface of the surrounding mound on newly prepared foundations, systematically replacing the restored blocks in their places one by one’ (Quoted in Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1982:31-32).
The Enclosure walls of the temple.

The southern enclosure wall clearly abuts the pylon. This southern, mudbrick wall (c. 4m wide) is persevered to 1m height above the sill in the Sanctuary’s doorway. Due to the height of the water level, the base of the southern enclosure wall was not reached in 1955 and 1956. In an attempt to locate the western enclosure wall, a trial trench was excavated to the west of the Sanctuary. Here, no trace of the wall was found (either – the wall is further west, the wall has been entirely demolished, or a western wall was never built).

To locate the northern wall, the trench in Area B (excavated in 1955) was re-examined. However, no trace of the wall was found.

5 Tombs and Settlement

AREAS A, D and E

Jacquet published a set of plans – some in 1959 and some in 1965. These show a set of features (mainly architecture) by level– organized into ‘levels/broad phases’ 1 through to 4 but by Area (so for example A1, A2, D2 etc..). We have digitized these features into ArcGIS and show them here in the level/broad phases that Jacquet originally suggested (see figure…). Plan from Area D (east) do not appear in the publications, Jacquet writes ‘We shall examine, this year, only the results obtained in the western part of Sector D, that facing the Sanctuary, since we did not excavate the eastern section completely’ (1965:46).

The excavations in this area display deep and complex stratigraphic sequences, which could not be properly understood using the methodology employed during the 1955 and 1956 excavations. Subsequent evolutions in excavation and recording methodology (see MoLAS), namely single context recording, would have enabled the sequence to have been more accurately understood. Indeed, where single context excavation has been used in Memphis excavations (EES and AERA), the complexity of developmental sequences (particularly within settlement contexts) is extreme and often nuanced - with structures demolished down to foundation levels and subsequent structures then built on
It is clear that in 1955 and 1956 the excavators and interpreters struggled with the sequences, producing plans by ‘level’, with attempts to show the sequence by broad phase.

Although the detailed developmental sequence may not have been recorded, Jacquet does discuss the broad phasing of the area:

Jacquet on phasing (1965:58-59) -

‘At the end of this season, we can make an attempt to trace the chronology of our site somewhat as follows:

1) Construction of the Temple in the time of Ramesses II, 250 m. to the south of what is now known as the West Hall of Ptah. The Temple, which opened toward the east, comprised a large court and a sanctuary with a portico in front. On the east it was bounded by a pylon and on its other three sides by a brick wall, the 4m.-wall, of which, however, only the southern section has been identified.

2) Utilization of the Temple, as such, at least until the time of Sety II, as is proved by the inscriptions.

3) Building of tombs around the Sanctuary at about the 21st Dynasty.

4) Development of dwelling places south of the Temple complex. Destruction of the 4m.-wall and installation of craftsmen’s quarters in the Sanctuary court.

5) Filling up of the Sanctuary court with debris coming from the habitations to the north and south of it.

6) Progressive elevation of the terrain to the south of the Sanctuary, and filling up of the ruins of the latter with various constructions. Leveling of the area above the court and construction of buildings on this surface.

7) Construction, perhaps in the Graeco-Roman Period, of the Enclosure Wall of Ptah which redrew the limits of the temenos and brought about the destruction of the north (and north face of north chapel/sanctuary, wall down to foundation level) side of the Pylon as well as the complete disappearance of that part of the 4m.wall which closed the north side of the Temple complex.
Later Anthes writes that two direct dates were established within the excavated stratum – 21\textsuperscript{st}/22\textsuperscript{nd} dynasty stratum and Ptolemaic/Roman stratum. Between these two ‘periods’ there is a period of c. 500 year of non-use – where ‘strata’ are separated by a 70cm thick deposit(s) of debris accumulation (Anthes 1956:20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Early pylon construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Temple Construction, including m/b southern wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Utilisation of Temple</td>
<td>At least into Seti II period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Building of tombs and first structures in the court</td>
<td>The kiln stratum within the court to have lasted c. 200 years (Anthes 1956: 21). Establishment of kilns and burials c. 21\textsuperscript{st} dynasty (c. 1100BC) (ibid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Settlement Strata</td>
<td>21\textsuperscript{st}-22\textsuperscript{nd} Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Disuse</td>
<td>Accumulation of debris between c. 700 and 200BC (ibid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Settlement strata</td>
<td>Ptolomaic (only just preceding construction of enclosure wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Construction of Enclosure wall</td>
<td>Ptolomaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Settlement strata</td>
<td>Ptolomaic- Roman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Tombs

Five tombs were found by Anthes during the 1955 and 1956 excavations (Tombs V, W, X, Y and Z; figure 61). Only tomb Z had not been robbed in antiquity, and contained the skeleton of an old woman. Tomb Z is dated to the end of the 20th dynasty or 21st dynasty, Tombs V, W and Y were built soon after the temple was abandoned (the tombs were generally contemporaneous – c. 1100BC). REF. Anthes writes that the locations of these tombs (within the chapel, abutting the southern wall of the sanctuary, and within the southern wall of the enclosure ‘was presumably due to the desire of the deceased to be under the protection of the god of the temple, and to participate in the rites performed for him’ (Anthes 1956: 20). Two additional burials were recorded by Anthes – a child burial in a jar, and a skeleton ?? (Anthes 1956: 17).

The tombs contained re-used Ramesside architectural pieces, probably from earlier tombs – including lyry, a High Priest of Memphis and Nehesy, Commander of Soldiers. Their presence in the tombs appears to indicate that:

- **Tomb Z**

  Tomb Z contained the skeleton of a woman (50+ years), an extended inhumation with head at the eastern end and face turned slightly to the north (figure 62). Her arms were folded across the chest. No traces of coffin or covering were found. 11 pendants (figure 63; mainly silver and gold) lay around the neck (including a silver plaque representing Ptah), possibly from a single necklace, and two alabaster vessels were found at the feet (Fischer 1959: 15). For full descriptions of the pendants and vessels see Fischer 1959: 15-19).

  The tomb was cut through the southern mudbrick temple precinct wall. The tomb was 1.85m by 0.60m by 0.64m (high). The tomb was covered with flat slabs, some with torus mouldings. One floor slab is a cornice fragment. The walls are rounded, made from large slabs on edge. These sit upon the floor of the tomb, made up of smaller stones. One of the slabs at the western end of the floor was made in the form of an offering table. The burial trench (the cut) had been refilled with bricks. ‘The only slab with relief in Tomb Z (1955, cat. no. 148) was laid upon the roofing slabs and faced downward’ (Anthes 1965:17-19).
Figure 61 Showing locations of 21st Dynasty tombs (V-Z). Map prepared by GIS specialist
Figure 62 Tomb Z (Anthes 1956: figure 6)
Figure 63 The pendants in Tomb Z (Anthes 1956: figure 7)
Tomb Y

Tomb Y was a robbed tomb, located adjacent to the south wall of the sanctuary, constructed using large blocks of limestone. Inside the tomb measures 2.70m by 0.93m and was covered with limestone slabs (30-50cm thick) – including doorjambs (doorjambs of Nhsy – c. 13th Century (cat nos. 12-13), resting on a narrow stone wall constructed against the sanctuary. The roof had collapsed, possibly under the weight of later construction. The tomb was 93m high and the floor made of limestone slabs. In 1955 these slabs were covered in water. A few bones were found within the tomb (including 2 skulls), but in 1956 a skeleton was found on the covering slabs, which had been removed from their original position by tomb robbers. The skeleton had been laid down outstretched, with feet to the SW, with the left foot crossed over the other. Its arms and head were missing (Anthes 1956: 19; figure 64).

For a description of the doorjambs of Nhsy, probably robbed from his tomb, presumably located nearby see Anthes, Bakry, Simpson 1965:page 85 – cat. nos 12-13.

Figure 64 The skeleton at Tomb Y (Anthes 1956: plate 17c)
Tomb W

One meter west of Tomb Y Tomb W was found (also robbed), oriented, like Y, along the wall of the Sanctuary but a little lower (the floor of the tomb is at level 94.68; the interior dimensions are 2.50 x 1.20 m). ‘This tomb, like the preceding one, was covered with re-used slabs of limestone, one side of which was decorated with bas-reliefs attributed to the second half of the 19th Dynasty, the tomb itself being datable probably to the 21st Dynasty. If this is the case, it is evident that the water level during the 21st Dynasty, even at the period of the inundation, was still at least 1.20 m lower than the floor of the Sanctuary. The excavation of this tomb was made possible only by constant pumping, because as quickly as the water was removed, it was replaced by infiltration from below. It is perfectly possible, therefore, that there are other tombs lying along the wall of the Sanctuary still farther towards the west, which were not reached by our excavation because they lay too far below the water level’. (Jacquet 1965: 51-52).

The stones which covered the tomb (including a lintel, a panel and a door jamb) were from the tomb of lyry, a High Priest of Memphis, cat. nos. 9-11, dated to c. 1250BC. The slab depicts lyry and his wife in an unusual scene, wherein lyry presents his wife with a bouquet of flowers (figures 65, 66). Anthes writes ‘a representation of two persons almost life size is hardly known elsewhere in Egypt (Anthes 1957:29). For further information on these re-used pieces see Anthes 1957: 28-33; Anthes, Bakry, Simpson 1965: page 79-85 – cat.nos 9-11).
Figure 65  The panel from the tomb of Iyry, re-used in Tomb W (Anthes 1957: figure 8)

Figure 66  Reconstruction of the Tomb of Iyry (although note Anthes later comments in Anthes, Bakry, Simpson 1965:page 79-85). Reconstruction from Anthes 1957: figure 11
Tomb V

Tomb V is located within the south-west chapel of the Sanctuary. ‘A few bones were all that was left of the body. The following deposits were found: two alabaster jars re-used as canopic jars (cat. nos. 34-35); two two-handled pottery jars which may or may not have served as canopic jars (cat. no. 399 and another similar one, broken); four canopic jar lids of alabaster, two of which were found outside the tomb (cat. nos. 30-33); and, among other sherds, the painted ones, cat. nos. 648 and 649, presumably early Ramesside, to which the painted similar potsherd in the child burial may be, compared; see the note on the occurrence of this sherd in a burial on p. 30. For a small piece of gilt and red? painted limestone, which was also found in the tomb and duplicated by another fragment found above the tomb, see the introduction to cat. nos. 5-8.’ (Anthes 1965: 18). Note that the two lids of canopic jars, cat. nos. 30 and 31 from the Southern chapel, which were also found during this post-season work, proved to have originated in Tomb V, which was identified and uncovered a year later, in June, 1956.

The tomb is 0.80m by 2.50m, with walls of re-used stone, and had been robbed in antiquity. The tomb was covered with stone slabs, its walls are 1m high. So that the floor of the tomb is at 94.15m.

Tomb X

A third construction (a tomb?) marked X was built into the northern side of the southern mudbrick wall of the temple precinct (figure 67). The inner face of the three sides of this construction shows funerary reliefs ‘indicating that the stones were taken from another tomb’ (Jacquet 1959: 11). Anthes suggests that this feature served as a niche rather that a tomb; he bases this on the fact that the Ramesside reliefs are used in the walls (the other burials use them in their roofs; Anthes 1965: 18).

For further information on the funerary reliefs see Anthes, Bakry, Simpson in Anthes 1965: 87-90 - cats nos 14-18)
Figure 67 Tomb’ or niche X (Anthes 1959: plate 12a)

Child burial in a pot

A child was found inside a large wine jar with 2 handles (cat no 397), inside the enclosure, with its head at the bottom (upside down), facing west (Anthes 1965:19-20).
A number of beads were also found within the vessel, a small wedjet eye and a painted potsherd (ibid) Cat 397

**Skeleton**

A skeleton was found in the western trench below level 96.00. There were no signs of a coffin or a wrapping. The body had been laid with its head to the west. Small beads and a scarab were found on the body (Anthes 1965:20)

**The Settlement**

Below the features recorded in Area A (1955), Area A (1956) and Area D (west) are discussed in level:

- **Level 0**

  An upper horizon is mentioned in connection to Area A (1955), not with relation to the other areas. However, this level/broad phase was not planned. Jacquet writes ‘The work begun on the surface at a height of +100.55 did not at first yield more than a few traces of crude brick, and the incoherence of what was found made it impracticable to construct a plan’ (Jacquet 1959: 8).

- **Level phase 1 (figure 68)**

  This level/broad phase (1) is only planned in Area A (1955), presumably (although not stated) because this area was surviving physically higher than the others? The first published plan depicts a series of mudbrick walls, creating a series of spaces and parts of at least 5 buildings. Since the focus of planning was architectural it is unclear what were the stratigraphic relationship and phase relationships between buildings/spaces. Here I attempt some phasing and allocate building numbers based on an interpretation of Jacquet’s text. Jacquet refers to a building at the southern end of the trench that was ‘deeply buried in the earth’, of which only three of its walls could be seen (this may be B1). To the north of this and surrounding it, a more ‘comprehensive complex appeared’ (1959:9) – which I have labeled B2. Jacquet does not mention how the two buildings (B1 and B2) relate to each other. Jacquet refers to 3 chambers (1-3), with Chamber 2
containing a partition-wall and containing pottery fragments. The oven shown in chamber 1 appears to have been a later construction. The northern wall of B2 abuts an older wall, which runs south to the southern LoE. However, Jacquet also mentions that the east limit of the building (B2) was ‘destroyed by later constructions’? To the north ‘part of another building of the same type’ was recorded (B3). Jaquet does not mention the relationship between B3 and B2.

In the centre of the excavation area, Jacquet records what he believed to be the corner of a house, containing 2 ovens and a small mortar (B4). The walls bounding B4 and ovens were constructed on earlier walls, along the same alignment and position, but wider. This earlier manifestation had a limestone block, re-used as a threshold in the sw corner. Again Jacquet does not mention the relationship between B4 and B2 or with the wall to the east. The walls to the east (B5 and B6) are not mentioned by Jacquet.

Jacquet suggests that the structures recorded as level A1 were ‘rudimentary dwellings’. ‘The complexity of the plan at this level shows a small section of a town in continuous development, and apparently fairly rapid development. The paucity of re-used stones from the Sanctuary implies that at this time the latter was completely covered over by subsequent building levels’ (1959:9).

Although this ‘level’ (read broad phase) of activity was not planned in Area A in 1956, Jacquet states that they ‘made a rapid survey of the installations at level 98.80m. These …consisted of thick walls penetrating down from the upper levels and seemingly belonging to a rather large building which extended to the south and west of the excavation. Its continuation to the north could not be determined but it no doubt extended above the Sanctuary’ (1965: 50). I suspect however, that A2 (1956) is in general phase with A1 (1955), that Jacquet had excavated down more in terms of ‘level’ than ‘phase’, and that there is a general slope downward from west to east – check on site. Note that the eastern walls in A2 (1956) match with the walls of A1 (1955).
Figure 68. Showing Level (phase) 1 architecture, which was excavated by Anthes in 1964. Map prepared by GIS specialist.
Level Phase 2 (figure 69)

This level (broad phase) is shown in both publications as D2, A2 (1955) and A2 (1956). According to Jacquet the walls (foundations) in the north-east corner (B8 and B9) are later than those to the south (B7). Of these north-eastern walls, Jacquet mentions that the easternmost building (therefore B9) cut through the walls of B8. Later still Jacquet mentions that the large area of mudbrick and the small wall to the north (abutting the south face of the mudbrick enclosure wall) may be contemporaneous with the enclosure wall, and that the large area of mudbrick may represent an associated surface at the time. This ‘surface’ slopes downward to the north and to the south (Jacquet 1965:46).

To the south and southwest a large structure straddles the D2 and A2 (1955) excavation area (B7). Note that the plan of this structure is clearly multi-phase. Jacquet records ovens in one of the rooms, which he interprets as ‘ovens for baking bread’, and jars in one of the rooms at the eastern end of the structure (1965:46). The walls of a structure in the southeast corner (B7?) correspond to the walls of B4 in Level A1. The north face of this structure was preserved to 80cm high. Adjacent to the western wall of the building three limestone blocks and 2 threshold stones with door sockets were found. In the south-west corner of the excavation the foundations of a wall constructed using pottery and limestone were found. Two limestone fragments contained hieroglyphs.

In the northwest corner, adjacent to the sanctuary, Jacquet records an area of limestone debris (limestone chips and powdered stone), at least 20m², and 30cm thick, which he suggests was left by stoneworkers (contemporaneous with the destruction of the sanctuary).

Of the structures to the west of this (in area A 1956), all Jacquet states is that ‘none of the other walls which appear at this level presents a coherent plan and none of them descends to any great depth’ (1965:50).
Below Level A2, Level A3 was planned. In the western and northern ends of the trench Jacquet records building debris, devoid of structures. To the south-east he records a series of walls, some rounded, (which he suggest may have been used for storage or preparation of clay for making pottery?); also a circular oven, on the edge of which (originating from a higher level) a large pot was found (50 cm din diameter). Level A3 (1956) ‘shows several closely related periods of construction; the houses are rebuilt on older foundations; the Sanctuary is still visible and the presence of the 4m-wall, inasmuch as it provided a solid base on which to build, had not yet been forgotten’ (Jacquet 1965:50). A NW-SE mudbrick wall abuts and overlies the southern wall of the Sanctuary to the east, the structures continuing into D3. Again, what is depicted is multi-phase.
Level Phase 4 (figure 71)

The underlying level (Level A4) is dominated by a large NW-SE mudbrick wall. The base of this wall was not reached during excavation. Several round enclosures are planned, and a circular oven, 2.5m in diameter. ‘The surroundings of this oven were strewn with fragments of crude pottery and, to the north-east, with sherds and discards of glazed ware’ (Jacquet 1959:11).

During the subsequent season, in Area D4 a series of circular structures were recorded, mainly pottery kilns. Jacquet writes that this level (with D3) ‘is characterized by the presence, in its western part, of a dense agglomeration of installations for craftsmen, consisting mainly of pottery kilns. It is limited on the east by a brick wall 60 cm thick perpendicular to the 4m.-wall. One can distinguish at least six kilns, more or less well preserved but constructed without reference to any apparent plan. Near them were
found a number of round or rectangular buildings of unbaked brick constructed in the same technique and, in the case of the round ones, covered no doubt originally by a roof in the form of a cupola. It is probable that these constructions were magazines for the temporary storage of pottery before or after baking. Their walls are very thin, usually the thickness of only one brick. Their proximity to the kilns makes it probable that the temperature inside these constructions was higher than normal, The kiln situated at point 40/ 232.50 with its annexed buildings presents the best illustration of this hypothesis. Also to be noted is a series of connected magazines opening into each other, whose entrance must have been on the northern side. The most northerly of these three magazines is built on a circular course of re-used stones. The floor of these constructions is of beaten earth. No sherds identifiable as having formed part of the contents of these magazines were found on the floor.

The kilns in this area were built of crude bricks, baked incidentally in the course of their usage. Outwardly, they resemble the kilns represented in the paintings of the tomb of Kenamun at Thebes (Davies, Kenamun, p. 51, pl. 59) except that no trace of stairways or ladder has been found. But these may very well have been made of wood. None of the kilns was found in perfect condition but we were able to gather enough material from the remains to enable us to reconstruct their original form. The kilns situated at point 36/ 235, on whose floor were found some pieces of unbaked pottery, still possessed a considerable part of its shelf, or sole plate, pierced with round holes and resting on two vaults above the hearth, on which was placed the pottery ready to be baked. The utilization of these ancient kilns must have been of relatively short duration. They all cut across one another more or less, and one finds in all of them, among the unbaked bricks of which they were built, a certain number of re-used bricks already baked by previous usage.' (1965: 47)

‘West of Tomb W, at level 95.85, we found a surface covered with chips of stone similar to that mentioned in A2. Above this debris and partly built into the 4m.-wall, was a small kiln surrounded by a thick circular wall, apparently designed for the firing of faience objects (pl. 17d). It is pierced on the west by an opening leading into an unusually long ventilation shaft built of brick. This shaft was blocked at the point where it opened into the kiln by a mass of slag which proves that the firing must have been done at a high
temperature.

South of the 4m.-wall at point 33.50/ 255.50, there is a curious elliptical brick construction whose walls incline inwards. It contained two rows of bricks placed on edge so that they leaned over, one against the other, all at the same angle; see the like manner of setting the bricks in a sector of the wall superseding the elliptical structure, on pl. 17b. The two ends of the ellipse were filled with debris. The face of the 4m.-wall was destroyed around this construction to a depth of 20 cm. Once again the high water level prevented us from clearing this installation in its entirety and thus possibly discovering what purpose it served’. (Jacquet 1965:52)

During 1955 a further trench was excavated to the south of the eastern gate (pylon) of the temple (Area E). Jacquet mentions that the northern side of the gate had already been cleared. Jacquet excavated through 5m of later occupation levels to the floor of the gate. None of the depositional (including structural) sequence was planned; Jacquet writes ‘this excavation, being very limited in area, would not have permitted the mapping-out of an intelligible plan of brick constructions. We may note, however, that these very simple buildings are of the same type as those uncovered in the course of Excavation A, with floors of beaten earth or re-used stone. These structures begin at the floor level of the gate (95.88) and have much contributed to the destruction of the latter’ (Jacquet 1959:14).
Figure 71 Level (phase) 4 architecture planned by Anthes. This architecture was not excavated and is therefore still in situ. Map prepared by GIS specialist.
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1 Introduction

Area RAB II represents all the archaeological remains to the west of the Ramesses II Temple (RABI), west of the southwest corner of the Great Ptah Temple, south of the Saqqara –Bedreasheid, and to the east of a north-south road leading from the Saqqara-Bedreshein Road (figure 1). Area RABII comprises two, two-storey, gable roofed, limestone tombs (22nd dynasty; the tombs of Petiese, Harsiese, Takeloth and Tabakhtenaskhet); the site of a tomb that has been re-sited in the Egyptian Museum (22nd dynasty; tomb of Sheshonq); large mudbrick silos; and a large ‘area of mudbrick architecture’ (figures 1 and 2). None of the archaeological remains of RAB II, including the Tombs of the High Priests of Ptah, are currently open to visitors.

One group of tombs was first discovered in 1931 by a local unidentified inspector, working for the Antiquities Service. Later, in 1942, Ahmed Badawi and Mustafa El-Amir of the Antiquities Service extended the excavations, excavating a further 2 groups of tombs and exposing the silo area to the north and mudbrick architecture to the south. Later, Rudolph Anthes of the University of Pennsylvania recorded some observations of the area that he made in 1955 and 1956 and in 1981 the Survey of Memphis returned to the area and mapped the exposed remains of the tombs and the silos to the north.

AERA’s work at the Tombs of the High Priests formed part of the MSCD Project’s on site work program – to clean and record the site in advance of opening a Memphis Walking Circuit. Work in Area RABII began on 9th April 2016 and continued through to 14th May 2016. A team of workmen cleared the site of vegetation and modern rubbish. A team of archaeologists recorded the visible and existing archaeological features of the tombs, and nearby elements (photography, written records, survey, 3-D modeling). Apart from the onsite component, research was also conducted on the excavation history of the site and area around. The methodology and data collected from these activities are presented below.
Figure 1 showing the location of RABII. Map prepared by GIS Specialist. NB the paths shown were laid by the MSCD Project in 2016
Figure 2 – RABII comprises two, two storey, gabled roofed, limestone tombs (22nd dynasty; the tombs of Petiese, Harsiese, Takeloth and Tabakhtenaskhet); the site of a tomb that has been re-sited in the Egyptian Museum (22nd dynasty; tomb of Sheshonq); large mudbrick silos; and a large ‘area of mudbrick architecture’
2 Methodology

2.1 Cleaning
The site was covered in dense vegetation, so much so that the tombs were barely visible. The topography of the site was also barely visible and relatively dangerous prior to cleaning, with numerous deep drops (created by previous excavations) obscured by vegetation. A team of local workmen removed the vegetation over the course of 24 days in April 2016 (figure 3-4). In the area of the silos (to the north of the tombs) and in the area to the south of the tombs (where there is a mass of mudbrick architecture, the team cleaned superficially so that the walls were visible, but did not scrape off the modern deposits (accumulated since the 1940s) to expose the ‘soft archaeology’ beneath (figures 5-6). This was in line with our policy elsewhere, so that mudbrick architecture and soft deposits were not open to erosion, but cleaned to a point where we were able to record (survey) architecture.

2.2 Site Survey and Recording
No plans or records were produced (read, published) in the 1940s during the excavation of RABII. In the 1980s The Survey of Memphis produced the first and only plans of the area and the first account of the existing archaeological remains (figures 7 and 8). We georeferenced these plans by surveying corners of the monument in UTM, enabling the project’s GIS Specialist to digitize the published Survey of Memphis plans. Since only the standing architectural parts of the tombs and silos had previously been planned we then needed to survey all other elements (non in-situ blocks etc.). All of these elements and the standing architecture were assigned a record number and then surveyed (figure 9), using a Total Station, using their appropriate numbers. In tandem, each element was recorded using bespoke record sheets, recording ‘type’, ‘description’, ‘condition’, ‘inscription y/n’ etc. These record sheets were then imported into the GIS to enable the data to be queried and viewed.
In addition, all inscribed pieces were individually photographed. The mass of mudbrick architecture to the south of the tombs was outside our Scope of Work. However, because these elements had never previously been planned/surveyed, we surveyed the limits of the visible walls (figure 2). However, we did not produce written records for these remains.
Additional survey of the area included all previous excavation limits, all modern structures (buildings, electricity posts etc), trees, and the full extent of the area that we cleared (figure 2).

2.3 3-D Models
In May 2016 we trialed the 3-D recording of the tombs using Photo Scan Pro. A 3-D model produces extremely accurate images that entirely capture the present state of a monument. In this way, the 3-D model can serve as part of the conservation baseline data, as well as augmenting the overall site record. We produced 2 models in April, one of the west face of the tombs, and one of the east face of the tombs. These can be viewed in ArcGIS, within Adobe Reader, and as flattened tiff images (figure 10).

Figure 3 The View of the Tombs of the High Priests (RAB II) before we removed vegetation and modern garbage. Looking NE. Photo by the project Overseer. Photo no. 822931
Figure 4 View of the Tombs of the High Priests after MSCD workmen removed vegetation and modern garbage cleaning. NE facing. Photo by the Field Director. Photo no. 301817

Figure 5 Area RABII showing the mudbrick architecture to the south of the tombs, and the tombs obscured by dense vegetation. East Facing. Photograph by the Field Director. Photo 102324.
Figure 6 View of the mudbrick architecture to the south of the tombs, after cleaning. NE facing. Photo by the Field Director. Photo 201268
Figure 7. Plan of the tombs and silos to the north (Jeffreys 1985: figure 26)
Figure 8 Plan of Area RABII and part of Area RABI (Jeffreys, Malek, Smith 1983: figure 3)
3 The Site
The site is located south of the Saqqara-Bedreshein Road and westerly adjacent to the small temple of Ramses II (RABI). The site is bounded to the north by a fence lining the south side of the Saqqara-Bedrashein Road, to the east by the Ramesses II temple (RABI) and to the south-west corner of the Great Ptah Temple, to the west by a north-south prepared road/track that links the Saqqara-Bedrashein Road and settlements to the south. The southern limit is defined as the same as of Badawi’s 1940s excavations. The area has a number of visible archaeological remains, including two, two-storey tombs, mudbrick silos to the north, a mass of exposed mudbrick architecture to the south, and scatters of limestone architectural blocks not in-situ.

The tombs can only be accessed from the east and west. However, access to the tombs themselves is from the west, via a downward slope (figure 11). A ghaffir’s hut is located to the east of RABII (figure 12), on an area of high ground, and comprises an enclosed building and patio. Because of its positioning, the hut services the temple (RABI), the Tombs of the Priests (RABII), Seti I Chapel (RAD) and the Apis House (FAG). A north-south trodden pathway leads from the hut to an opening in a
fence that separates the Saqqara-Bedrashein Road from the Antiquities Area to the south. A further modern building – an open shelter – lies to the north of the site, which may have been used as a police look-out point. This structure (bus stop?) is no longer used.

The site (RABII) was first discovered in 1931, when the Antiquities Service uncovered the southernmost of a pair of gable-roofed, two-storey stone tombs of Dynasty 22. Professor Ahmed Badawi and Mustafa el-Amir then excavated the site between February to April 1942, at which time he uncovered three more Dynasty 22 tombs (Anthes 1959:4) adjoining the gable-roofed tombs to the north as well as silos adjacent to the tombs to the north. During these excavations he also uncovered the interior and façade of the chapel room of the Ramses II temple (RABI), as well as brick structures between the sanctuary and the tombs. According to Anthes, the ‘level’ (read, ‘phase’?) of these are the same as those in the ‘A1’ excavations (for explanation of level ‘A1’, see information packet for RABI (Anthes 1969:4)).
Figure 11  The slope that leads down into the entrance of the tomb. East facing. Photo by the Field Director.

Figure 12 Panoramic view of RABII (including the tombs), RABI and the Ghaffir Hut. West Facing. Photograph by the Field Director.
4 The Tombs
There are four existing tombs within Area RABII, comprising two groups of two-storey tombs (figure 13). Of the southern group (Group A), Harsiese’s tomb is the upper and can be accessed from the west (figures 14-16). Below this tomb is the tomb of Tabakhtenaskhet, which is not at accessible or visible. This southern group was discovered and excavated in 1931 by an unnamed Antiquities inspector (Badawi 1944: 182 n1; Aston and Jeffreys 2007:74). The eastern face of Group A was never exposed. The excavation was not published, and very little information was published in terms of material found. In 1942 Ahmed Badawi and Moustafa el-Amir excavated to the north, excavating a second group (Group B), northerly adjacent to Group A. Here, they found a further 2-storey tomb group, of which Petiese’s tomb is the upper and Takeloth’s tomb is the lower. Both the upper and lower tombs are visible from the east; from the west only the upper tomb is visible. Again, very little was published on the archaeological context of Burial Group B.

In the same year Ahmed Badawi and Moustafa el-Amir discovered and excavated the tomb of Sheshonq D, to the northeast of tomb groups A and B. This tomb was subsequently moved to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo and is currently restored in the front garden there..

Four of the tombs are certainly Royal – belonging to the son (Sheshonq D), grandson Takeloth B, and great grandsons (Petiese A and Harsiese) of King Orsokon II of the 22nd dynasty. All four were the high priests of Ptah (see table 1). The location of these tombs here, in the vicinity of the temple (and not at the necropolis of Saqqara) is similar to the royal tombs at Tanis, and may have been due to them being better protected here (near to the temple) (Badawi 1957). The fifth tomb, that of Tabakhtenaskhet, may have been the wife of King Takeloth II, who may have died prior to her husband becoming king (Aston and Jeffreys 2007: 75).
Figure 13 Plan of the Tombs of Petiese and Harsiese. Map prepared by the GIS Specialist.
Figure 14. Elevation drawing of east face of Tomb groups A and B, with the individual tombs marked (Jeffreys 1985: figure 28)
Figure 15 Photograph of the east face of Tomb Group B (the tombs of Petiese and Takeloth). West facing. Photo 301791. Photo by the Field Director.

Figure 16 Photograph of west face of Tomb Group A and B – only the Tombs of Petiese and Harsiese are visible. Photograph by field school graduate, NE facing. Photo 302451.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal pharaohs ruling over Memphis</th>
<th>Dates BC</th>
<th>High Priests of Ptah</th>
<th>Dates BC approx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smendes</td>
<td>c. 1069-1043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenemnisu</td>
<td>c. 1043-1039</td>
<td>Ashaket A</td>
<td>c. 1040-1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psusennes I</td>
<td>c. 1039-991</td>
<td>Pipi A</td>
<td>c. 1025-1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenemope</td>
<td>c. 993-984</td>
<td>Harsiese J</td>
<td>c. 1005-995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osochor</td>
<td>c. 984-978</td>
<td>Pipi B</td>
<td>c. 995-975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siamun</td>
<td>c. 978-959</td>
<td>Ashakhet B</td>
<td>c. 975-960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psusennes II</td>
<td>c. 959-949</td>
<td>Ankhefensekmet A</td>
<td>c. 960-940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheshonq I</td>
<td>c. 945-924</td>
<td>Shedsunefertem A</td>
<td>c. 940-920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon I</td>
<td>c. 924-889</td>
<td>Sheshonq C</td>
<td>c. 920-900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shehonq II</td>
<td>c. 890</td>
<td>Osrkon A</td>
<td>c. 900-885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeloth I</td>
<td>c. 889-874</td>
<td>Merenptah</td>
<td>c. 885-870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
<td>c. 874-849</td>
<td>Sheshonq D</td>
<td>c. 870-848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheshonq III</td>
<td>c. 849-810</td>
<td>Takeloth B</td>
<td>c. 848-840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harseise</td>
<td>c. 840-835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petiese A</td>
<td>c. 835-825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peftjauawybast</td>
<td>c. 825-805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsiese H</td>
<td>c. 805-790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheshonq 1b</td>
<td>c. 810-798</td>
<td>Ankhefensekhmet B</td>
<td>c. 790 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamiu</td>
<td>c. 798-792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheehonq V</td>
<td>c. 792-755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd dynasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th dynasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th dynasty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No further incumbents are known for these periods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Third Intermediate Period pharaohs ruling Memphis and known High Priests of Ptah, taken from Aston and Jeffreys 2007:65
• The Tomb of Petiese.

The tomb consists of two chambers, covered by a pent roof of limestone slabs at an angle or 36 degrees (in the underlying tomb of Takeloth the limestone slabs are angled at 45 degrees; figures 17-20). The eastern chamber is the best preserved, with a floor of limestone slabs (above the gabled roof of Takeloth) and a small rectangular access into the western chamber (figures 19-20). The western chamber is not so well preserved, comprising collapsing western, northern and southern limestone walls surviving waist high. On the surface of the chamber is a pile of limestone (either collapse or collapse that has been cleaned up and piled). Not wanting to remove this material, we cleared the chamber only to expose the walls and piled up stone and did not cleaner deeper to reveal the floor of the chamber (if this still survives).

The floor level of the lower storey (the tomb of Takeloth) is at c.95m SD (EES datum) – slightly lower than the level of the Ramesside forecourt. The upper storey at 98.30 SD is more in line with the expected floor level rise in this period – suggesting that the lower storey was subterranean. With this upper storey associated with the free-standing mudbrick walls. According to Jeffreys the silos to the north continued to function at this time – with the northern wall of the tomb group respecting their position (Jeffreys 1985: 70-71).

Badawi writes that Petiese had been buried in a red re-used granite sarcophagus, originally belonging to the Ramesside noble Amenhotep Hwjj (Badawi 1944, note 2). This sarcophagus is currently displayed in the Memphis Open Air Museum – as Museum Object 5 and Object 8 (figures 21-23).

The following text is from the MSCD object catalogue on piece MO5 and MO8: ‘The lid and bottom of the sarcophagus of Amenhotep, also called Huy, are beautifully carved from two massive blocks of red granite which have been hollowed out.

The lid (MO 5) is broken in half, but the two pieces have been restored. This lid is rectangular with a rounded head. Every face of this lid is covered with funerary decoration and inscriptions carved in sunken relief. On the top face, the rounded head of the sarcophagus is adorned with a curved hieroglyphic sign of the sky surmounting two prophylactic eyes. Beneath the eyes, the goddess of the sky, Nut, is portrayed standing on a gold sign, her winged arms outstretched to protect the
deceased resting inside the sarcophagus. The whole surface of the lid also features strips of funerary inscriptions (four horizontal and five vertical) overlapping each other. These may evoke the outer strips of cloth commonly used to bind the wrapping layers of a mummy. These strips of inscription extend over the sides of the sarcophagus, where they delimit the sides of panels featuring funerary deities and additional columns of texts, among them the god Anubis, who is depicted as a recumbent canine upon a divine standard. The head and foot of the lid are adorned with funerary deities also kneeling on gold signs, their arms upraised in a sign of protection: on the head side, the goddess Nephthys, and on the foot side, the goddess Isis. Both goddesses are flanked by deities of the necropolis.

The bottom part of the sarcophagus (MO 8) is also rectangular with a rounded side at the head. Its decoration is of a simpler design: a single line of funerary inscription carved in sunken relief runs horizontally around the outer surface of the sarcophagus. The inside is undecorated.

The owner of this sarcophagus, the deceased Amenhotep-Huy, is identified through the inscriptions, and is known for being the governor of Memphis at the beginning of the Ramesside period, most likely under Ramesses II (not to be confused with another Amenhotep-Houy, who was chief steward in Memphis under Amenhotep III, see MO 27). He also served as director of a Ramesses II temple located in the Memphite estate of the goddess Hathor. It is now lost, but was presumably in the vicinity of the Ramesses II Temple of Hathor excavated in Kôm el-Rabî’a (Pasquali 2012: 141–144). To date, his tomb remains lost (though a location in the necropolis of Saqqara is probable). However, we can argue that it was looted in antiquity, as evidenced by the discovery of several elements of his tomb and burial equipment outside of their original context (Pasquali 2012: 141–149). Such is the case with the present sarcophagus lid and bottom. They were exposed by Ahmed Badawi in 1942 when he excavated in the 22nd Dynasty cemetery of the High Priests of Memphis, located on the northwest of the Small Temple of Ramesses II at Kôm el-Rabî’a (Badawi 1944: 181-206 and pl. XVI-XX; Jeffrey 1985: 22, 70–71 and fig. 26; Aston and Jeffrey 2007: 74). This sarcophagus was found re-used, together with an anthropoid sarcophagus also belonging to Amenhotep-Huy (now housed in the Cairo Museum: JE 59128, Hamada 1935: 122–131), in the tombs of the High Priests Petiese and Harsiese’.
Also of note, is the inner sarcophagus of Amenhotep Hwjj was found, re-used, in the Tomb Group A (Badawi 1944: note 1; Anthes 1959: note 3), presumably in the grave of Petiese’s brother, Harsiese.
Figure 17. Eastern face of the Tomb of Petiese, with the eastern chamber in the foreground and the western in the background. West facing. Photo by the Field Director. Photo 30184.
Figure 18. The Western chamber of the Tomb of Petiese. Note that the tomb walls are made of limestone and enclosed by substantial mudbrick walls. The western mudbrick wall originally continued to the south but had been cut through in 1931 or 1942. West facing. Photo 301819. Photo by the Field Director.
Figure 19. Eastern chamber of the Tomb of Petiese in the foreground and Western chamber in the background. West facing. Photo by the Field Director. Photo 301804

Figure 20 The gable roof and paved floor of the eastern chamber. West facing. Photo by the Field Director. Photo 301805
Figure 21 Top surface of the re-used sarcophagus MO5, displayed in the Open Air Museum. Photograph by the project photographer. Photo 704000

Figure 22 Side of sarcophagus MO5, displayed in the Open Air museum. Photograph by field school graduate. Photo 102208
The reused anthropoid sarcophagus of Amenhotep Hwjj, found in the tomb of Petiese (Hamada 1935, plate I a, b)

*Petiese A*

Petiese A is known from other monuments, including a stela from the Serapeum as High Priest of Memphis, See Kees: Priestertum, S, 184. See table 1 for his approximate dates.

- The Tomb of Harsiese

As currently visible the tomb consists of one gable-roofed, chamber (figures 24 and 25), but presumably, when originally discovered in 1931, it consisted of two chambers, similar to Petiese’s. Given that we know that the underlying tomb was also excavated in 1931 we must assume that excavation was sunk to the west of the
existing chamber of Harsiese, and that the material now filling this area is back-fill or
collapse (erosion from surrounding walls).

A limestone threshold sits a little higher than the limestone paving within Harsiese’s
tomb. A slight break in the floor, revealing angled stone beneath, is the only
indication of an underlying tomb.

The tomb was discovered in 1931 by an unnamed inspector. In 1944 Badawi writes
that the only information pertaining to the discovery of the tomb was a letter dated,
12/10/1931, in which the inspector states that he has discovered a two-storey grave
in Mit Rahina, and two sarcophagi. He saw the sarcophagi as significant finds and
requested immediate transport to the Egyptian Museum (Badawi 1944: note 1). One
of these, was the re-used inner sarcophagus of Amenhotep Huy (Anthes 1959, note
3; Badawi 1944, note 1; Aston and Jeffrey 2007:73), the same individual whose
outer coffin was re-used in the Tomb of Petiese. The sarcophagus is anthropoid and
of pink granite, and is displayed/stored at the Egyptian Museum (from or before
1935; Hamada 1935: 122; figure 26). ‘It was made for high official described in the
inscriptions as a Royal scribe, a steward in the Royal place and a great Count in
Memphis, Amenhotpe, who has a “beautiful name”, Huye’ (Hamada 1935:122).
Based on its type and inscriptions it ‘is certainly of late XVIIIth – early XIXth
dynasties’ (Hamada 1935:122). See Hamada 1935 for a full description and
translation of the sarcophagi.

Figure 24. The west face of the Tomb of Harsiese. East facing. Photograph by the
Field Director. Photo 301796
Figure 25. Inside the Tomb of Harsiese. East facing. Photograph by the Field Director. Photo 301810
Harsiese

Badawi (1944:181 n1) and Kees (1953:183) both suggest that Harsiese was the son of Takeloth B. Kitchen (1966:350), however suggests that he was the son of Petiese A. However, as Jeffreys and Aston point out, given that both re-used the same coffin (inner and outer), it is likely that they were contemporary – and therefore brothers (Aston & Jeffreys 2007: 73)

- The Tomb of Takeloth B

Only a small portion of the eastern chamber of Takeloth B is currently visible. Peering inside, one can see the gabled roof and the doorway that would have led into
a second chamber (figure 27). The area to the west of this doorway is completely filled with silts. The tomb is filled with material (silts), so that any surviving floor would be well below the present level.

The floor level of the lower storey (the tomb of Takeloth) is at c.95m SD – slightly lower than the level of the Ramesside forecourt. The upper storey at 98.30 SD is more in line with the expected floor level rise in this period – suggesting that the lower storey was subterranean (Jeffreys 1985: 70-71).

Casual conversations with workmen in May 2016 revealed that this tomb is (or was) often flooded with water and that until relatively recently local people would bathe in its waters. The waters within this tomb were considered to have certain properties – to aid a woman in conception and to heal skin complaints.

_Takeloth B_

Takeloth was a son of Sheshonq D and died c. 840BC (Aston and Jeffreys 2007:74). Takeloth B is known from other monuments, including a stela from the Serapeum as High Priest of Memphis, See Kees: Priestertum, S, 184. See table 1 for his approximate dates.
Figure 27. The Overseer inside the eastern chamber of Takeloth B. Note the doorway leading into a second chamber behind. The ‘void’ behind is completely filled with silt West facing

- The Tomb of Tabakhtenaskhet

The tomb of Tabakhtenaskhet is not currently visible. The tomb was excavated along with the upper tomb of Harsiese in 1931 by an unnamed inspector (Jeffreys & Aston 2007:75). As with the tombs of Harsiese there is little or no documentation on this tomb.

Tabakhtenaskhet

As indicated by Jeffreys & Aston, given the location of Tabakhtenaskhet, it is likely that she was part of or associated with the royal family. Based on context and association Jeffreys suggests that her burial was c. 850-825BC. The date correlates with a Tabakhtenasket I, who was married to a king Takeloth (presumably Takeloth II. The fact that there appears to have been no mention of royal status in her grave goods may indicate that she had died prior to Takeloth becoming king (Aston and Jeffreys 2007: 75)
The Tomb of Sheshonq D

The tomb of Sheshonq D was found in the Spring of 1942 and excavated by Badawi and Mustafa el-Amir. The tomb was later moved and reconstructed in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo and is currently exhibited in the garden of the Museum as a store for garden tools. Aston and Jeffreys write that the tomb is ‘similar to the royal tombs at Tanis and Herakleopolis, in that it was small rectangular stone-built construction, using material decorated with mythological scenes, usurped from earlier structures such as one erected by Seti I, and another usurped from Tutankhamun by Horemheb, as well as the large red sandstone stela of Amenophis II used to roof the burial chamber. The mythological scenes have close parallels in the contemporary Tanite tomb of Osorkon II, and the slightly later tomb of Shehonq II. His grave goods comprised a heart scarab, canopic jars, shabtis, jewellery, a limestone cippus of Harpocrates, and numerous amulets’. Unusually Sheshonq D was not buried within a sarcophagus or silver coffin (Aston and Jeffreys 2007:74). His chapel was roofed with the stela of Amenhotep II (published by Badawi 1957). This was a 2.85m red sandstone stela. Badawi (1957) provides a detailed description of the tomb.

Sheshonq D

Sheshonq was the son of Orsorkon II and his chief wife (a king’s daughter), but apparently died during his son’s lifetime. Another son, Nemrut, was a high priest of Amun in Thebes (Badawi 1957). According to Aston and Jeffreys probably Sheshonq D died during the reign of Sheshonq III, since his cartouche appears on one of the Wedjat eyes on Sheshonq D’s necklace (Aston and Jeffreys 2007:73).

Sheshonq is known from a number of sources, including:

1. Detailed titulary on a statue from the Serapeum (Gauthier, Livre des Rois, III, S.344; Badawi 1957: 156)

2. On a stela from the Serapeum, which was dedicated in the third Apis funeral among the 22 Dynasty in year 28 of King Sheshonq III (Badawai 1957: 156)

3. A scarab collection (Petrie, History III: 248, 253, 103; Newberry, Scarabs: 190, pl 40, Nr. 8; Badawi 1957: 156).

4. On a scarab, Sheshonq’s mother gave to him (Petrie History III: 251; Newberry, Scarabs: 190, pl 40, Nr. 8; Badawai 1957: 156).
5 The silos
These presumably had been excavated by Badawi and el-Amir in 1942 but were unpublished. They consist of two large circular domes silos, with rectangular chambers above, of a smaller size without door to the south. These probably represent part of the granary area associated with the temple (Jeffreys, Malek and Smith 1983). The two silos to the north predate the construction of the 22nd dynasty tombs, but may have continued in use after the construction of the 22nd dynasty tombs (Jeffreys 1985:71). These silos would originally been free-standing, as indicated by the ‘arched communicating doors on the eastern and southern sides of the western silo’ (Jeffreys 1985:71; figure 28).
Figure 28 The silos as recorded by Jeffreys (1985: 27).
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1. Introduction

The White Walls Chapel\(^1\) (RAD)\(^2\), situated on the southern side of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road, 200 m west of the Memphis Open Air Museum (QAS), is not currently open to visitors (figure 1).

\[\text{Figure 1. Location of the White Walls Chapel (RAD) at Memphis.}\]

\(^1\) Also referred to as the Seti I Chapel or oratory.

\(^2\) Site code assigned by David Jeffreys and the Survey of Memphis in the early 1980s. The ‘R’ stands for Kom Rabia which the site is situated on, and the ‘AD’ is the code specific to the site on the Kom.
The northern side of the White Walls Chapel is bounded by a metal fence with a brick and cement foundation (figure 2, 3 & 4). This fence and foundation is 1.90 m high and made of a series of metal panels (1.18 m in width by 1.52 m in height), supported and connected by metal rod pillars. This fence forms the southern side of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road. The metal part of the fence is in quite good condition with only a few bars missing from the panels. The only exception to this is where three of the panels are missing to the north east of the chapel. The foundation of the fence is also broken and missing in places.

Figure 2. View of the White Walls Chapel (RAD) looking south east after cleaning in April 2016. The Saqqara to Bedrashein Road is in the upper left of the picture along with the car park of the Memphis Open Air Museum. Photo by project archaeologist. Photo no. 102532.

The official entrance to the site is through a gateway in the fence on the southern side of the road (figure 4). This entrance, situated just to the north-west of the chapel, however, is permanently open because it has no gate. The whole area south of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road is Ministry of Antiquities (MoA) land but apart from the fencing running along the road, there is no other official boundary demarcating the exact limits of the MoA land (as shown in the official cadastral map) in the south.
Figure 3. View of the White Walls Chapel (RAD) looking north after cleaning in April 2016. The Saqqara to Bedrashein Road with its fencing is on the northern side of the chapel. Cross the road, directly to the north is the Apis House (FAGI). Photo by project archaeologist. Photo no. 102547.

Figure 4. Location of the official entrance to the site. Photo by project archaeologist. Photo no. 102533 (insert - looking north), 102535 (main picture, looking NW).
Running across the MoA land south of the road are a number of informal paths used by local residents. One of these paths is on the western side of RAD and leads from the open gateway at the road past the RAD chapel, towards the south east and the Hathor Temple (RAG) and Sekhmet Temple (RQA) (figure 5).

![Figure 5](image-url)

**Figure 5.** The western side of the White Walls Chapel (RAD) with the path running along and demarcating the sites’ west limit. Photo by project archaeologist, looking SW. Photo no. 102542.

Although the official entrance to the area is permanently open, this particular path is not used much, if at all by local residents, because there is a MoA guard hut (figure 5) just to the south of the gateway. A section of the path on the western side of the RAD area was used to test the viability of using red *tafla* gravel for the Memphis Walking Circuit. A section of gravel was laid and bordered by split palm tree logs in April and May 2016 (figure 5).

The southern limit of the RAD site is demarcated by the Ptolemaic (or Hellenistic) mudbrick wall of the Great Ptah Temple (figure 2). Just to the south-west of the chapel is the small temple to the god Ptah built by Ramesses II (RABI).
The White Walls Chapel site comprises a series of remains of various dates: mainly a chapel of Seti I (New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty) with its later extensions (late New Kingdom and 25th Dynasty), a section of the Hellenistic brick enclosure wall delimiting the southern side of the Great Temple of Ptah, a small tank of unknown date, and a few scattered elements found either loose or in situ in the immediate vicinity of the chapel (figure 6).

Figure 6. Overview of the White Walls Chapel (RAD) showing its component parts. Photo by project archaeologist, looking SE. Photo no. 102532.

The chapel³, dedicated to the God Ptah and to two goddesses of Memphis, is situated within the Great Temple of Ptah enclosure. It consists of an axial chamber built by King Seti I at the beginning of his reign, and two flanking chambers believed to have been added shortly after (New Kingdom). Oriented East-West, each of these three chambers is built of limestone blocks and opens on the West through an independent entrance. This monument shows various similarities (quality, style and iconography) to the well-known temple of Seti I found in

³ Perkins 1949, 41 and pl. IX[a]; C. Desroches-Noblecourt’s account of the excavations in Mit Rahina as reported in Société française d’Égyptologie 1949, 10, 14, 17; Leclant 1951, 345-346 [6] and pl. XXXIII-XXXIV [16-18]; Berlandini 1984a; Berlandini 1984b; Jeffreys 1985, 15, 22 and 73-74, fig. 25 and 37; Smith/Jeffreys 1985, 10.
Abydos⁴, and testifies to the development of new religious practices and to the evolution of the Memphite religious topography throughout the Ramesside period (see below, “narratives”). The chapel area is accessible through an axial gate uncovered a few metres further West (unknown date). Under the 25th dynasty, this small monument was slightly extended with extra wings built on the North and South, probably sometime after Taharqa’s accession to the throne (most likely under Shabaka’s reign)⁵. The Southern section of the building has then been disturbed during the Hellenistic period, when a trench dug to accommodate the new enclosure wall delimiting the Southern edge of Ptah’s precinct.

2. AERA’s Work 2015 (17 December)

Between September and December 2015 the AERA team, including 35 workers cleaned the Ptah Temple West Gate (BAA), Apis House (FAGI), West Chapel (FAGII), and the Hathor Temple (RAG). The White Walls Chapel (RAD) was due for cleaning and recording during April and May 2016.

---

⁴ See for instance comments in BERLANDINI 1984a, 32.
⁵ Two limestone blocks, one of them mentioning “Taharqa beloved of Ptah” (lintel reused in a late wall located on the North of the chapel), and the other one bearing the cartouche of “Shabaka beloved of Ptah” (left jamb of a door found reused in the façade of the Southern wing of the chapel), provide a terminus post quem for these late extensions: see LECLANT 1951, 346; and HABACHI 1979, 49-50 and pl. I. For the importance of Memphis in the 25th dynasty and the intensive building activities undertaken in this city under Taharqa and Shabaka’s reigns, see LECLANT/YOYOTTE 1952, 28.
However, we were fortunate enough to finish cleaning of the 2015 sites before the end of the season. This gave us an opportunity to spend one day cleaning one of the 2016 sites, and we chose the White Walls Chapel (figure 7 & 8). The site was not as heavily overgrown and the workers did a fantastic job of clearing all the vegetation in one day. This was all the work that took place at the chapel in 2015.

![Figure 8. Workers clearing the vegetation (hafta grass and camel thorn) from around the White Walls Chapel on the 17 December 2015. Photo by the Overseer, looking east. Photo no. 821693.](image)

3. AERA’s Work (2016)

AERA’s work on site RAD started on the 12th April 2016 and continued through to the 21st April 2016. During this period a small team of 2-4 workmen cleared the site of vegetation that had grown since December 2015 (figure 9). This was accompanied by an archaeological site assessment consisting of a thorough record of all existing architectural/archaeological features (written record and photography) and survey using a Total Station. Alongside fieldwork, a desk-based assessment was also conducted on the available documentation and a set of documents was produced to enable the students of the next Field Schools to design the future site signage. The methodology and data collected are elaborated below.
Despite having been extensively excavated over the past century, the archaeology, architecture and epigraphy of the monuments found on site RAD remain largely overlooked because poorly documented. Yet, the importance of this small site for the understanding of the whole archaeological area and of the history (notably religious) and town planning of Memphis prompted us to include site RAD in our overall project of protection, presentation and enhancement of the monuments and remains of the ancient city of Memphis. An archaeological site assessment has therefore been undertaken by AERA with a view to record thoroughly the remains present on site and to evaluate their present-day condition.

As for most of the other sites included in the MSCD project, a preliminary clearance of the archaeological area of site RAD was required prior to the archaeological assessment of the remaining monuments. This operation was particularly easy to conduct because 35 workmen had already been sent last season on site (17th December 2015) to clear manually the whole area of its greenery and modern rubbish; in this occasion, the cut foliage and garbage had been collected and transported using a loader and trucks to municipal landfill (together with the rubbish coming from the clearance of the nearby Apis House (FAGI). As a consequence,
only a small team of 2-4 workers were needed this season (14\textsuperscript{th}, 17\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} April 2016) for removing manually the 3-months plant growth covering the site.

At the start of the archaeological site assessment, the AERA team used the only plan available to date as a base map for their record (produced by the \textit{Survey of Memphis} project in the 1980s\textsuperscript{6}). On this occasion, features were systematically numbered (using area code RAD as a prefix) and recorded since, to our knowledge, no full record of the monument has ever been published or provided to us\textsuperscript{7}; consequently every element composing the elevation of the monument have been recorded and described individually. Every feature of interest (inscriptions, decoration, statuary, architectural features) were then photographed.

The site was surveyed, using a total station, by the project surveyor with a view to complete the former map produced by the \textit{Survey of Memphis} project. Special attention has been paid to mapping the upper elements of the elevation the chapel, as well as the numerous blocks found loose in the vicinity of the monuments and the constitutive elements of the tank located on the North of the chapel's gate, since most of these features escaped from the previous surveys of the area.

\textsuperscript{6} JEFFREYS 1985, fig. 25 and 37.

\textsuperscript{7} Habachi’s and Jaromir Malek’s unpublished archives on the epigraphy work still needs to be done.
Figure 10. View of the White Walls Chapel (RAD) on the 17 December 2015, before cleaning. Photo by senior archaeologist, looking SE. Photo no. 102247.

Figure 11. View of the White Walls Chapel (RAD) on the 19 April 2016, after cleaning. Photo by project archaeologist, looking SE. Photo no. 102531.
Figure 12. Map of the White Walls Chapel (RAD) following the April and May 2016 MSCD work.
4. Archaeological Baseline Data Research

Several significant discoveries have been made inside and outside this chapel:\(^8\):

(1) The first striking element is probably the group of three separate large seated statues found in position on a platform at the back of the axial chamber of the chapel\(^9\) (figure 12, 13, & cover image page 1 above). They consist of the God Ptah (centre), flanked (South and North) by two unique goddesses of Memphis personified\(^10\). These are both depicted as seated women holding on their lap a small-scale effigy of King Seti I crowned with a *khepresh* and holding the *heqa*-scepter. It has to be noted that in the 1980s the two heads of the kings were identified by J. Berlandini-Keller as being kept in a Saqqara storehouse\(^11\) (yet to be identified again). These statues bear stylistic details showing similarities with the Memphite style developed at the end of the 18\(^{th}\) dynasty (post-Amarna); this argues in favour of an early execution under the reign of Seti I (his first art period)\(^12\).

\(^8\) See *PM* 3\(^2\), 843 [J].
\(^9\) PERKINS 1949, 41 and pl. IX [a]; C. Desroches-Noblecourt’s account of the excavations in Mit Rahina as reported in *SOCIÉTÉ FRANÇAISE D’ÉGYPTOLOGIE* 1949, 10, 14, 17; LECLANT 1951, 345-346 [6] and pl. XXXIII-XXXIV [16-18]; BERLANDINI 1984a, pl. II [1-2].
\(^10\) According to the convincing analysis and interpretation proposed in BERLANDINI 1984a, 28-52. The following description is mainly based on the results presented in this study. To be noted: in the past, those two goddesses were commonly identified wrongly with Isis and Nephty and Ptah as Osiriss: see for instance PERKINS 1949, 41 and *PM* 3\(^2\), 843 [J].
\(^11\) BERLANDINI 1984a, 42, fig. II and n. 99.
\(^12\) SOUROUZIAN 1993, 248-249; BRAND 2000, 148-149.
(a) In the centre: Ptah which, albeit found headless, is clearly depicted in his classical appearance. The God is wrapped in a cloak adorned with rishi-feather pattern. He bears a large collar and holds his well-known composite sceptre.

(b) On the Southern side of Ptah: a female deity presumably personifying a Memphite topographical feature called Tjesmet (tšm.t), which may have been located somewhere on the South of the Ptah temenos (considering the relative position of the statue within the chapel). This deity is wearing a large wig, wings of a vulture and a modius surmounted by a model of a crenellated tower, whose walls show an incline and are topped with rounded crenation. A fragmentary inscription found on the back pillar of the statue seems to positively identify the fortified element which topped the goddess headdress as a tšm.t. In Egyptian texts, this generic word usually designates any fortified structure used to strengthen the corners, gates and outer faces of enclosure walls (sbty) in defensive places (fortresses, temples, cities); etymologically, the word tšm.t may relate to the idea of vigilance (see tšm “watchdog”). This depiction of a tšm.t could potentially refer here: (1) either indirectly to the enclosure walls of Memphis (the well-known “white walls”), a conspicuous architectural feature commonly used as a synecdoche for designating the whole city of Memphis in Egyptian texts and iconography, (2) or to a hypothetical fortified gate of the Ptah precinct, potentially built by Seti I, and where a specific form of Ptah might have been worshipped (still to be located and identified on site). Despite the absence of archaeological evidence asserting it, the discovery at Memphis of numerous ex-votos depicting an architectural feature similar to our tšm.t (sometimes explicitly named as such), and whose decoration and inscription relate them to the worship of a form of Ptah which the private people could reach out through practices of personal piety, seems to argue in favour of the second identification (2: a fortified gate hosting a statue of Ptah). The location of our chapel – in the

---

13 For a lexicographical presentation of the word tšm.t, see Berlandini 1984a, 34-35.
14 Monnier 2010, 62-64, and 178-179.
15 For examples, see a model of fortress showing a lady worshipping Ptah and a pair of ears (Berlandini 1984a, fig. 1 [a-b]); see also the fortress-shaped libation basin found in the pillared room of the nearby temple of Ramses II dedicated to Ptah, as well as several parallel objects (Jacquet 1958, 161-167; Anthès 1965, 72-77, fig. 6 [a-b] and pl. 24-25 [a-c]; Berlandini 1984a, 33). It has to be noted that these votive models all come from the same archaeological levels (beginning of Ramesside period) and from the same area (outer face of the enclosure wall of the Ptah precinct and vicinity of the chapel of Seti I): Petrie 1909, 7-8 (§20-21) and pl. IX-XIII; Jacquet 1958, 167.
16 Especially two forms of the God Ptah worshipped in Memphis, and known as Ptah “who listens to the prayers” [sšm-nH.wt] and Ptah “of the ancient gate” [n-pA-shA-isy]. See also Wilkinson 2000, 71 (“chapels of the ‘hearing ear’”).
17 For a parallel, see the embrasure of the Southern Gate of Medinet Habu Ramesside temple: Wilkinson 2000, 71.
area of the Southern approach and gate leading to the precinct of Ptah – tends also to support this hypothesis.

(c) On the Northern side of Ptah: another female deity, which again seems to personify a Memphite topographical or architectural entity, in the present case: Mennefer (mn-nfr). It has to be noted that this Northern statue appears slightly smaller and in a more heavy-handed style than the Southern one. In the absence of her headdress (found missing upon the modius), this entity cannot be firmly identified. However, the inscription on the back pillar of the statue provides a conclusive element of identification. This time, the inscription explicitly mentions mn-nfr, a toponym which refers, at the beginning of Ramesside period, either (1) to a specific district of the city of Memphis (c. the location of the original Thinite foundation), or (2) to the city of Memphis as a whole, if not to the Memphite nome itself. In the present case, this designation could also correspond more specifically to the initial centre founded by Pepi I in the Old Kingdom18 and which could hypothetically be located on the North of the Ptah temple, as is again precisely the case of the statue which was found seated on the North side of the God Ptah within the chapel. If the identification of a Mennefer entity is correct, this could provide some clue for reconstructing the missing headdress of the statue: the head of the goddess may have originally been surmounted by a sort of oblong vertical element, midway between an obelisk, a pyramid, a stela, the façade of a chapel and the Heliopolitan betyl19.

(2) Only parts of the wall decoration of the chapel has survived:

(a) According to former visitors and commentators, the preserved elevation of the monument bears, for the outer faces of the three chambers: a decorative program related to the cult of Ptah and Sekhmet20; and for the inner faces of the axial chamber: references to the aforementioned group of statues standing at the back of the chapel (especially inner side walls)21. In this regard, it has to be noted that the chapel of Seti I provides one of the few examples, found to date, of a fully preserved and contextualised case of correspondence between full-relief statues and low-relief wall decoration22. Furthermore, the content of those depictions tends to indicate that the group of three seated statues found in the axial chapel

---

18 MONNIER 2010, 178.
19 As is suggested by later depictions of Mennefer personified on a series of Ptolemaic coffins found in Saqqara: see BERLANDINI 1984a, n. 78.
20 LECLANT 1951, 346.
21 SOUROUZIAN 1993, 247 and 249, and pl. 48 [a-b].
22 SOUROUZIAN 1993, 239-257.
may have been originally completed by a statue of the king kneeling and bringing a table filled with offerings (now missing). Here again, the post-Amarna-influenced style of the figures argues in favour of an early date in the reign of Seti I.

(b) The PM also mentions the doorway lintel of the South side chamber which shows a double depiction of a (unidentified) King before Ptah.

c) A fragment of limestone cavetto cornice inscribed with the cartouches of Seti I, found loose among rubble in the vicinity of the monument and now exhibited in the Museum of Mit Rahina (next to the colossus of Ramses II), was also identified as coming from this chapel of Seti I.

(d) A limestone fragment of relief bearing the head of a goddess breastfeeding the king was uncovered in 1948, fallen down at the back of the seated statues of Ptah and of the Northern goddess; this slab (?) apparently comes from the decoration of the inner back wall of the monument and can be dated from the reign of Seti I on the basis of its fragmentary inscription. This relief, which has been looted perhaps shortly after its discovery, was reported missing for decades before that the Metropolitan Museum, New York, identified it while this fragment was on loan at the museum from a private collector (since 1996). The Met succeeded in negotiating its return back to Egypt in 2001. The relief now belongs to the Egyptian Museum collections in Cairo under the inventory number JE 99091.

(3) A limestone stela (70 x 50 cm), commemorating construction works undertaken by King Merneptah in the area, was found in the vicinity of the chapel (to be located). It shows King Merneptah making offerings to the God Ptah, and mentions the erection of a large enclosure wall: “he made (this) as a monument for his father Ptah, making for him the Great Wall of mry-n-pth-ḫr-mȝʿ.t who makes wide the space for Ptah” (Ir.n=f m mnw n ʾṯ=f ṣḥ.t n=f sbty ʾž n mry-n-pth-ḫr-mȝʿ.t swsḥ n ṣḥ). This stela may have originally been embedded

---

23 SOurouzian 1993, 249-250.
24 Described in PM 3², 843 [J], after a picture published in HABACHI 1979, pl. I.
26 See the position of this relief on an archival photograph published in BERLANDINI 1988, pl. 3.
27 This story is reported in an online article published by the Archaeological Institute of America: SCHUSTER 2001.
28 See the Global Egyptian Museum database: http://www.globalegyptianmuseum.org/record.aspx?id=15845
29 ANTHES 1959, 5 and pl. 9 [a]; text in KRI IV, 32 [14].
into the brick masonry of this enclosure wall\textsuperscript{30}, before this wall was destroyed and replaced by later constructions\textsuperscript{31}.

(4) The vicinity and late extensions of the chapel bequeathed a series of reused blocks. Among them, several date from the reign of Taharqa and Shabaka, and testify to the intense building activity undertaken in this area of Memphis during the 25\textsuperscript{th} dynasty\textsuperscript{32}. These re-used stone elements may come originally from one or several Memphite chapels of Shabaka, whose nature and location have not been identified to date\textsuperscript{33}:

(a) First, what seems to be a fragment of a finely carved lintel (limestone?) was found in 1963 in the vicinity of the chapel\textsuperscript{34}. This block shows a fragmentary depiction of the goddess Mut (recognisable through her pschent and a damaged writing of her name) and bears an inscription mentioning king Shabaka. This block is reported missing for decades\textsuperscript{35}; it testifies however the existence in this area under the 25\textsuperscript{th} dynasty of a cult dedicated to a rare form of Mut, known as the one “who is in front of the House of Ptah” (\textit{ḥnt pr pth})\textsuperscript{36}.

(b) A piece of a left door jamb made of limestone, and bearing the name of “Shabaka beloved of Ptah”, was found re-used in the façade of the late Southern extension of the chapel of Seti I. This block has obviously been robbed sometime after its discovery, before

\textsuperscript{30} About the tradition of embedding royal commemorative stelae into enclosure walls, see TRAUNECKER 1975, 144-145.

\textsuperscript{31} It seems unlikely that this stela was embedded into the Hellenistic wall found on the South of the chapel, considering the late date of this wall: for a different opinion, see the suggestions of L. Habachi in ANTHES 1965, 5.

\textsuperscript{32} See for instance comments and bibliography provided in LECLANT/JOYOTTE 1952, 28 and n. 4; LECLANT 1981, 289-294; and BERLANDINI 1984b, 35-40.

\textsuperscript{33} BERLANDINI 1984b, 37-38. Some other elements coming from one or several chapels of Shabaka have been found in the same area, reused in the nearby and within the Apis premises located North of the chapel of Seti I: see a reused block found in the West Chapel (site FAE: PETRIE 1909, 10 [§ 29, 31] and pl. XXV [bottom left] and XXVII [top left]; JONES 1983, 37-38; and JONES 1985, 26), the slabs of a doorway (usurped by Psamtik II) found reused in the masonry of the purification place of Apis (site FAG: JONES 1985, 26-27 and fig. 10-12) and another single block found in the false-door passage of the same monument (site FAG: JONES 1985, 26, n. 16).

\textsuperscript{34} BERLANDINI 1984a, 42 and fig. IV; and BERLANDINI 1984b, 31-40 and fig. 1.

\textsuperscript{35} To date, we do not know whether this block is currently stored in one of the numerous storehouses of the Saqqara Inspectorate, or else in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, or if it has been looted before ending up in a private collection: see BERLANDINI 1984b, 31.

\textsuperscript{36} Cult attested in the Memphite area since the 18\textsuperscript{th} dynasty, and which became increasingly in favour under the Ramesside kings, up to the TIP and Persian period. According to J. BERLANDINI (1984b, 34), this form of Mut had nothing to do with its homonymic Theban forms, and its origin shall be found in ancient local goddesses worshipped in the Memphite area.
being acquired illegally by a dealer in 1966 who sold it to the Ägyptisches Museum in Berlin (where it has been kept, since then, under the inventory number 39/66)\(^{37}\).

(c) A fragment of what could have been a lintel has also been found re-used in a later wall located on the North of the chapel of Seti I. This block, which is now reported as missing or lost, was still bearing an inscription mentioning “Taharqa beloved of Ptah”\(^{38}\).

(5) During the excavation of the Chapel of Seti I and its surrounding area, hundreds of objects of various types and material have apparently been discovered, consisting of: foundation deposits, ex-votos, statues, stelae, etc.\(^{39}\). To date all this excavated material remains unpublished; part of it appears to be kept in one of the storehouses of the Mit Rahina-Saqqara inspectorates (see below “previous excavations”).

(6) At the time of the excavation, a number of blocks and columns were found around the chapel. According to D.G. Jeffreys, who had available unpublished archive pictures, some of these blocks are now lying loose along the Hellenistic enclosure wall:

(a) A large split block with square recesses which “is in fact a ramp-and-stair section which originally stood in front of the chapel”\(^{40}\).

(b) A severely damaged large limestone cult-model of the Memphite ṭṣm.t (i.e. the hearing wall/fortified gate of the God Ptah) bearing fainted lines of inscriptions. This model has been identified in situ in the South-Western nearby of the chapel by J. Berlandini in 1983\(^{41}\). It has to be noted though that when J. Berlandini came to the site, the chapel itself was no longer in position, for it had been raised and partially reconstructed by the MSA in the 1960s (see below “previous excavations”). It seems likely that this model escaped this restoration campaign; this seems to be confirmed by D.G. Jeffreys who locates, for his part, this cult-model (at the time of his survey of the area in the 1980s) “in front (i.e. west) of this chapel”,

\(^{37}\) First mentioned by LECLANT 1951, 346; recorded and described in the Berlin collections by KAISER 1967, 96 [957] and fig. 957; identified in Berlin collections and reported as robbed by HABACHI 1979, 49-50 and pl. I (block visible on the right of the lintel); studied by LECLANT 1981, 290-294 and pl. 44 [a-b]. To be noted: J. BERLANDINI (1984b, 37 and n. 28) mentions the existence of another fragmentary doorjamb of Shabaka (now kept in Japan, at the Middle Eastern Culture, Tokyo) which style argues in favour of a similar origin.

\(^{38}\) First mentioned by J. LECLANT (1951, 346).

\(^{39}\) Mentioned in the brief reports published in ANTHES 1965, 60. See also BERLANDINI 1988, 35-36.

\(^{40}\) JEFFREYS 1985, 73 and n. 574: identification based again on the examination of archival photographs taken by L. Habachi in 1952 (then in possession of J. Berlandini).

\(^{41}\) BERLANDINI 1984a, 33 and n. 23.
and deduces its original location, “at the right of the chapel door” apparently based on the interpretation of archival photographs42.

Some other blocks were instead removed to the Museum where they are now exhibited in the shelter together with the colossus of Ramesses II:

(c) This is the case of two slabs bearing depictions of a king and the gods Ptah and Sekhmet during the jubilee festival, and which may have originally belonged to other chapels in the area43.

PREVIOUS EXCAVATIONS:

- This chapel was uncovered accidentally in 1948, when the Irrigation Department dug a drain from East to West in the archaeological area in order to lower the level of the subsoil water44. These drain-cutting operations exposed some walls of the chapel as well as a section of the Northern face of the Southern enclosure wall (Hellenistic period) of the Ptah temple precinct45.

- Systematic excavations have then been conducted shortly after, in June-September 1948, by the inspectorate of Saqqara (namely by a local inspector known as Hâshim ‘Assaf46). This exposed the whole structure of the chapel; on this occasion, a series of stelae and statues (in bronze and various stones) were unearthed inside and in the immediate vicinity of the monument. Most of this work remains unpublished47.

- In November-December 1950, further excavations have been undertaken by L. Habachi in the same area. This work led to the discovery of the axial portal which gives access to the chapel, of additional bronze statues and slabs48, and of the ramp-and-stair and cult-model of the ṯsm.t mentioned above49. Here again, the archaeological material coming from the excavation of the area remains unpublished.

43 MOUSSA 1982, 115-118 and pl. I [a-b].
44 ANTHES 1959, 4-5, and 1965, 60; for the outline of the drain, see ANTHES 1959, pl. I.
45 For maps of the area, see JEFFREYS 1985, fig. 25 and 37.
46 PERKINS 1949, 41. JEFFREYS 1985, 95, n. 170.
47 General information about these excavations is concisely reported in PERKINS 1949, 41 and pl. IX [a]; SOCIÉTÉ FRANÇAISE D’ÉGYPTEOLOGIE 1949, 10, 14 and 17; LECLANT 1951, 345 and fig. 16-18.
48 See ANTHES 1965, 60.
49 JEFFREYS 1985, n. 574.
- For conservation purposes, in the 1960s, the Ministry of Antiquities (MoA) decided to raise (approx. 1.50 m higher than its original position) and reconstruct the chapel, giving it its present aspect and location\textsuperscript{50}.

- From the early 1980s, J. Berlandini-Keller joined L. Habachi to undertake the final publication of the monument. This joint study started with archival work among the documentation gathered by L. Habachi (1982-1983) and was followed by one fieldwork season (November-December 1983). On this occasion, J. Berlandini-Keller and L. Habachi requested a detailed large-scale plan from D. Jeffreys of the Survey of Memphis project who was then mapping the Memphite area. This constitutes the only survey of the monument available to date; it has to be noted though that this plan represents the chapel in its current location, after it had been raised and restored (see above)\textsuperscript{51}. During this single fieldwork season, J. Berlandini-Keller and L. Habachi managed to locate and identify, in one of the storehouses of the inspectorates of Saqqara and Mit Rahina, several sealed cases coming from L. Habachi’s excavations (yet to be identified again), and containing hundreds of unpublished objects which would be particularly useful for determining the use, purpose and chronology of the monument; unfortunately J. Berlandini and L. Habachi could not obtain the authorisation to examine the content of these cases any further\textsuperscript{52}. Their collaboration ended up in a few articles examining the purpose and decorative program of the chapel, as well as its function and location within the network of small chapels built in the Southern area of Ptah temenos\textsuperscript{53}. It seems however that the comprehensive publication of the monument was curtailed due to the death of L. Habachi and the many difficulties encountered by the team for examining the unpublished material stored in Saqqara and Mit Rahina\textsuperscript{54}.

\textsuperscript{50} Jeffreys/Smith 1985, 10.
\textsuperscript{51} Jeffreys/Smith 1985, 10. The plan is provided in Jeffreys 1985, fig. 37 ("chapel (‘oratory’) of Seti I. restored").
\textsuperscript{52} Berlandini 1988, 36.
\textsuperscript{53} Berlandini 1984a, 28-52; Berlandini 1988, 35-36.
\textsuperscript{54} See conclusions in Berlandini 1988, 36.
RESULTS OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE-ASSESSMENT:

The site-assessment initiated this season on Site RAD enabled to draw up a series of observations.

After clearing the whole area from vegetation, the chapel and its gateway appeared in quite good condition with only few damages to be noted on the North door jamb of the entrance gateway (figure 14 & 15). Actually vandalism appears to be the main source of harm having recently affected the monuments on site RAD. From what we understand, the chapel was broken into and its content vandalised 10 years ago (personal communication with site, ghafir); on this occasion, the two goddesses’ statues have been beheaded. Subsequently, the axial doorway of the chapel was permanently blocked with a modern masonry which still prevents access to the inside of the monument today (figure 14).

Figure 14. Front view of the White Walls Chapel (looking east) post-cleaning. Photo by project archaeologist. Photo no. 102503.
The clearance of the area exposed the set of modern platforms upon which the different parts of the monument have been rebuilt and raised 1.50 m above their original floor level (see above “previous excavations”. These consist of: (1) a stepped platform made of limestone blocks assembled and coated with cement which supports the gateway of the chapel (figure 14 & 15); (2) a platform made of big limestone blocks upon which stands the axial chamber of the chapel; (3) two separate platforms adjoined to the central one, made of a masonry of small limestone blocks topped with a paving of limestone slabs, which support respectively the remains of the North side chamber of the chapel, and its South side chamber and South extension (figure 14, 16, & 17).
The cleaning of the area also revealed the upper outline of the buried U-shaped mudbrick structure which apparently supports the set of modern platforms and was used in the raising process\(^{55}\).

These modern platforms, on which the chapel and its gateway are currently standing, show clear signs of collapse probably due to land subsidence; it seems that the backfill used to raise the monument has got more compacted over time. The North part of the gateway’s platform is ruptured while its South part has slightly caved in, disclosing its structure beneath the cement coating (figures 14). Likewise, a crack and signs of collapse can be observed on the North quarter of the middle platform on which the axial chamber of the chapel is standing. It has to be noted though that these platforms have contributed to keep the chapel and its gateway effectively away not only from subsoil water but also from vegetation-related harm.

\(^{55}\) The shadow on the ground of this construction can be seen in figure 2 and 14.
Figure 17. The remains of the Late Period southern extension showing the concrete and limestone foundation. Photo by project archaeologist, looking NW. Photo no. 102495.

Despite being exposed to the elements and vegetation for decades, the remnants of the Hellenistic enclosure wall (figure 18), as well as the in situ tank (figure 19) and the numerous loose blocks found in the immediate vicinity of the Chapel of Seti I (figure 17 & 18) all appear in relative good condition.

The current condition of every of these monuments is elaborated below.
Figure 18. The Hellenistic mudbrick enclosure wall of the Great Ptah Temple. Photo by project archaeologist, looking SE. Photo no. 102525.

Figure 19. The brick and stone built tank on the northern side of the White Walls Chapel. Photo by project archaeologist, looking north. Photo no. 102509.
The Chapel of Seti I

The Chapel of Seti I constitutes the most conspicuous monument currently visible on site RAD. As mentioned above, the chapel and its gateway are no longer in position since the 1960s when they have been raised and rebuilt for conservation purposes. The outer structure of the chapel appears in good condition, only ancient destruction especially in the lower part of the walls.

The modern restorations are also still in very good condition; especially: (1) the limestone blocks and cement filling the wall gaps and forming the reconstructed upper part of the elevation of the axial chamber, (2) the modern roof which seals the top of it, and (3) the massive back wall made of limestone blocks coated with cement against which the three chambers have been rebuilt. However, some flaws can be observed in the restoration undertaken for the side chapels. In particular: a noticeable gap can be observed at their point of contact with the axial chamber. The walls of the two side chambers have been rebuilt slightly away from their original location (characterised by their distinctive rough surface which has been reworked in ancient times in order to engage with the wall and doorjamb of these later adjunctions); they now conceal part of the wall decoration of the axial chamber (figures 20).

Figure 20. Doorjamb of the north chamber reconstructed slightly away from the wall of the axial chamber and now concealing inscriptions. Photo by project archaeologist, looking south. Photo no. 102443
AERA’s record of the monument enables to get a more detail picture of the decorative program and architecture of this chapel.

(1) First of all, it should be recalled that the axial chamber of this chapel which probably constitutes the main feature of interest of the monument is currently not opened to visitors, its doorway being blocked with a modern masonry to protect its contents. This season, AERA has not been authorised entry the axial chapel for assessing the condition of its inner walls and statuary. Luckily, the inner decoration and statuary of the axial chamber are, to date, the only part of the monument which has been extensively published and commented\textsuperscript{56}.

An assessment of the decoration of the outer walls of the axial chamber was however possible. The low-relief decoration of the North, West and South outer faces of the building is still perfectly visible and show a few traces of its original painting:

(a) The façade of the chamber still bears on both sides of the entrance doorway inscriptions and depictions of King Seti I designed as a symmetrical composition on the right side, two scenes depicting from left to right: 1. the King receiving the life-sign ankh from Sekhmet (large scale), and 2. the King performing an unidentified action (small-scale); on the left side, the remains of a similar composition from which only 3. the standing King (large scale) is still visible.

(b) The Northern outer face of the chamber still shows inscriptions and depictions of the King and the God Ptah embracing each other (figure 20), and of the King consecrating offerings to a deity (destroyed). The Southern outer face of the chamber bears a similar decorative program with the King and the God Ptah again embracing each other, and then the King making offerings to Ptah standing in his shrine.

(c) The corner blocks also bear the remains of the torus which once adorned the corners of the façade of the chamber.

(2) The North side chamber of the chapel is very fragmentary. As at the time of its discovery, only a few blocks of the original structure of the chamber (the façade) are remaining and have been rebuilt by the MoA\textsuperscript{57}. Based on what can be observed on archive pictures, it has to be noted though that two blocks of the upper course of the right doorjamb of the chamber

\textsuperscript{56} See in particular BERLANDINI 1984a for the statuary, and SOUROUZIAN 1993, 247-250 and pl. 46-48 for its inner wall decoration.

\textsuperscript{57} Nothing more was remaining of this side chamber even at the time of the excavation of the chapel: see photograph in LECLANT 1951, pl. 34 [17]. To be noted though: it seems that the assemblage of blocks constituting the Southern section of the façade was slightly different from the one reconstructed by the MSA.
seem to be missing now. None of the blocks currently on site shows any trace of decoration. However, a small-scale seated statue of Ptah (figure 21), made of limestone and whose upper part is missing, is cemented against the front of the North door jamb of the entrance of the chamber. To our knowledge, this statue has never been recorded or described, but it appears already in the same position on excavation pictures and has been mapped by the Survey of Memphis project in the early 1980s.

Figure 21. Remains of the bottom half of a small seated statue of the god Ptah at the entrance to the northern chamber. Photo by project archaeologist, looking NE. Photo no. 102381.

(3) Nothing currently remains from the Northern later addition to the chapel reported by former commentators and which is known as having contained a reused lintel of Taharqa (see above “the site” [6c], block now missing). At this stage, we do not know what happened to this section of the chapel, notably whether this was far too denuded for the officers of the MSA to rebuild it when they undertook the raising and reconstruction of the monument.

(4) The South side chamber of the chapel appears in good condition. Its reconstruction by the MoA seems to be quite faithful to the original assemblage found during the excavation of

58 Unfortunately, the pictures available to date do not show the bottom of the North doorjamb: see for instance LECLANT 1951, pl. 34 [17].
the chapel\textsuperscript{59}. Despite the gap mentioned above (see point of contact between the façade of the side chamber and the Southern wall of the axial chamber), the façade of the chamber still shows its decorated lintel standing upon its original doorjambs (figure 22). During AERA’s record, it has been observed that this lintel bears not only a double depiction of a king (unidentified) making offerings to Ptah on its West face\textsuperscript{60} but also traces of decoration on its South face which could argue in favour of a re-used block (secondary use).

![Figure 22. Façade of the southern chamber. Photo by project archaeologist, looking east. Photo no. 102368.](image)

The examination of the lintel also revealed that, despite its small size, this doorway was designed to engage with a double leaf door opening inwards (the lintel shows two door sockets: figure 23). The decorative program of the Southern wall of this side chamber is still visible. Though poorly preserved, the inner face of the wall still bears traces of a depiction of the king making offerings to the God Ptah standing inside his shrine. The decoration of the outer face of the wall is comparatively well preserved and has been partially reconstructed by the MoA; it shows the king offering Maât to the God Ptah standing inside his shrine and followed by the Goddess Sekhmet standing.

\textsuperscript{59} See photographs published in \textit{LECLANT} 1951, pl. 34 [17] and \textit{HABACHI} 1979, pl. I.

\textsuperscript{60} See the double depiction reported by in \textit{PM} 3\textsuperscript{2}, 843 [J].
(5) Unlike the Northern later adjunct described above, the Late Wing adjoined to the South of the Southern side chamber has been fully rebuilt by the MoA. It consists of a façade wall which comprises at its Southern end the North doorjamb of a doorway (figure 24). This doorjamb still shows the shape of an embrasure and what could have been a square hole for a door bolt. Again this reconstruction seems to be rather faithful to the original assemblage exposed by the excavation. The only notable difference is the absence of the re-used block inscribed with the name of Shabaka and about which we know that it once stood in the sixth course of the wall masonry, next to the doorjamb of the South side chamber (a gap is now visible where this block once stood) (figure 22). AERA’s record of the architecture of the monument led to the identification of five additional re-used blocks in the South wing wall which still bear traces of inscriptions.

61 From what we can judge based on comparisons with the excavation photographs published to date: see LECLANT 1951, pl. 34 [17] and HABACHI 1979, pl. I.
62 Block visible in HABACHI 1979, pl. I.
The Hellenistic enclosure wall

The two remaining portions of the Hellenistic enclosure wall bordering the Southern side of site RAD appear in relatively good condition (figures 18). Especially, the Western section of the wall, whose North face shows an elevation consisting of several courses of mudbricks. Likewise, the Western end of this section of the wall still shows the remnants of the south-west corner at more than 90°, as observed and mapped by the Survey of Memphis project.

The tank

During AERA’s new survey of site RAD, the rectangular tank mapped by the Survey of Memphis project on the North-West of the Chapel of Seti I has been found buried in situ (figure 19). The cleaning of the tank revealed further details about its structure, in particular it shows that, while its rim frame is made of limestone, its bottom is composed of a layer of five rows of fired bricks. This feature is probably therefore of the Ptolemaic or Roman Period.
Several series of loose blocks

A number of stone architectural elements of various sizes and shapes has been found loose throughout site RAD, especially along the Northern face of the Hellenistic enclosure wall (figure 18) and at the back of the Southern extension of the Chapel of Seti I (figure 17 & 24). It appeared from the results of AERA's research that none of these stone elements had ever been recorded before, with the exception of a socket (figure 25: for a wooden canopy?) and two slightly curved blocks mapped by D.G. Jeffreys for the *Survey of Memphis* project, and which have been found in the same position in 2016. Therefore, our task consisted in a thorough mapping and recording of each of these loose elements.

*Figure 15.* Stone sockets found loose in the North-West nearby and at the back of the Chapel. Photograph by project archaeologist. Looking down. Photo no. 102521 and 102484.

More than 40 stone elements have thus been surveyed this season.

Among the blocks found at the back of the Chapel were identified a variety of stone elements: a fragmentary rectangular basin, various fragments of door lintels with their upper cavetto cornice and door socket, a socket (figure 25: for a wooden canopy?, similar to the one mentioned above), a slab topped with a cavetto cornice (maybe from the casing of an altar), and various blocks coming from the masonry of a wall and from a doorjamb (which three show traces of inscription).
Ramp-and-stair (figure 26)

Figure 26. Fragment of a stone ramp-and-stair. Photograph by project archaeologist. South facing. Photo no. 102504.

Column capital (figure 27)

Figure 27. Stone column capital. Photograph by project archaeologist. West facing. Photo no. 102523.
Cult model?: Desroches-Noblecourt 1949, 10 (photograph); Copy David; Leclant 1951, fig. 17; Berlandini 1988, pl. III

D'après les photos d'archives: aussi un élément sculpté (fragment de naos ?) présentant la face du dieu Ptah (gauche de l'entrée de la chapelle axiale): Berlandini 1988, pl. III; Copy David;

- At the time of its discovery, the elevation of the monument was still reaching 1,5 m high. It has to be noted yet that the monument is no longer in position as it had been restored and raised by the MoA to keep it away from subsoil water-related harm (see above). Likewise, the inside of the axial chamber is now no longer accessible since its door has been walled and its roof sealed by the MSA (unknown date), obviously in order to protect its contents.

---

63 See estimation proposed after archival pictures in Jeffreys 1985, 73 and n. 570.
NARRATIVES

The Chapel of Seti I is remarkable at various levels:

- First of all, this chapel constitutes the only monument of king Seti I still standing on the site of Memphis, and as such, the only direct evidence of his building activities in the Memphite area. It is assumed, however, that Seti I’s building program in the Memphite area was far more extensive. To date, the presence of other monuments of this king can be guessed from the discovery of inscribed blocks found loose throughout the site\textsuperscript{64}, a few elements coming from a foundation deposit but whose exact provenance remains unknown\textsuperscript{65}, an inscribed statue\textsuperscript{66}, and a few references in later texts\textsuperscript{67}.

Furthermore, this chapel impresses by its unique decoration and content (see above “the site”), which testify to new religious practices and to the evolution of the religious topography of this section of the Memphite sacred area from the reign of Seti I and throughout the Ramesside period. Indeed, and as shown above, the design of this monument and the deities worshipped inside it seem to coincide with the development, under the reign of Seti I, of new practices in the vicinity of temples and a new building program. In particular: the development of oracular practices and the increasing importance of temples’ gates and enclosure walls which became favoured loci of private devotion and for rendering justice\textsuperscript{68}. A concentration of votive objects found in the South of the Ptah temenos\textsuperscript{69} testifies to the existence around there of a “hearing wall or gate” (probably the enclosure wall of the Ptah precinct or one of its gates) through which the god Ptah could be reached and worshipped by

\textsuperscript{64} See especially a lintel uncovered in the vicinity of the palace of Merneptah at Kôm Qal’a which testifies to the existence of another chapel dedicated by Seti I to the Theban gods Amun-Re and Mut: BRAND 2000, 149 [3.36] and comments in 352.

\textsuperscript{65} These elements testify to the erection of a temple dedicated to Ptah, or most likely, of “a large hypostyle hall added to the main sanctuary of Ptah” (BRAND 2000, 146 [3.32]).

\textsuperscript{66} BRAND 2000, 147 [3.33: Seti kneeling before Atum].

\textsuperscript{67} Two additional establishments built by king Seti I are known from texts, among which what could have been his memorial temple: BRAND 2000, 352-353.

\textsuperscript{68} See especially BERLANDINI 1984a, 32-38.

\textsuperscript{69} EATON 2012, 125. For examples, see the model of a fortress showing a lady worshiping Ptah and a pair of ears (BERLANDINI 1984a, fig. 1 [a-b]); see also the fortress-shaped libation basin found in the pillared room of the nearby temple of Ramses II dedicated to Ptah, as well as several parallel objects (JACQUET 1958, 161-167; ANTHES 1965, 72-77, fig. 6 [a-b] and pl. 24-25 [a-c]; BERLANDINI 1984a, 33). It has to be noted that these votive models all come from the same archaeological levels (beginning of Dynasty 19) and from the same area (outer face of the enclosure wall of the Ptah precinct or vicinity of the chapel of Seti I): PETRIE 1909, 7-8 (§20-21) and pl. IX-XIII; JACQUET 1958, 167.
ordinary people (by “listening” to their prayers). We also know from texts that the New Kingdom was marked by an increasing tendency to transfer some acts of justice to the temples (see especially the practice of rendering justice at the gates of temples).

Likewise, this chapel could also fit into the building program undertaken by Seti I from the beginning of his reign to consolidate his dynasty and bring some unity throughout Egypt. This implied the erection of religious monuments where the three main state gods of Egypt – that is: Ptah of Memphis, Amun-Re of Thebes, and Re-Horakhty of Heliopolis – were worshiped together according to newly designed cultic schemes (see the monuments erected by Seti I in Thebes, Abydos and Memphis).

Finally, we should also mention the possibility that the unusual characteristics of one of the deities worshipped in this chapel (see below the šm.t-goddess) may also reflect the appearance of new architectural features and forms related to the overall “military” policy of King Seti I (development of defensive architecture within and outside Egyptian borders, concurrently with the numerous victorious campaigns conducted in Asia).

It has to be noted that the chapel of Seti I provides one of the few examples found to date of a fully preserved and contextualised case of correspondence between full-relief statues and low-relief wall decoration (see above the description of the content and decoration of the axial chamber).

---

70 The documentation testifies to the existence of two forms of the God Ptah worshipped in Memphis, and known as Ptah “who listens to the prayers” [šDm-nH.wt] and Ptah “of the ancient gate” [n-pA-sbA-isy]. See also Wilkinson 2000, 71 (“chapels of the ‘hearing ear’”).
71 Sauneron 1954, 120-123.
73 See Berlandini 1984a, 36.
74 Sourouzian 1993, 239-257.
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1. Introduction

The Hathor Temple (RAG) is situated on the southern side of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road, 128 m. south-west of the Memphis Open-Air Museum (QAS), and 125 m. south-east of the White Walls Chapel (RAD) (figure 1). The temple, which is not open to visitors, is orientated north/south and comprises a partially exposed colonnaded hall on the north and sanctuaries on the south. The southern and eastern side of the temple are overlaid by later deposits and mudbrick architecture.

Figure 1. Google-Earth image of south central Memphis showing the location of the eight sites of the MSCD project. The Hathor Temple is no. 6 on the map. AERAgam 16.2, page 4.
The whole area south of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road is Ministry of Antiquities (MoA) land but apart from the fencing running along the road, there is no other official boundary demarcating the exact limits of the MoA land in the south. Running across the MoA land south of the road are a number of informal paths used by local residents. The Hathor Temple can be accessed from all directions via a combination of narrow paths used for walking or travel by donkey, and much wider paths (west and south of the temple) used by cars, trucks, and tuk-tuks (figure 2).

![Figure 2](image)

Figure 2. Sketch of the pathways around the Hathor Temple. Not to scale, by senior archaeologist.

In order to integrate the Hathor Temple into the Memphis Walking Circuit with the other seven sites of the project, two paths on the northern side of the site were widened by clearing vegetation and lined with split palm tree logs. These two paths were coded by the project; XAB3 and XAB4 (see figure 2). These paths were created during the 2016, April and May season with XAB3 measuring 68 m in length by 2.5 m in width, and path XAB4 measuring 126 m in length by 2.5 m in width (figure 3 and 4).
Figure 3. View of path XAB3 in the foreground leading to the Hathor Temple (RAG) and Ramesses II Chapel (RAB I). Photo by the Overseer, looking west. Photo no. 823426.

Figure 4. Close-up of the intersection of path XAB3 and XAB4 leading to the Hathor Temple (RAG). Photo by Field Director, looking west. Photo no. 102878.
The limestone remains of the temple are up to 5 metres below the present day surrounding ground surface. There are no information boards or signage at the site. The only indication that there is a temple dedicated to Hathor in the area, comes from a sign listing sites, outside the Memphis Museum.

The temple is almost completely surrounded, on the upper high ground by a metal fence (figure 5, 6 & 17). This fence comprises thin vertical iron posts placed at intervals along the southern, western, and part of the eastern side of the site. These posts are cemented into the ground. The fence itself is made up of five rows of thin metal wire threaded through holes in the iron posts. In places, between the posts, these rows are held together by welded vertical pieces of wire. The rows of wire are mostly in place along the southern and western side of the site. The wire is almost completely missing from the eastern side of the site.

![Figure 5. Close-up view of the wire fence surrounding the Hathor Temple (RAG). Students and supervisors from MSCD FS2, 2015, walking around the temple, on the outside. Photo by project photographer, looking south. Photo no. 702934.](image)

There is no formal access point into the temple site itself. Due to the poor quality of the fence, access down into the temple can be made from any direction. However, the northern, western, and southern sides of the site are fairly steep and comprise loose archaeology, making entry rather dangerous. The eastern side of the site is generally from where people descend into the temple because not only is the fence missing but this side of the site slopes
down more gradually from east to west (figure 6 & 7). The absence of any formal access point, means that anybody could walk directly onto the site.

Figure 6. The eastern side of the site showing where the metal fence ends and where access into the temple is mostly made. Photo by project photographer, looking NE. Photo no. 703241.

Figure 7. View of the informal route into the site that slopes down gradually from south to north. Photo by the Overseer, looking east. Photo no. 821160.
The site is protected by a mudbrick and limestone-built guard hut situated on the northern side of the site (figure 8 & 17). The hut is square in shape and has a roofed porch on its eastern side where the entrance to the hut is located. There is a small window on all four sides of the hut. Additional security comes in the form of a wooden post with two light bulbs located on the high ground, in the south-west corner of the site (figure 9).

Figure 8. View of the guard hut on the northern side of the Hathor Temple site. Photo by the project photographer, looking NE. Photo no. 703274.

Figure 9. View of the light post in the southwest corner of the site with students and supervisors from the second MSCD field school (FS2) walking past. Photo by project archaeologist, looking NE. Photo no. 102036.
The electricity cable for the lamp post comes from the guard hut and hangs across the site (see photo 101908).

The temple was originally found by the Egyptian army in 1969, whilst digging air raid shelters. Surrounding the site there are other military related constructions. These take the form of linear metal-grill subterranean structures that were to function as storage cages. On the whole only the upper part of the structure is visible. One of these cages is situated in the south-west corner of the site; inside the perimeter fence (figure 10 & 17). Only the NW and SE limits of the cage are visible, with the most of the structure covered by the mound of spoil on the western side of the site. A more exposed [one of these cages] is situated just to the east of the site and orientated N/S (figure 11).

**Figure 10.** The southeast part of the metal cage can be seen in the top left of the photo. Photo by the Overseer, looking SW. Photo no. 821097.
The north part of the temple courtyard was then excavated and recorded in 1970 by Abdulla Sayed Mahmoud for the Ministry of Antiquities (el-Sayed Mahmoud 1978). The southern part of the temple was excavated in 1978 by Huleil Ghaly. Further excavations took place in 1984, by Abd al Karim Abu Shanab. In c.1985 the Egypt Exploration Society planned the architectural elements of the temple (Jeffreys 1985, 25-26). The site is regularly cleaned (pers. comm. and evidenced by changes in foliage coverage in google earth).

All existing features connected with visitor experience of the site, such as modern building, interpretative signs, visitor facilities and visitor routes, were recorded using pro-forma forms and photography, by the MoA students of field school group 2 (FS2), in 2015.

2. AERA’s work 2015 (4 November – 17 December)

The aim of the work in 2015 was to clear the site (within the perimeter fence) of vegetation, undertake a written and photographic record of all the archaeological features (as well as modern features such as the fence electricity posts, guard hut etc.), and survey these features using a Total Station. There was a light covering of foliage within and around the temple comprising patches of *halfa* grass (figure 12). Although this plant growth was present along the western border of the site, it was more concentrated in the central and southern
part which, due to its lower elevation, is damp from the presence of ground water. The clearing of this vegetation was undertaken by a team of 30 workmen on 22 November (figure 13). Since the temple is filled with unexcavated archaeological deposits, and the sections that border the temple are densely packed with material culture, we decided not to conduct a ‘fine clean’ of the temple. Such a clean would have generated a considerable amount of material culture that we would have not been able to properly provenance. It would also have led to a substantial body of material that we would not have been able to properly process (clean, identify, analyze, and store).

Figure 12. View of the Hathor Temple site RAG looking east prior to cleaning. Photo by project photographer, photo no. 703233.

Figure 13. Workers lightly cleaning the Hathor Temple (RAG) of vegetation. Photo by the Overseer, looking NW. Photo no. 821161.
For the recording, we used, as a template, the map by David Jeffreys and the Survey of Memphis (SoM) team (Jeffreys 1985, fig. 38; shown here as figure 14).

Figure 14. Plan of the Hathor Temple (RAG) by the Survey of Memphis (SoM) team.
Upon this template we noted the changes to the site that had occurred over the past 35 years and sketched (not drawn to scale) additional features not on the map (including the modern features). These features were then numbered and recorded on a ‘Record Sheet’, recording material, type, condition, whether piece is inscribed etc.

Once the recording was complete, a series of post-cleaning and recording photographs were taken of the site as a whole (figure 15) along with all visible inscriptions, all faces of the column capitals and various other features. This was done by the site photographer Amel Eweida.

![Figure 15. View of the Hathor Temple site (RAG) looking east after cleaning and recording. Photo by the project photographer, photo no. 703275.](image)

Unfortunately, due to the heavy volume of survey work at the Ptah Temple West Gate (BAA) and the Apis House (FAG I), it was not possible to survey all the features recorded. Our site surveyor, was only able to survey some of the stone features of the temple in the north and the later phase mudbrick architecture in the south. The survey work was completed in the April and May season 2016.

During this period, the students of MSCD Field School 2 (FS2) also developed the content and design of proposed signage for the temple site. Outside of the ‘on site’ component, research was conducted on the excavation history of the temple.
3. AERA’s Work 2016

During April and May of 2016 our priority was to clean, record, photograph, and survey the remaining four sites of the MSCD project; RAB I, RAB II, RAD, and RQA. However, we also took the opportunity of being back on site to complete the survey of the Hathor Temple. To assist in this process, the temple was given a light clean to remove the vegetation that had grown over the past five months (figure 16).

Figure 16. Workers giving the Hathor Temple a light clean. Photo by the Overseer, looking SW. Photo no. 823707.

Survey of the remaining features was done on the 10 and 11 April 2016. The survey data from these two days was added to what we already had in the GIS allowing us to produce an up-to-date map of the site (figure 17).
Figure 17. Map of the Hathor Temple and surrounding features as visible in 2015 and 2016. NB the paths shown were laid by the MSCD Project in 2016. Map prepared by the GIS Specialist.
4. **Archaeological Baseline Data Research**

According to Abdulla Sayed Mahmoud who excavated the temple in 1970, the plan of the building is similar to two Ramesses III temples in Karnak, taken as typical examples of New Kingdom cult temples (Mahmoud 1978: 3). See Vandier, Manuel d'Archéologie, II, p.935, fig 430; Badawy, History of Egyptian Architecture III 1968, p262-67, figs 141-2. The temple is orientated north-south, with its entrance to the north. The temple consists of a symmetrical columned court, with limestone Hathor Head capitals, a pylon to the north, and probably a tripartite sanctuary to the south.

At the northern end of the site the extent of the north-western pylon is visible, with the eastern and southern faces of the pylon clearly demarcated. In 1970 Mahmud also saw the north and west faces of the pylon (external faces; figure 18). These he recorded as having being left ‘rough’ (Mahmoud 1978: 3); the northern face he measured as 8.25m long. The east and south faces of the pylon are dressed and covered with inscriptions (see below for detailed description; figures 19 and 20). The pylon is constructed with a rubble core, comprising irregularly-shaped limestone blocks and the facing limestone blocks are coursed but irregularly sized. There is a recess in the eastern face, which would have originally accommodated a door.
Figure 18. Mahmud’s plan of the Hathor Temple site as it looked in 1970 (Mahmud 1978, fig. 2)
**Figure 19.** The east face of the pylon as seen in 2015. Photograph by project photographer. West-facing. 703798 (for detailed shots of individual inscriptions consult AERA photo archive).

**Figure 20.** The south face of the pylon. Photograph by the project photographer. North-facing. 703815 (for detailed shots of individual inscriptions consult AERA photo archive)
The partnering north-east pylon is absent, instead a deep excavation trench is visible, where previous excavators possibly searched for signs of the pylon (see figure 18). According to Jeffreys the pylon may have been dismantled or quarried in the Medieval Period (or at least after the re-use of the temple evidenced by the construction of the eastern mudbrick wall – see below; 1985:74). The northern ‘gate’ leads into the rectangular colonnaded hall. This space has not been fully excavated - not only does archaeological material still ‘fill’ the space, but also the original eastern and southern boundaries of the room have not been completely defined. The footprint of the room is most clear in the northwest, western limit and south-western corners. Here, although the eastern inner face of the western wall is clear, the western face of the wall is not. In 1970 however, when the west face was visible (see figure 18), Mahmud recorded that this face was undressed (1978: 3). This western wall is also constructed with a rubble core; the eastern face consists of thin limestone slabs, which have been dressed and covered with inscriptions (see detailed description below and figure 21). The inscriptions on the east face of the western wall are covered with a c. 2cm thick ‘treatment’ (figure 22), applied by the Ministry of Antiquities Conservation team. The composition of this treatment is unknown to the authors. On the 15th December 2015, MoA conservators visited the site to re-apply the treatment. It is unknown to the authors how frequently the treatment is applied.

Figure 21. The only visible inscriptions on the east face of the west wall. Photograph by the project photographer. West facing. 703838.
At the very southern end of the Hall there are two pillars (RAG69 and RAG72), 1m apart, with inscriptions (figure 23). Mahmud suggests that these may have been supports for a portico running east-west leading to the southern part of the temple. Only the south-western corner of the southern wall of the Hall is visible. Here, the north face of the wall has been dressed and has some preserved inscriptions.
Figure 23. View of pillars RAG 69 (right) and RAG 72 (left). Possible remains of portico supports. Photo by the project photographer, looking west. Photo no. 703847.

The original eastern stone wall of the hall cannot be seen at all. Instead, a north-south mudbrick wall forms the eastern extent (a later phase of temple use). The wall comprises mudbrick of unequal sizes and runs parallel to the presumed western wall. However, if the original stone wall is projected, the mudbrick wall appears to be located a little to the west of this. Mahmud suggests that the absence of the east wall may be due to robbing or collapse (Mahmoud 1978:4). Courses of the original stone wall may exist beneath the unexcavated features along the eastern boundary of the site.

The central and southeastern area of the hall contains unexcavated, later mudbrick structures and associated deposits (figure 17 – features shaded in blue). These mudbrick structures are multi-phase, and without excavation, or fine cleaning, the stratigraphic and phase relationships between them are unclear. Mahmud notes that kilns were recorded within the Hall, with burnt limestone (including a burnt part of a Hathor capital), and dates this industrial activity to the Greco-Roman period (Mahmud 1978:4). AERA observed the presence of a burnt mudbrick structure in the northern limits of the unexcavated mound in the southeast corner of the Hall. Mahmud mentions that, based on the types of objects retrieved from the vicinity, the kilns had probably been used for the firing and glazing of small
objects (1978:4), and that similar kilns had been found by Petrie during his excavations at Memphis.

Within the Hall the tops of 12 limestone columns are visible (c.2.15m in diameter). In 1970 Mahmud saw three rows of columns – a northern, eastern and western row – however, subsequent cleaning and excavation in the area have revealed two southern rows. These formed a colonnaded court. Six of these are at present topped with Hathor capitals (in situ); in 1970 Mahmud recorded seven in situ, RAG2 having subsequently fallen. A further capital (RAG83), has also subsequently been exposed. The columns are dressed and inscribed. In 1970 Mahmud excavated to a depth of 1m, around column RAG4 (Mahmud 1978:10; figure 24), in order to test the presence and preservation of the inscriptions on the columns (see below). This was subsequently backfilled. The surmounted capitals are carved from white limestone in the shape of cubes (112x86x28cm – as measured in 1970). Mahmud suggests that they are likely to be Tura limestone (Mahmud 1978: 5). They are all very similar in the way that they have been carved, with Hathor as a woman’s face and cow’s ears carved in high relief on two opposite sides. The other two faces of the block are carved with locks of hair. Mahmud notes that there are slight differences in the carvings, ‘especially in the way the smile is treated’ (Mahmud 1978:4). In 1970 Mahmud recorded traces of colour including: red on the lips; green and yellow on the neck; blue on the necklace; black on the hair; and red and yellow on hair parts. In 2015 AERA recorded traces of colour remaining on only one capital – RAG6 – as red on a hair part (see below). The capitals are positioned so that Hathor’s face looks outward and inward – so that on the northern row the faces look to the north and to the south, and on the western and eastern rows, the faces look out to the east and west. See below for a detailed description of each capital, and below for a history of Hathor capitals.
Figure 24. The Inscriptions on RAG 4 as photographed in 1970. The sounding excavated around the column was subsequently backfilled with sand. Mahmoud 1978: plate 10.

To the south of the east-west mudbrick wall [RAG102] previous excavators have excavated deeper, searching for the southern wall of the hall (this area was excavated in 1978 by Huleil Ghaly- MoA – and in 1984 by Abu Shanab; information from Jeffreys 1985:26). We have been unable to locate reports describing these operations. Here, at the base of these irregular trenches the partially robbed remains of part of the southern wall can be seen (figure 25), with at least two accesses through, probably originally leading to chapels (see
Jeffreys plan figure 26). These two may be two of three, representing accesses into a tripartite chapel at the back of the hall.

The rest of the area to the south of the Hall consists of partially exposed mudbrick walls, constructed over the temple’s southern wall. These appear to be the remnants of multi-phase structures and occupation of the area (see below).

Later Occupation of the Site
Apart from a description and discussion of the objects recovered during excavation, and the reference to kilns within the Hall (see above), very little information is provided about the post-temple use of the site. Mahmud mentions that most of the objects were ‘found within the first meter below the surface of the upper excavated layer. They were found scattered in the general excavation and were mixed with the Roman house material, except for the beads which were found in the south-east corner of the site, adjacent to the kiln area’ (Mahmud 1978:12). Using the objects Mahmud indicates that there were Roman houses on site, as well as Ptolemaic occupation of the site (Mahmud 1978:12).

Mahmoud provides information and photographs of the objects including: ceramics; figurines and terracotta heads (including ‘obscene’ figurines); molds (for divine figurines, scarabs, amulets, seals, amulets); faience (including deity figurines, wedjat eyes, seals etc). See Mahmoud 1978.

Subsequent excavations have clearly ‘tucked’ into the archaeological deposits at the southern end of, and to the south of the colonnaded hall (figures 27 - 30). These excavations seem to have ‘chased’ mudbrick walls when encountered (preserving the mudbrick structure, but excavated archaeological deposits abutting them, and stratigraphically beneath them). What has been left therefore, is a series of mudbrick walls (often ‘pedestalled’) representing multiple phases of occupation of the site. The upstanding mudbrick walls all follow a similar orientation (N-S) to the Hathor temple and it is possible that substantial east-west mudbrick wall RAG102 represents a re-use of the temple itself (in the same way that the eastern mudbrick wall (on the eastern side of the colonnaded hall) may have been. As can be seen in Figure 12, the original southern wall of the hall appears to have been dismantled immediately prior to the construction of RAG102. Careful recording (requiring very detailed cleaning), and some targeted excavation (including excavation of
pedestalled walls) is required in this southern area of the site to understand the stratigraphic sequence and phased development of the site.

Figure 25. Photograph showing the excavations to locate the southern wall of the temple Hall, and overlying, unexcavated mudbrick architecture, including wall FAD 102. North Facing. Photograph by the project photographer. 703255.
Figure 26 Survey of Memphis plan of the Hathor temple site (Jeffreys 1985: figure 38)
Figure 27 View of the (physically and stratigraphically) higher unexcavated features (including mudbrick walls) at the southern end of the site. Photograph by the project photographer. South facing 703270

Figure 28 View of the (physically and stratigraphically) higher unexcavated features, above the southern end of the colonnaded hall. Photograph by the project photographer. SW facing 703264
Figure 29. View of the (physically and stratigraphically) upper features covering the southern end of the colonnaded hall and the southern area of site. NB the level of column RAG175 in the section in the foreground. Photograph by the project photographer. SE facing. 703271

Figure 30. Example of the deep stratigraphic sequence in the sections of previous ‘soundings’ at the southern side of the temple. Photograph by the project photographer. 703863, looking west
Figure 31. Section drawing of stratigraphic sequence in the SE corner of the Hathor Temple (Jeffreys 1985, fig 39; 74).
5. Columns and Column Capitals

The northernmost row of columns and column capitals consist of: column RAG1 with fallen capital RAG2 (figure 32); column RAG10 with capital RAG9; column capital RAG11; column capital RAG12. As with the column capitals, the capitals consist of two sides of Hathor faces, placed so that one face looks to the north and the other to the south.

Column capital RAG2 lies to the southwest and adjacent to column RAG1. The capital has moved position since Jeffrey’s 1985 map (fig. 38). Judging from the shape of the block on Jeffrey’s map, capital RAG2 seems to have lain face down in 1985. It seems to have been subsequently, purposely, rolled over so that neither face was lying face down. This probably accounts for the severe erosion on its southeast face? (figure 33) as opposed to the relatively good condition of its north-west face (figure 34).

Column RAG1 survives 0.70m high above the current ground level. Much of the northern curve of the column is white with salt crystals and appears to be badly damaged (figure 35). The eastern curve appears to be less damaged (figure 36).

Column capital RAG9 is in situ, on column RAG10 (figure 41). All sides have areas of white salt crystals (figures 37 - 40), but the northern face is far more damaged than the southern face (figure 37) - so much so that barely any of the facial features can be made out.

Column capital RAG11 is also in situ. The north face of the capital is severely damaged with barely any facial features surviving (figure 42). The lower half of the south face is considerably more damaged than the upper half, with large areas flaking and white, salt crystal coverage (figure 50).

Column capital RAG12 is also in situ. The north face is the most damaged of all the exposed faces within the Hall, its surfaces have almost completely flaked off (figure 48). The south face is less damaged, but is white with salt crystals and pitted (figure 46).
Figure 32 Map of the Colonnaded Hall showing numbers assigned to column capitals and columns. Map prepared by GIS Specialist.
Figure 33 Southeast face of capital RAG2. Photograph by project photographer. 703762. NW facing

Figure 34 northwest face of capital RAG2. Photograph by project photographer. 703763. SE facing
Figure 35. Northern curve of column RAG1. Photograph by project photographer. 703758. South

Figure 36. Southern curve of column RAG1. Photograph by project photographer. 703757. NW facing
Figure 37. South face of capital RAG9. Photograph by project photographer. 703746. North facing

Figure 38. East face of capital RAG9. Photograph by project photographer. 703747. West facing
Figure 39. North face of capital RAG9. Photograph by project photographer. 703748. South facing

Figure 40. West face of capital RAG9. Photograph by project photographer. 703749. East facing
Figure 41. North face of column RAG10. Photograph by project photographer. 703753. South facing

Figure 42 North face of capital RAG11. Photograph by project photographer. 703837. South facing
Figure 43. East face of capital RAG11. Photograph by project photographer. 703840. East facing

Figure 44. South face of capital RAG11. Photograph by project photographer. 703843. North facing
Figure 45  East face of capital RAG11.  Photograph by project photographer. 703846. West facing

Figure 46  South face of capital RAG12. Photograph by project photographer. 703824. North facing
Figure 47. East face of capital RAG12. Photograph by project photographer. 703829. West facing

Figure 48. North face of capital RAG12. Photograph by project photographer. 703832. South facing
The western line of columns and column capitals consist of: RAG1 (already described); RAG3 (capital) and RAG4 (column); RAG6 (column) and RAG5 (capital); RAG7 and RAG8 (column); and RAG175 (column).

The western face of capital RAG3 is far better preserved than the eastern face (figure 50 & 51). Here, apart from the ears and upper forehead line, the face has completely flaked off, eroded and pitted (figure 52). The eastern face, although better preserved, still shows signs of flaking and pitting, particularly around the lips and chin. The upper limits of column RAG4 are visible, showing signs of severe salt damage, with salt crystals crusted all around (figures 54 - 58).

Capital RAG5 is the only Hathor Head to clearly show signs of colour – in the form of the red band around the hair, on the east face of the capital (figure 58). The east face of the capital shows flaking and considerable pitting of the lower face (figure 59 & 60). The west face shows pitting at the top (figure 60). There seems to be some streaking of the face (caused by what?). The upper limits of column RAG6 are visible. Again, this is encrusted with salt crystals (figure 61 - 63).
There is no column capital associated with column RAG7 and RAG8. Only the upper part of the column is visible, with what appears to be the broken off uppermost part repositioned on top (figures 65 & 66).

Only the western curve of column RAG175 is visible. The rest of the column is obscured by unexcavated archaeological deposits (figure 67). Where exposed, the column is pitted (figure 68).

Three of the southern columns and one capital have not previously been recorded. These include columns RAG82, RAG86, RAG128 and capital RAG83. Only the upper ??m of RAG82 is visible and seems to be relatively well preserved (figures 69-71). To the east and southeast of this, only the western curve of columns RAG86 and RAG128 are visible, protruding only slightly out of overlying unexcavated deposits (figure 72). To the west of column RAG86 its capital (RAG83) appears to have fallen from it, lying on its side. The south and north faces of the capital are flaking and pitted (figures 73 & 74).

Of the eastern line of capitals, apart from RAG 12, only RAG 13 has previously been exposed. The east face of capital RAG 13 is better preserved (figure 75) than the west face, although there is flaking, streaking and pitting apparent. On the west face, the majority of facial features have flaked off (figure 76).
Figure 50 East face of capital RAG3. Photograph by project photographer. 703764. West facing

Figure 51 North face of capital RAG3. Photograph by project photographer. 703765. South facing
Figure 52 West face of capital RAG3. Photograph by project photographer. 703766. East facing

Figure 53 South face of capital RAG3. Photograph by project photographer. 703767. North facing
Figure 54 Column RAG4. Photograph by project photographer. 703768. North facing

Figure 55 Column RAG4. Photograph by project photographer. 703769.
Figure 56 Column RAG4. Photograph by project photographer. 703770.

Figure 57 East face of capital RAG5. Photograph by project photographer. 703774. West facing
Figure 58 North face of capital RAG5. Photograph by project photographer. 703775. South facing

Figure 59 West face of capital RAG5. Photograph by project photographer. 703776. East facing
Figure 60 South face of capital RAG5. Photograph by project photographer. 703777. North facing

Figure 61. Column RAG6. Photograph by project photographer. 703778
Figure 62. Column RAG6. Photograph by project photographer. 703779

Figure 63. Column RAG6. Photograph by project photographer. 703780
Figure 64. Column RAG6. Photograph by project photographer. 703781

Figure 65. Columns RAG7 and RAG 8. Photograph by project photographer. 703782
Figure 66. Columns RAG7 and RAG 8. Photograph by project photographer. 703784

Figure 67. The southwest corner of the Hathor Temple, showing column RAG175 within the section. Photograph by project photographer. 703856. NE facing
Figure 68. Column RAG175. Photograph by project photographer. 703853. East facing.

Figure 69. Column RAG82. Photograph by project photographer. 703795.
Figure 70. Column RAG82. Photograph by project photographer. 703796.

Figure 71. Column RAG82. Photograph by project photographer. 703797
Figure 72. West facing section, with two columns (RAG128 (right) and RAG86 (left)) visible. Photograph by project photographer. 703794. NE facing.

Figure 73. Capital RAG83. Photography by project photographer. 703788. South facing.
Figure 74. Capital RAG83. Photography by project photographer. 703789. North facing

Figure 75. East face of capital RAG13. Photography by project photographer. 703819. West facing
Figure 76. South face of capital RAG13. Photography by project photographer. 703820. North facing

Figure 77. West face of capital RAG13. Photography by project photographer. 703821. East facing
Figure 78. West face of capital RAG13. Photography by project photographer. 703822. South facing
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Cover image. View of the Sekhmet Temple (RQA) looking east. Photo by field school graduate. Photo no. 302422.
1. Introduction

The Sekhmet Temple (RQA), situated on the southern side of the Memphis Open-Air Museum (QAS), is currently not open to visitors. The remnants of the temple occupy a low-lying area on the eastern side of Kom Rabia (figure 1).

Figure 1. Map showing the location of the Sekhmet Temple (RQA).
The site code, RQA, which was assigned by David Jeffreys and the Survey of Memphis team in the early 1980s, includes the Sekhmet Temple and the limestone remains of the southern approach to the Great Ptah Temple enclosure.

The site is situated on a large expanse of Ministry of Antiquities (MoA) land south of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road. The temple itself has no official perimeter fence, but this is not particularly necessary, because it is afforded protection by its location. Due to the low-lying area it is situated in, which is filled with dense vegetation and surrounded by numerous palm trees, the site is not actually visible from the museum to the north, or the path (XAB1) to the west (figure 2). Even after our extensive cleaning of the area in May 2016, the temple was only partially visible from the path which is 60 m (figure 3).

**Figure 2.** View to the east from path (XAB1) at the western edge of the RQA area on the 3 April 2016 before cleaning. Apart from some scattered blocks of the southern approach, the Sekhmet Temple is not visible. It is located on the eastern edge of the concrete pillar construction in the background. Photo by Field Director. Photo no. 102262.
2. AERA’s Work 2016 (27 April – 18 May 2016)

During the Spring 2016 season, we cleaned, recorded, and surveyed the Sekhmet Temple (RQA) as part of the process of including the site in the Memphis Walking Circuit. We were fortunate enough to have some time left at the end of the season, which allowed us to clean the southern approach area to the west of the temple (see figure 3 above).

When we started our work the temple was buried beneath reeds, halfa grass, and camel thorn (figure 4). On the 27 April, our team of workers began clearing the vegetation from within and around the temple (figure 5). They also cleared the vegetation from the area east of the temple where a number of scattered limestone features are situated.
Figure 4. The Sekhmet Temple (RQA) on the 26 April 2016 before cleaning. Photo by project archaeologist, looking NW. Photo no. 102766.

Figure 5. Workers beginning to clear the vegetation from temple. Photo by the Overseer, looking NW. Photo no. 823307.
All the vegetation was removed from the temple and surrounding area, was piled up on the high ground just to the south of the temple. Over two days (16 and 17 May), this vegetation was collected from the site using a front loader and trucks, and deposited at a municipal landfill site (figure 6). In total 232 square metres of spoil was removed from the site.

![Image: The front loader filling one of the trucks with vegetation and rubbish for removal from the site. Photo by the Overseer, looking east. Photo no. 823978.](image)

**Figure 6.** The front loader filling one of the trucks with vegetation and rubbish for removal from the site. Photo by the Overseer, looking east. Photo no. 823978.

Once the temple was fully exposed, it was fine-cleaned with brushes by the workers. With the temple and surrounding area fully cleaned (figure 7) we were in a position to compare the remains with the map done in 1982 by David Jeffreys and the Survey of Memphis (SoM) team (Jeffreys 1985, fig 42) (figure 7). All of the features recorded by David Jeffreys were still visible and only a few had moved slightly. There were also a large number of blocks visible that do not show on David’s plan. Whether, these were visible at the time or not is unclear. Also, we do not know if any other work had taken place on the site after the SoM team.
All the features of the temple were assigned a number and described, including the concrete pillar foundation over the south west corner of the temple. All these features were then surveyed using a Total Station between the 9 and 14 May and uploaded to GIS. The results of the survey are shown in figure 8.

As the Sekhmet Temple is due to be part of the Memphis Walking circuit a path had to be prepared, that would allow access to the site. The Ministry of Antiquities (MoA) land south of the Saqqara to Bedrashein Road has a number of informal paths running across it that are used by local residents. One of these paths is on the southern side of the RQA area (figure 9). This existing path is ideal for the Walking Circuit because in the west it connects with a path leading from the Memphis Museum car park (figure 10). We therefore coded this path XAB2 for recording purposes, widened and cleaned it (figure 11).
Figure 8. Survey map of the Sekhmet Temple showing the additional features recorded in May 2016 and the location of the inscriptions. NB the path shown was laid by the MSCD Project in 2016.
Figure 9. View of the RQA area (before cleaning) showing the narrow path (right side of photo) leading to Kom Qala in the east. Photo by Field Director, looking east. Photo no. 102270.

Figure 10. View of the intersection of three existing paths slightly widened, cleaned, and bordered with split palm logs in May 2016. Photo by Field Director, looking SE. Photo no. 102845.
3. Archaeological Baseline Data Research

The Sekhmet Temple\(^1\) was found by accident in 1959 when construction began on a residential property. The land at this time was not owned by the Egyptian Antiquities Service. While digging and laying the concrete foundation for the building, the south-west part of the temple was revealed and in fact the north-east corner of the concrete foundation partially overlies this south-west corner (figure 8 & 12). When this part of the temple was uncovered the Antiquities Service claimed the land and put a stop to the construction. The concrete foundation remains to this day a rectangular structure measuring 19.53 m long (E-W) by 7.38 m wide (N-S). The whole structure was built of concrete reinforced with iron rebars (figure 12 & 13). Originally, it was meant to have 16 pillar supports (8 equally spaced out on the north side and 8 on the south), but today only 12 are standing (the 8 on the north and 4 on the south). Whether the other four on

\(^1\) Also referred to as Temple A by the Survey of Memphis team.
the southern side were built is unknown. The base frame of the construction is supported by six crossbeams. The mound of earth in the centre of the construction is most likely spoil from the 1962 excavation of the temple.

**Figure 12.** View of the concrete foundation over the south west corner of the Sekhmet Temple. Photo by project archaeologist, looking SW. Photo no. 302081.

**Figure 13.** View of the concrete foundation looking east. Photo by the Overseer. Photo no. 823931.
From the work carried out by David Jeffreys and the Survey of Memphis (SoM) team, the temple, with its main entrance facing west, flanked the southern approach to the Great Ptah Temple (see figure 1 above & fig 13 & 15 of Jeffreys 1985). It was built by Ramesses II of the 19th Dynasty and is thought to be dedicated to the goddess Sekhmet. There are very eroded inscriptions remaining on some of the stone blocks of the temple (see figure 8 for their location), but none state to which the temple was dedicated. Our only indication comes from a triad statue found by Ahmed Tahrir in 1962 during his excavation of the temple for the Antiquities Service (figure 14 & 15).

**Figure 14 (left) & Figure 15 (right).** Front view (left) of the triad statue depicting the god Ptah (centre) with Ramesses II on his right and the goddess Sekhmet on his left. Figure 15 is the back view of the statue. It is currently on display in the Memphis Open Air Museum as Museum Object (MO) 25. Photos by project photographer. Photo no. 704253 (left), 704256 (right).

The fragmented triad statue was found at the centre back of the temple (see figure 8) and was reconstructed in 1980. It is now on display at the Memphis Open-Air Museum. The statue is carved in red granite and depicts the god Ptah with his consort Sekhmet on his left and Ramesses II on his right. In this case it appears that Ramesses II is
assuming the role of the child god Nefertem and as such part of the divine family unit of Memphis. It is because of this statue that it is currently thought that the temple in which it was found, was dedicated to the goddess Sekhmet. As far as we are aware the only excavation of the temple was by Ahmed Tahrir over 1961 and 1962 (unpublished). Ahmed Moussa, in 1981, published an article on the triad statue, and in 2010 Stephane Pasquali published a small report on the temple.

This temple of Sekhmet was one element of a major set of religious complexes, included a series of other small temples and shrines that had been dedicated to a large number of ancient Egyptian deities beside the main temple of Ptah at Memphis. These religious buildings were most likely connected to each other through processional routes. Like other large sacred areas in ancient Egypt such as Luxor. It is worth mentioning that ancient Memphis temples include more than one temple dedicated to Sekhmet. Each had his own name such as pr-%xmt nt int, 3nmt %xmt, @wt %xmt.

Apart from the two statue pedestals at the entrance and a small section of the north wall, the temple has been robbed down to its limestone foundation. Even so, the original layout is still partially discernable, along with some later modifications. The following is an overview of the temple’s history.

**Temple phasing**

The temple is rectangular in shape measuring approximately 22 m east-west by 13.17 m north-south externally and 19.16 m east-west by 10.45 m north-south internally. The small size and design of this temple, strongly suggests that it might functioned as subsidiary or secondary temple beside the main temple of Ptah, the chief god of the city.

The foundation for the outer walls of the original temple is clearly visible at the back of the temple. From what we could see both the foundation for the walls, and what survived

---

3. Ibid., pp. 232.
of the walls themselves, were constructed of limestone. The foundation for the walls consisted of three courses (figure 16). The lowest (bottom) course was mostly built using irregular shaped and re-used limestone, and was not meant to be seen as its external and internal elevations were not finished off. The re-use of stone was very clear on the southern wall foundation (figure 17) where four sections of a column were laid in a row.

![Figure 16. View (looking north) of the foundation for the eastern wall (back) of the temple showing the three foundation courses. Photo by Senior Archaeologist. Photo no. 302161.](image)

The middle foundation course was constructed of square and rectangular blocks of limestone with vertical finished outer elevations. This course also had a limestone rubble core. On the upper surface of the middle foundation course a line was carved 6cm away from the internal elevation as a marker for the positioning of the third and upper course of the foundation (figure 18). There was no evidence that connector cramps had been used in the middle course. The third and upper foundation course was constructed of rectangular-shaped limestone and connector cramps were used to hold the stone together. This course also had a rubble core. On this occasion a survey line was carved on the upper surface 20cm away from the outer elevation of the temple (figure 19 & 20).
Figure 17. Lowest course of the foundation for the south wall of the temple showing re-used column segments. Photo by Senior Archaeologist. Photo no. 302103.

Figure 18. Survey line or mason’s mark on the upper surface of the middle foundation course. Photo by Senior Archaeologist, looking north. Photo no. 302145.
Figure 19. The third and upper foundation course at the north east corner of the temple showing the carved survey line, connector cramp joints, and circular carving for three quarter torus molding. Photo by Senior Archaeologist. Photo no. 302155.

It was upon this uppermost foundation course that the walls of the temple were constructed, being set-back 20 cm from the outer foundation edge. Also, on both the north east and south east upper foundation was carved a circle (figure 19) to show the size and positioning of the vertical three-quarter torus moulding that would adorn the corners of the temple walls.

Finally, the two-row wide limestone block wall of the temple was constructed (figure 20). Again, connector cramps were used to hold the blocks together, with the internal elevation of the wall flush with the uppermost foundation course, and the outer elevation set-back 20cm. A small section of the north wall is all that survives of the outer wall of the temple (figure 21).
Figure 20. View of the temple’s northern wall built upon the uppermost foundation course. Photo by Senior Archaeologist, looking west. Photo no. 302154.

Figure 21. View of the back half of the temple looking north showing the only surviving section of the temple wall. Photo by project archaeologist. Photo no. 302092.

The main entrance (1.90 m wide) to the temple is located on the west between two massive red granite statue pedestals (figure 22). Upon the northern pedestal which
measured 1m north-south by 1.70m east-west and 1m high, is the very degraded bottom half remains of a seated statue in red granite (0.65m by 1.30m and 1.40m high). The remains of the statue (0.75m by 0.70m and 0.90m high) from the southern pedestal (1m N/S by 1.70m E/W and 1.10m high) lies fallen just to the south east of its pedestal. This statue was on its pedestal when David Jeffreys mapped the temple in the early 1980s, so has fallen since then. The western side of the northern pedestal bears very eroded signs of names and titles of Ramesses II inside lower parts of two cartouches while the inscriptions on the southern side of the pedestal is only marked by a repetition of a prayer formula as ⲉ ⲫ Ⲝ ⲫ “given life like Re”.

Figure 22. Entrance to the Sekhmet Temple on the 16 May 2016. Photo by field school graduate, looking east. Photo no. 302422.

The threshold of the entrance comprises a flight of four steps leading up from west to east. Only the southern half of the staircase survives. The average dimensions of the lowest three steps measures about 0.38m wide and 0.78m long and 0.16m high. The fourth/highest step is the biggest. It measures about 0.82m by 0.71m and 0.08m high.
Behind both entrance statue pedestals were two massive red granite doorjambs. The one behind the north pedestal has fallen to the north, and the one behind the south pedestal has fallen just a bit further away to the south. The north-east corner of the modern concrete construction was built partially over the southern jamb (figure 23).

Figure 23. View of the entrance from within the temple, looking north west showing the two fallen red granite doorjambs. Photo by Senior Archaeologist. Photo no. 302115.

Just behind the southern entrance pedestal and partially blocking the threshold are two large sections of the red granite lintel of the entrance. They were originally part of a large false door stela of a man named Kaires of the 5th/6th Dynasty that was dismantled (possibly in Saqqara) and brought to be part of this temple (figure 24; Smith, Jeffreys, Malek 1983, 38).
Figure 24. Part of a red granite false door stela from the tomb of Kaires reused as the entrance lintel in the Sekhmet Temple. Photo by Senior Archaeologist, looking east. Photo no. 302128.

The current condition of the temple’s interior causes some difficulty in identifying its real design to determine its inner divisions. However, through some archeological features, we can extrapolate some of the original layout (figure 25). The walls and features highlighted in blue in figure 25 give an indication of the temple’s original layout. The main western part of the temple was most likely a pillared hall with columns, similar to the one in the Ramesses II small temple to the god Ptah located further to the west at Memphis coded RABII. Two possible column bases are situated in the central part of the temple. The entrance to the sanctuary and inner part of the temple is possibly demarcated by two north-south walls opposite each other, east of the column bases. The triad statue was centrally situated at the back of the sanctuary on direct alignment with the main entrance of the temple and appears to have had a wall on its northern side. The northern side of the sanctuary may have actually been a separate rectangular room because the northern limit wall of the sanctuary contains a threshold (1 m wide) with the remains of two limestone doorjambs and a pivot socket for a door on its southern side.
Later Occupation Phase

A sequence of granite walls, limestone paved floors, and three *in-situ* ceramic vessels, strongly showing that the Sekhmet temple had been re-used in later phase and functioned as a house or a residence place. It is visible that the walls of this later phase are constructed on the top of sandy clayey silt layer. It spread through the internal area of the temple. It seems that it filled the temple’s divisions and accumulated over time against the inner faces of the temple walls and later used as a foundation layer. Actually, the excavation and analyzing the cultural materials remains of this layer is very important to know the separating deposit between two living phases. The thickness of this possible make-up layer is not visible and it is difficult to determine.

The later walls are those marked yellow on figure 25 above and were built in granite. There is no way to tell at this time whether the stone came from the temple itself, or
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**Figure 25.** Color-coded map of the Sekhmet Temple showing the proposed original layout in blue and the later modifications in yellow and green.
elsewhere. The longest wall runs east-west on the southern side of the entrance. It seems to abutt the eastern face of the southern side of the western external wall of the temple. It measured 8.97 m long by 1.04 m wide. Two blocks of this wall have remains of hieroglyphic scenes and inscriptions. The first block is located at the eastern end of the wall and measured 0.84 m by 0.50 m. Its top surface bears the remains of hieroglyphic inscriptions as of lord of diamonds followed by destroyed part of Ramesses’ II name (figure 26).

![Block no. 22 with part of a figure on the left and line of inscription. Photo by Senior Archaeologist, looking down. Photo no. 302110.](image)

The second inscribed block is located towards the western end of the wall and measured 0.76 m by 0.63 m. On the upper surface is carved the waist to knee depiction of a king (figure 27). In front of the king there are remains of hieroglyphic inscriptions that refer to names and titles of the king. That means this later occupation phase within the RQA temple happened a long time after the death of Ramesses II.
Abutting the southern side of the east-west granite wall is a small north-south wall that measured 2.40 m long by 0.66 m wide by 0.30 m high. Two areas of limestone floor paving slabs; one on the western side of the possible pillar base in the north, and the other around the southern pillar base, may date to the original temple phase, or were laid at a later time. The northern floor has a ceramic jar sunk into it (vessel no. 18) and one situated on it (vessel no. 19; figure 28; vessels marked in green on figure 25). Vessel 18 had a diameter of approximately 0.28 m and about 0.44 m for the depth. Actually, it is difficult without excavation to determine whether the floor was built around the vessel, or a cut made through the floor for the vessel. Vessel 19 measured about 0.46 m in diameter by 0.18 m in depth.
Figure 28. Ceramic vessel 18 (left) and 19 (right) functioning with a limestone floor. Photo by Senior Archaeologist, looking west. Photo no. 302119.

The third and final ceramic vessel was located against the west facing elevation of the southern sanctuary wall. It also appeared sunken and measured about 0.28 m in diameter and 0.32 m deep.

Post abandonment Phase

The post abandonment phase of the temple is marked by the presence of a sequence of limestone collapse, spread through the temple. This collapse comprises carved limestone blocks in different shapes and sizes. Generally, they appear in groups located in different areas of the temple. All of these collapsed blocks, situated over a layer of sandy silt deposit filled the internal size of the temple. Some of which still buried within this deposit.
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