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I stood on the balcony of the Open Air Museum of Mit Raḥina on the morning of October 14, 1972—the first stop on my very first day in Egypt. I came to Mit Raḥina with a tour of like-minded youths. We had arrived in Cairo from London the night before. From the Lotus Hotel just off Soliman Pasha Square in downtown Cairo, we set off in an old blue and white Misr Travel bus. In our first look at ancient Egypt, we gazed down upon the colossal body and the idealized, youthful face of Pharaoh Ramesses II. But I was more struck when I turned away to look south, down a ditch grown thick with palm trees and tall green reeds. There lay another broken colossus, this one of red granite, a striding king wearing the conical crown of the south. I was amazed that an ancient work of art so sublime could be just lying so, in a ditch.

In fact, I learn now, 47 years later, from this book, Treasures from the Lost City Memphis, by Aude Gräzer Ohara, that the statue was on its way up and out of that ditch, which is why it lay on a wooden berth. 'Abd el-Tawwāb el-Hitta rediscovered this and a companion striding statue for the Department of Antiquities in 1962, a century after J. Hekekyan first discovered the pair between 1852 and 1854. That ditch had once been a grand processional way to the main, southern gate of the great Ptah Temple of Memphis. The resurrection of this pair of granite statues, inscribed for Ramesses II, but carved originally for a king who reigned centuries earlier, came in the late 1980s, after the first of the pair to be restored traveled all the way to that other Memphis (in Tennessee, USA), and back. And then the Egyptian antiquities authority restored both statues upright in the Mit Raḥina Open Air Museum sculpture garden.

When I arrived in Egypt, it seemed that few visitors who came to modern Mit Raḥina realized the importance and magnitude of ancient Memphis, whose ruins lie below. This capital city of Pharaonic Egypt lies buried in water-soaked ground, covered by fields of tall reed and prickly camelthorn, within and under vibrant, expanding modern urban centers—villages perched on separate mounds until recent times when they merged into one conurbation. The walls of ancient Memphis lie embedded in their own disintegrated fabric, close to the water table, extremely difficult for archaeologists to extricate. As mudbrick walls disintegrated over centuries, the stone elements of the monuments of downtown Memphis survived, some so big that they lay partially exposed and obvious two millennia after the city’s final demise.

Over the last two centuries, a number of projects sought to learn more about Egypt’s ancient capital and to protect its archaeology. Of these, the longest and most comprehensive for the whole of Memphis and its surroundings was the Survey of Memphis, led by David Jeffreys and Lisa Giddy for the Egypt Exploration Society. Looking at Memphis in its regional environmental context, Jeffreys brought together the various archaeological “interventions” up to the 1980s. In Treasures from the Lost City Memphis, Aude offers a useful summary of how archaeology continued at Memphis and how pieces of the Memphis puzzle have come together in the Mit Raḥina outdoor museum.

Ancient Egypt Research Associates’s (AERA) Memphis project grew from long-term cooperation with Egypt’s Ministry of Antiquities and the American Research Center in Egypt (ARCE) for training
Egypt’s young archaeologists. Between 2005 and 2011, AERA developed and deployed ten field schools for ARCE. With steadfast USAID support, these field schools for Beginners and Advanced Archaeology, Salvage Archaeology, and Scientific Analysis and Publication trained more than 300 Ministry of Antiquities Inspectors. Many students became as skilled in best standard practice of scientific archaeology as any of their foreign colleagues. They went on to teach, in Arabic and English, younger Inspectors throughout the country.

The Mit Rahina Field School (MRFS) in 2011 and 2014, directed by Ana Tavares and Mohsen Kamel, was one of the largest of the AERA-ARCE Field Schools, and was one of the first major field archaeology projects in Memphis in twenty years. Deployed in the oldest known part of Memphis—Kom Fakhry—the MRFS 2011 made it clear that the archaeology of central Memphis now faced critical challenges.

AERA responded by developing with the Ministry of Antiquities the Memphis Development Project (MDP).* When in 2014, USAID put out a call for proposals to enhance and promote cultural tourism, AERA and our colleagues in the Ministry saw our Memphis development plan as an ideal opportunity, albeit one that faced significant challenges, both natural and urban. In proposing the Ancient Memphis Walking Circuit, we hoped to build on the MRFS 2011. If we could clear and investigate the Kom el-Fakhry site, we believed that we could prepare the other major sites in central and southern Memphis and offer a unique opportunity for visitors to glimpse the visible remains of Egypt’s ancient capital. Showing the sites would increase awareness of the need for conservation and maintenance. Increased tourism would generate opportunities for the local community.

Mit Rahina provided an ideal place to train and practice how to face the often complex challenges of cultural heritage management. Between 2015 and 2016, AERA partnered with the University of York, under Sara Perry, to deploy four field schools for this intensive training. Seventy-seven students and twelve supervisors, all Ministry of Antiquities Inspectors, co-created the Ancient Memphis Walking Circuit while working with heritage professionals.

MDP team members cleaned, surveyed, and mapped monuments in seven sites previously excavated and long neglected, as well as in the Open Air Museum. To promote ancient Memphis, students and teachers developed videos, a Memphis website, social media, a guidebook, brochure, information packets for tour guides, and the signage for the Walking Circuit sites and the Open Air Museum. Project members installed paths and signage in close collaboration with the Director of Mit Rahina, Ibrahim Rifaat, and his staff at the Mit Rahina Inspectorate. Sadly, Ibrahim Rifaat passed away in 2018, the year after we finished the MDP.

Every team member worked very hard to meet AERA’s ambitious list of deliverables under our USAID grant. Those deliverables relied on a comprehensive Historical and Environmental Record of

---

*This project was originally known as the “Memphis Site and Community Development Project” (or MSCD). Ultimately, we did not receive permission to do community outreach on site, but we did teach its principles in the four field schools, so that MoA archaeologists could go on to do their own community archaeologies throughout Egypt. So, in the end, it became the Memphis Development Project, in the interests of “developing” the known ancient sites of Memphis and the Open Air Museum.
greater Memphis, including major archaeological investigations, exposures of ancient monuments, as well as artifacts and art objects on display in the Open Air Museum. For this record we owe a great deal to several team members, but especially to Field Director Freya Sadarangani and Archaeologists Daniel Jones and Aude Gräzer Ohara. A major deliverable was to assist the Ministry of Antiquities in upgrading Mît Rahîna’s Open Air Museum and Sculpture Garden. This collection includes statuary and major pieces of temples and palaces, including the largest sphinx in Egypt after the Great Sphinx of Giza. Yet no one ever published a catalog of this most important collection.

Although a museum catalog was not on AERA’s list of deliverables, we committed resources that enabled Aude to carry out further research, to use her skill and competence as an Egyptologist, and her time and labor to work toward producing a catalog of the Mît Rahîna museum that could be available—free and open access—to students, scholars, and visitors interested in Mît Rahîna. Now we can present Treasures from the Lost City Memphis, thanks also to the skills and labor of the AERA Publications Manager, Ali Witsell, and Art and Science Editor Wilma Wetterstrom. We wish to also highlight the contributions of MDP Photographer Amel Nasr Mohammed Eweida and the catalog’s Arabic translator, Reham Mahmud Zaky el-Sayed.

On behalf of everyone on the AERA Memphis project, I would like to thank Dr. Mamdouh Eldamaty, former Minister of Antiquities; Dr. Khaled El-Anany, Minister of Antiquities; Dr. Moustafa Waziri,
General Director of the Supreme Council of Antiquities; Dr. Khalid Zakaria el-Adli, former Governor of Giza; Dr. Mahmoud Afifi, former Director of the Pharaonic Sector for the Ministry of Antiquities; Dr. Mohamed Ismail, former Director of the Department of Foreign Missions; Dr. Nashwa Gaber, Director of the Department of Foreign Missions; Ala Shehat, former Director of Giza and Saqqara; Ibrahim Rifaat Ibrahim, former General Director at Mit Rahina; and Essam Hussein Khamis, Director of Mit Rahina. We also thank Waleed Mohamed Sa’ad and Amina Abd el-Aziz for serving as Inspectors for the Ministry of Antiquities during the MDP field seasons.

We give special thanks to Zeb Simpson, Sylvia Atalla, and Robert Parker at USAID for all their work, help, and counsel with the USAID grant for the Memphis Development Project.

The success of the MDP was due to the leadership of Field Directors Mohsen Kamel and Freya Sadarangani. We are exceptionally grateful for the support, encouragement, and guidance of David Jeffreys, who as Director of the Egypt Exploration Society’s Survey of Memphis brought over thirty years of experience working at this important ancient capital.

We especially wish to thank the late Ibrahim Rifaat Ibrahim, former General Director at Mit Rahina, for his valuable assistance during the MDP. While he saw an early draft of this volume, we lament that he was unable to see the final product, in which he played no small part.

As AERA team members turned from our Memphis project to other tasks, we did not take our eyes off Memphis. We hold open the possibility of a return. We all agree that Memphis ranks among Egypt’s most important cultural heritage sites. For it was right here that Egypt itself began its millennia-long history as a united country.

We are so pleased to present Aude Gräzer Ohara’s Treasures from the Lost City Memphis. For all of you who helped with your support, we are proud of your trust in AERA and our work.

* * * * * * *

Dr. David Jeffreys; Field Director, Survey of Memphis

The site of Memphis, ancient Egypt’s only real capital city, has been cruelly neglected over the years. Founded at or around the beginning of the third millennium BC as the hub of the newly united kingdoms of “upper” Egypt (the Nile Valley) and “lower” Egypt (the Delta), Memphis maintained its importance through the various political turmoils of pharaonic history and beyond. Indeed, as the precursor of both Roman Babylon (“of Egypt”) and Islamic and modern Cairo, and taking these three as essentially a single but mobile conurbation, of which Memphis is simply the first footprint, then its prime position has been almost unbroken for more than five thousand years.

And yet … it always comes as something of a shock to realize how little we know even now about the archaeology of the city itself. Many (misguided) guidebooks give the impression that Memphis has disappeared, that there is nothing left to see, that Memphis has “crumbled into dust” (to quote a recent popular documentary television program in the UK). Some of the people making such claims really ought to know better: even just the surviving visible remains at Memphis, although at times
perhaps somewhat unprepossessing, show it to be one of the largest settlement sites in the Nile Valley (at six square kilometers), and new discoveries are made whenever and wherever archaeologists are brave enough to explore the terrain. Of course the city’s burial grounds are famous all over the world: the pyramids, elite tombs, and later, temple towns in the desert regions on both sides of the valley. Ironically it is when these funerary monuments are most obvious (for example in the Archaic or Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom periods) that the city itself has been until now almost invisible.

So while the name of Memphis carried considerable cultural resonance abroad, any awareness of its physical reality remained low or non-existent. Almost all that was known or believed about the city derived from Greek and Latin authors, such as Herodotus and Strabo, and Islamic tradition. Milton, for example, could poetize about Osiris in his “Memphian grove or green,” but I think we can assume he had no knowledge or understanding of the actual, detailed context.

It seems almost counterintuitive to suggest that this lack of a high archaeological profile should in fact be a sign of the city’s importance, reflected in so much intensive later building activity. Memphis, and its twin city of Heliopolis to the north, were endlessly rifled for their building material, recycled to construct new urban extensions: first the fortress city of Babylon (“Old Cairo”) in the 1st century AD, then the Islamic new build of Fustat in the 7th, to the present urban sprawl of modern Cairo. By comparison and contrast, such sites as Thebes and Amarna, or the Nubian temples, so much more impressive in appearance today, survive as they do because they became, respectively, political backwaters or were rapidly abandoned after a short lifespan, and were largely free of iconoclastic and practical depredation.

In recent times some attempt has been made to remedy this neglect, and the resulting imbalance in our understanding of Memphis, with its undoubted central importance not only to pharaonic culture but to the social and economic life of the eastern Mediterranean as a whole. Numerous surveys and excavations, with varying degrees of competence and success, were carried out by 19th century antiquarians such as Champollion, and by some more systematic or scientific investigators such as Karl Lepsius and Joseph Hekekyan, in the mid-1800s. During the early 20th century, Flinders Petrie was active here, although at various sites in a rather haphazard fashion, and University of Pennsylvania carried out the first of what we might recognize today as controlled field excavations, firstly under Clarence Fisher at the palace of Merenptah through the 1910s and later under Rudolph Anthes during the 1950s. At the same time various small-scale excavations, largely of a reactive nature and often following chance discoveries from local digging for sebakh (topsoil) or speculative treasure hunting, were undertaken by the Egyptian antiquities authorities.

Very little of this older work pretended to any kind of overall investigative strategy or program for Memphis, and often, with no archival provision or access to earlier information readily available, let alone publication, there was hardly any way of knowing at any time what had gone before: Petrie, for example, was apparently blissfully (and it must be said inexplicably) unaware of Hekekyan’s (vastly superior) work half a century earlier, even though he was in some areas going over exactly the same ground—and complaining about how disappointing it was!

The Egypt Exploration Society’s Survey of Memphis, launched in 1981, was intended to provide some structure to the extraordinarily rich archive on Memphis and to future investigation of the city,
with a systematic inventory of individual excavations and the identities of those responsible, to be as complete as possible with the resources available to us at the time, and the opportunity to correlate these with the surviving fabric of the city. Some surprises confronted us along the way: little-known verbal and visual descriptions, especially among Arab writers such as Qalqashandi, the invaluable pictorial record then kept by the Antiquities Organization photographer Hasibulla al-Tayib, and perhaps most especially the documentary treasure house that is the volumes of manuscripts of Joseph Hekekyan, active at Heliopolis and Memphis in the 1850s. These not only provide new information and previously unrealized confirmation of much that was unclear, but also present what must surely be the first example of a truly geoarchaeological approach anywhere in the world.

In the 2010s the gauntlet was taken up by the American Research Center and Ancient Egypt Research Associates, firstly as a training excavation (the Mit Rahîna Field School, MRFS) and most recently as a truly visionary two-year project to train young Egyptian Inspectors more specifically in multiple aspects of public archaeology (Memphis Development Project, or MDP). It is from this program that the present volume has developed, as described below: an exhaustive catalog, compiled for the first time, of the many objects housed and displayed in the permanent Memphis museum at Mit Rahîna with, crucially, their archaeological context so far as can be established at the present time. Dr. Gräzer Ohara is to be particularly congratulated for the painstaking and wide-ranging quality of her research and for the many insights it has provided us on the material culture of this all-important site. It will certainly alert a wider world to the historical and archaeological potential of Memphis, alongside an attractive new website and other literature generated by the MDP, as well as a fresh approach to the visitor experience at the site. All of this will help to make Memphis in the future less of a detour, and more of a destination, as it deserves!
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This study would not have been possible, nor its research or publication completed so rapidly, without the generous support and valuable contributions of many people and institutions, whom I would like to thank most warmly in the following lines.

Thanks are due, above all, to Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA), Boston, and its director, Mark Lehner, for entrusting me with the task of researching the collection of artifacts kept at the Open Air Museum of Mit Rahina, and to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for funding much of the research and publication process. I am particularly grateful to AERA’s team members—my colleagues throughout the duration of the Memphis Development Project (MDP)—for their constant help and encouragement. The basic research and text of this book was completed within a period of just a few months, and without their assistance, this endeavour would not have been brought to fruition so rapidly. I wish to thank most sincerely Freya Sadarangani, who first encouraged the idea of turning this work into a publication and greatly facilitated my research in parallel with the field work for the MDP; Richard Redding for providing me with copies of bibliographical references that I could not access; Amel Nasr Mohammed Eweida for her high-quality photographs and her unflagging assistance when exploring archive material written in Arabic; Reham Mahmoud Zaky el-Sayed for her commitment in the challenging task of translating portions of the book into Arabic; Rebekah Miracle for the very elaborate maps which she created at my request; Daniel C. Jones for checking additional details at the museum after I had already left Egypt; Manami Yahata for her kind help while harvesting and scanning the documentation kept at AREA’s Giza research center; Sayed Salah Abd el-Hakim for his unfailing assistance in the field; Mohammed Said for facilitating my remote access to AERA’s server and database while not in Egypt; and last but not least, Alexandra Witsell and Wilma Wetterstrom for their encouragement and valuable work editing my English text and turning the whole manuscript and its image material into such a fine, well-built, illustrated book.

I am also indebted and immensely grateful to David G. Jeffreys, director of the Survey of Memphis project (SoM), for all the time that he generously spent discussing specific points and peer-reviewing the entire content of this study, often, at various stages of its drafting, as we were compelled by the time. My research benefitted greatly from his experience and unrivalled expertise on the archaeology and history of the ancient city of Memphis and the Memphite region.
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I’d like also to thank Michael Jones, of the American Research Center in Egypt, Cairo (ARCE), for the opportunity to access his full archive about Memphis, notably a set of archival pictures that he assembled and which was relevant to this study. I am grateful to the archivists of the Penn Museum, Philadelphia, and the Griffith Institute, Oxford—Alex Pezzati and Cat Warsi, respectively—who kindly granted permission to reproduce photographic archives in their possession. I also wish to thank Didier Devauchelle, director of the Institut de Papyrologie et d’Égyptologie de Lille, for granting me access to the Bibliothèque Vandier, Lille, where I could search and copy literature, and the librarian Sylvie Vérité, for her valuable assistance.

Aude Gräzer Ohara

Postscript: As this manuscript went to press, a publication (Sourouzian 2019, see bibliography) and online database were released that reference all the royal statuary dated to the 19th Dynasty, including sixteen of the objects presented in this catalog. We could not integrate the complementary information provided by this very useful reference, but we refer the reader to it for additional details, especially regarding the epigraphy of these pieces, and provide here a list of correspondences between our two catalogs:

Sourouzian 2019: 72–74, cat. 41 (= MO85); 161–162, cat. 87 (= MO21); 163–164, cat. 88 (= MO37); 202–203, cat. 109 (= MO51); 331–332, cat. 210 (= MO22 and MO87); 374–375, cat. 236 (= MO71); 384–385, cat. 244 (= MO69); 459–460, cat. 293 (= MO18); 474–475, cat. 302 (= MO25); 543, cat. 347 (= MO23 and MO86); 650, cat. R-1 (= MO1); 651, cat. R-2 (= MO26); 727, cat. R-72 (= MO11); and 780, cat. R-121 (= MO56).
Author's note: The current bibliography does not aim at providing an exhaustive list of the extensive documentation published on Memphis, but rather provide references that are relevant to the understanding and recontextualization of the artifacts on display at the museum and presented in the following catalog.
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Memphis was one of the most significant and emblematic cities of ancient Egypt. Its ancient origins, tracing back to the dawn of Pharaonic civilization, as well as its occupational history of no less than three millennia, contributed to making Memphis a legendary city, not only to the ancient Egyptians themselves, but also beyond, making a lasting impression on the collective imagination of the ancient and medieval world.

For the ancient Egyptian, Memphis represented a "primeval" place in many respects. As the earliest capital city of a united Egypt, Memphis was the place where the Pharaonic state had its roots. If we believe Classical tradition, Memphis was founded at the very beginning of Pharaonic history, when King Menes (a mythical figure of the Early Dynastic Period, who testifies to the memories that ancient people kept about actual events that occurred in their remote past) unified the Egyptian territory for the first time—a date that the archaeology of the site tends to confirm. As such, Memphis became, from a very early time, a special place where the Egyptian kings could reassert their rule and rejuvenate their power, and where significant events, such as the royal jubilee festival (*heb-sed*), and later, the king's coronation, took place.

The extensive necropolis of Memphis—which expands south to north from Dahshur, Saqqara, Abusir, Zawyet el-Aryan, Giza, to Abu Rawash—housed early royal tombs, including the first Egyptian pyramids. At the same time, the main local god of Memphis, Ptah, rapidly gained in prominence until he became one of the principal state deities, closely tied to Pharaonic royalty. Further, a local tradition known as the "Memphite Theology" attributes the creation of the universe to Ptah, and suggests that the first piece of fertile land that emerged from the primeval waters was in the Memphite area, adding to the overall mythical impression of this great city.

Closely tied to the formation and development of the Pharaonic state and civilization, the city's growth and history have always been exceptional. Throughout Egyptian history, the temples of Memphis received particular attention from the kings, who built there extensively, erecting some of the most impressive pieces of Pharaonic architecture and statuary. Thereby the sacred precinct of the god Ptah—the well-known *Hut-ka-Ptah* (or "Temple of the ka of Ptah"), whose name will one day evolve into ancient Greek "Aiguptos" or "Egypt"—gradually became one of the largest in Egypt, even competing in size and magnificence with the religious complex of Amun in Karnak better-known to modern tourists. In addition to the symbolic importance of Memphis to the Pharaonic state, its attractive location, strategically positioned in the narrowest part of the Nile Valley as a gateway between the Delta and the Valley, also contributed significantly to the expansion and afflu-
ence of the city. Memphis continually played a key role in the administration, economy, and defense of Egyptian territory, via its many local industries, its famous port that served as a crucial commerce hub, its dockyards devoted to shipbuilding activities, and its arsenal and garrisons. Though its status as capital was occasionally challenged by other local cities, Memphis always remained a metropolitan city throughout Pharaonic history, housing the headquarters of various important institutions, notably the Royal Residence and the Kap, where the royal heirs were raised and educated. Its estimated urban footprint—reaching at least 550–600 hectares from the Ramesside Period onwards until the Late Period—positioned Memphis amongst the largest Egyptian cities of its time. Its intriguing lure led to the city’s development as a true cosmopolitan center, housing many diverse foreign communities.

The prestige of this millennia-old city also reached beyond Egypt’s borders, as can be seen by the enthusiasm of ancient foreign travelers who reported their journeys to Memphis and their visits to its temples, and from the testimonies of native and foreign conquerors who always took pride in capturing this prominent city. The city’s glory was not overshadowed until a very late date, when the founding of Fustât (part of ancient Cairo) by the Arabs, farther to the north, caused its definite decline during the 7th century AD—a decline already initiated in the 4th century BC with the founding of Alexandria by Alexander the Great. But even then, the influence of Memphis on the collective imagination did not completely fade, as is evidenced by the medieval Islamic tradition that once again linked the site of Memphis with legends: indeed, Arabic medieval writers used to consider Memphis as the ancient city of the Biblical figure of Yusuf (or Joseph), and identified in its ancient monuments places related to his story, like the so-called “Granaries of Joseph” or the “Prison of Joseph.” This folklore still lingers on nowadays in collective memory through a series of Arabic toponyms that relate Memphis to various characters mentioned by Quranic tradition as being linked to the story of Yusuf, for instance: the village of ‘Aziziya and the Kôm ‘Azîz, referring to El-‘Azîz (also known as Potiphar in the Bible), the Egyptian officer who bought Yusuf, or the Gallery of Zalîkha and the Palace of Zalîkha, after the name of El-‘Azîz’s wife, who failed in her attempt to seduce Yusuf.

Though the exact location of Memphis was long lost, its name survived and interest in this illustrious city remained, leading to various suggestions in the 18th century for identifying it, and to its eventual rediscovery and excavation under the modern village of Mit Rahîna, located south of Cairo, from the beginning of the 19th century onwards. Over the two following centuries, explorers and surveyors completed plans and maps, and a series of over 150 excavations—some planned, the others accidental—were undertaken throughout the ruins, gradually unearthing scattered fragments of the lost city of Memphis.
Nowadays, however, the prestigious past of Memphis remains difficult to see or comprehend when walking through its archaeological sites. Even the knowledgeable visitor must make a real effort to imagine that they are treading upon the very earth of this once-glorious city! This is due in part to the nature of the excavations that were conducted there (many of which were not documented or remain unpublished), and failed, on the whole, to provide a satisfying overall picture of the city's extent, topography, and history. This situation is also due to the condition of the ruin field itself. Buried under modern settlements and encroaching vegetation, and exposed to an ever-rising water table, the remains of Memphis—a unique city with particularly complex and deep stratigraphy that we have only recently begun to understand—have also been heavily damaged by time and human activity. For example, most of the stone temples were dismantled in ancient times and extensively exploited as a quarry for building medieval Cairo. Moreover, a large number of the exquisite pieces of architecture and statuary unearthed here during the past two centuries were removed from Memphis in order to be added to the collections of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo and foreign museums all over the world, further increasing the perplexing feeling that the splendor of Memphis is everywhere, except in the region of Memphis itself!

Fortunately, over the last decades various teams have aimed to remedy this situation by undertaking a systematic survey of the ruins of Memphis, via a thorough mapping of the ruin field, a study of ancient sources and excavation archives, targeted excavations in areas likely to provide information about the evolution of the Memphite settlement, landscape, and environment, and a re-examination and re-contextualization of a series of excavated sites and of artifacts of Memphite provenance. Of particular note is the extensive work conducted here by the Egypt Exploration Society’s Survey of Memphis (SoM) under the direction of David G. Jeffreys, H. S. (Harry) Smith, and Lisa Giddy since the early 1980s. We can also cite other projects aiming to re-examine excavated sites, such as that undertaken in the 1980s by Michael Jones on behalf of New York University at the Memphite “Apis House,” which made a valuable contribution to the understanding of the site.

Following in the footsteps of these highly committed predecessors, recent work in Memphis by Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA)—the joint AERA-ARCE-EES Memphis Field School (held in conjunction with the American Research Center in Egypt and the Egypt Exploration Society; also known as MRFS, in 2011 and 2014) followed by the Memphis Development Project (or MDP, from 2015–2017)—aimed to make a contribution to our knowledge of this lost city through a new assessment of eight previously excavated sites. But it also, and perhaps more importantly, aimed to put Memphis back into the spotlight by implementing a plan for the protection, presentation, and enhancement of its remains, with a view to make the city’s ruin field, so
long overlooked and neglected, one of the must-see archaeological sites of the Egyptian tourist circuit. The present book is one of the many achievements of this project, and highlights the lost heritage of Memphis by drawing attention to a site that remained, until recently, the only available showcase of the in situ heritage of Memphis: the local museum of Mit Rahina, and its collection of 81 artifacts found within the Memphite region.

Among the sites that received extensive attention from the MDP is the museum of Mit Rahina, commonly known as the Open Air Museum or the Mathaf Ramsîs (or Ramesses Museum, in reference to one of the colossal limestone masterpieces in its holdings)—long since the only site open to visitors within Mit Rahina. It must be acknowledged that its many treasures, though accessible to the public, have not received adequate interest and prominence thus far. The museum displays a substantial and remarkable sample of Memphite monuments, including several unique pieces that deserve to be more widely known. In addition to this, the museum itself sits on archaeological remains in the heart of the Memphite ruin field, and the fuller understanding of its context—as presented in this book—will greatly enhance the visitor’s experience.

This publication aims to present the remarkable collection of artifacts displayed in the museum of Mit Rahina, and, through it, to introduce the reader or visitor to the site of ancient Memphis, offering insight into the history and excavation of this lost city. This book is the first to provide a comprehensive presentation of the museum and a detailed catalog of its treasures, which will hopefully make this book a useful document for specialists studying Memphite material.
The Memphis Development Project 2015–2017 (MDP)

Undertaken by Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA) via collaboration with the University of York, under the aegis of the Egyptian Ministry of Antiquities (MoA), and with the financial support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the two-year MDP was an ambitious endeavor: revive the ancient city of Memphis and arouse the interest of the general public for its little-known, though fascinating, archaeological remains.

In practice, this meant:

1. the undertaking of a new archaeological and conservation assessment of a selection of eight sites, the creation of a vast archaeological database (to be made available to specialists in the near future), and a plan for the long-term preservation of the remains. This database gathers together a new set of archaeological survey data (fig. 1), collected with a Total Station and imported into a Geographical Information System (GIS), as well as detailed information packets combining previous archaeological and interpretative work conducted on these monuments with any relevant published literature;

2. the creation of a full tourist walking circuit through the ruin field (fig. 2), which would connect these sites and make them both physically accessible and understandable to both Egyptian and international visitors through the implementation on-site of pathways, facilities, and interpretative bilingual signs, and through the production of informative and promotional media; and

3. the training, through a series of four dedicated field schools, of 77 MoA Inspectors from all over Egypt in cutting-edge methods of heritage management, so that they could experiment with and implement these new approaches both at Memphis and, in the future, on other Egyptian historical sites.

For this project, seven of the best-preserved monuments of the southern half of the Memphis ruin field were selected—in addition to the Open Air Museum—for their historical significance and the insight they provide into the ancient city of Memphis (map 1, p. 7):

- The West Gate of the Great Ptah Temple, built by Ramesses II
- The Small Temple of Ptah, built by Ramesses II
- The Cemetery of the High Priests of Ptah during the 22nd Dynasty
- The Apis House of the 30th Dynasty
- The Chapel of Seti I, also known as an “oratory”
Figure 1. Memphis Development Project (MDP) Surveyor Mohammed Abd el-Aziz Gabr surveying architectural fragments in the Ptah Temple West Gate. Photo by Amel Eweida.

Figure 2. A portion of the new walking circuit of Memphis. The MDP laid 1.3 km of pathways between eight archaeological sites, and installed new bilingual signage for visitors. Photo by Sayed Salah Abd el-Hakim.
Map 1. The Open Air Museum and the seven archaeological sites that were fully surveyed, researched, and equipped so that they could be integrated into the new tourist walking circuit created by the MDP, 2015–2017. Map by Rebekah Miracle, AERA GIS.

- The Temple of Hathor, built by Ramesses II
- A temple of Ramesses II, commonly known as the “Temple of Sekhmet”

**The Survey of the Open Air Museum of Mit Rahina**

Located in the middle of the ruin field, the Open Air Museum of Mit Rahina consists mainly of a modern display area dedicated to a permanent collection of 81 stone artifacts of large size. This display area—meant to emphasize three central pieces—is divided into roughly four parts. It consists of:

(1) A vast concrete shelter with a viewing platform for visitors to admire
a famous limestone colossus of Ramesses II. This shelter also contains a range of smaller pieces distributed around the colossus, within the staircase, and along the front of the shelter.

(2) Outside the museum’s shelter, along its eastern side, three rows of concrete platforms form an open air display area for additional pieces of varying size.

(3) Northeast of this, another centerpiece of the museum’s collection, a superb monumental sphinx of Egyptian alabaster of the 18th Dynasty, stands remote on a concrete plinth.

(4) East of the sphinx sits the museum’s garden, where another colossus of Ramesses II, flanked by two lines of smaller artifacts, takes centerstage. To the south of the garden, a vacant area contains an additional display platform intended for future use, the buried archaeological remains of a large enclosure wall, and extra space for the museum to expand.

For obvious reasons, the MDP work conducted at the museum differs from the recording undertaken at the other seven archaeological sites selected for the project. The focus of the museum work was to create a catalog of the objects on display, and to assess the museum’s existing features related to visitor experience at the site (modern buildings, interpretative signs, and visitor facilities and routes), with the hope that our field school students could enhance and supplement them.

For this purpose, Project Surveyors ‘Amr Zakaria Mohammed and Mohamed Abd el-‘Aziz Gabr undertook a topographical survey record by Total Station of all features within the museum. This included modern buildings, fences and fence poles, garden lawns and parterres, trees and curbs, smaller facilities like bins and benches, display facilities such as platforms and plinths, and, of course, displayed objects. Each surveyed feature was tagged with a feature type code. MDP GIS Director Rebekah Miracle then imported the entire survey data into GIS, and included the feature types within the GIS data tables, so that data can easily be accessed and queried (map 2, p. 9).

During this process, the surveyors assigned a Museum Object number (MO) to each object displayed within the museum: from MO1 through MO87. At the time of the survey, a total of 87 objects were on display (map 3, p. 10), including six objects (MO35, MO47, MO63, MO64, MO65, and MO70) that were awaiting official registration. In agreement with the MoA, we decided to remove these six artifacts from the current book, reducing the total number of objects addressed here to 81 (for practical reasons we kept our initial numbering scheme).

Each object was subsequently photographed (with both simple record shots and publication-quality photographs) by Project Photographer Amel Nasr
Map 2. The modern existing features (including new information panels) and displayed artifacts of the Open Air Museum, as surveyed when the MDP was completed in 2017. Plan by Rebekah Miracle, AERA GIS.
Map 3. Location (with MO number) of the 81 artifacts displayed within the Open Air Museum, and of six artifacts awaiting official registration. The approximate position of the in situ remains of the southern enclosure wall of the Great Ptah Temple (now reburied) is indicated. Plan by Rebekah Miracle, AERA GIS.
Mohammed Eweida, using a full-frame camera (Nikon D700) and two lenses—60 mm and 24 mm (for detailed shots). Where possible, she photographed the objects from four sides and from the top (using a ladder when necessary), but encountered some difficulties in photographing the larger objects (such as the colossi) because the use of scaffolding was not possible. Because the objects are displayed outside she used two silver reflectors and plastic sheets as light diffusers. We are very pleased to be able to use her photographs extensively in the catalog section of this book.

Researching the Objects and the Museum

In the absence of any comprehensive publication on this collection of artifacts, the MDP concomitantly carried out a study of each object displayed within the museum. Because no literary sources were available on the topic, we conducted research on the history of the museum, and on the museum as an archaeological site, since the museum’s compound sits on Memphis’s ruin field and contains in situ archaeological features. To this end, the characteristics (type, material, and any inscriptions), purpose, and provenance of each object was researched, and any published literature and archival material about the museum and its objects was sought and, where possible, collected.

The work published by the EES’s Survey of Memphis (SoM) from the 1980s onwards (see p. 52) was particularly helpful for tracking the provenance and excavation context of a number of objects and for repositioning them on a map (see especially Jeffreys 1985 and Jeffreys 2010; and see maps 7–9, pp. 75–77). For the purpose of our research, references to the SoM’s survey grid and site code system—whose coordinates were also integrated by Rebekah Miracle into our GIS database—were made in order to pinpoint either the exact or approximate findspot of objects on our maps (when a provenance was identified). Likewise, in the current publication, when referring to locations in the ruin field of Memphis, we use the topographical subdivision and glossary, as established by the SoM (Jeffreys 1985: 1–10, 78–84, figs. 2–10).

Divided first into northern and southern halves, Memphis’s ruin field is then further subdivided into a series of archaeological mounds (or kôm in Arabic) of varying extent and height, three depressions where the groundwater tends to create ponds or lakes (birka in Arabic), and former retention ponds that were used for holding floodwaters in the past (hôd in Arabic). The site reference system established by the SoM (SoM’s site codes) divides the whole archaeological area into smaller areas corresponding respectively to the northern, middle, and southern depressions (all identified as “B”), and to the various archaeological mounds (based on the initial letter of their local names, e.g., Q = Kôm el-Qal’a, F = Kôm el-Fakhry, etc.). Reference to excavated sites located in these many areas is then made through a unique identifier consisting of two additional letters (e.g., QAB refers to the site of the Palace
of Merneptah as excavated by Clarence S. Fisher on Kôm el-Qal'a; with Q for Qal'a, and AB for the area excavated there by Fisher). In three instances, however, the excavated areas overlap two kôms—Kôm el-Rabî'a and Kôm el-Qal'a; in this particular situation, the site code consists of the two kôms' initial (RQ) followed by a single-letter identifier (respectively, A, B, and C) (maps 4–5, pp. 13–14).

Our research also benefited greatly from data contained in various sets of unpublished documentation that were drawn to our attention and made available to us by colleagues of the MoA and other international institutions. Hisham el-Leithy, Director of the MoA's Center of Studies and Documentation of Egyptian Antiquities, Cairo (CEDAE) granted us permission to access archival material of significant importance for our research, in particular:

- a set of old photographs of Memphis in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, assembled by the German Egyptologists Hermann J. B. Junker and Ludwig Borchardt (the collection is known as "Junker and Borchardt, 1912" although some photographs were clearly taken later than 1912);
- and, more importantly, the Saqqara Photographic Archives (organized in folders by chronological order), containing records of all the fieldwork conducted in the Memphite area from the beginning of the 20th century, including Memphis and Saqqara. These consist of black and white photographs with Arabic captions mentioning the name of the photographer, the date, the type of activities (excavation, renovation, etc.), the overall area (Memphis, Saqqara, etc.), and occasionally indications of a more specific area or monument and of the people involved. This archive was particularly valuable for tracking unpublished objects whose provenance and excavation context were not otherwise identified by the SoM team, as well as for tracing back the history of the creation of the museum and the assembling of its collection.

Likewise, Michael Jones of the American Research Center in Egypt, Cairo (ARCE) provided us with his full Memphis archive, which included documents related to his work at the Apis House and a set of archival pictures that he assembled of this site and other areas of the ruin field (notably, photographs showing the museum's surroundings in the 1950s).

Additional graphic material was collected through photographic research within image collections made available online by institutions (e.g., the Oxford Griffith Institute's "Egyptian Mirage," the Library of Congress's "G. Eric and Edith Matson Photograph Collection") and from antique postcards and old private photographs for sale online (e.g., eBay). Old press articles were also searched in collections of digitized historical newspapers (e.g., the British Newspaper Archive, London).
Map 4. The southern half of the Memphis ruin field with detail of the areas (birka = pond) and excavated sites as defined and subdivided by the Egypt Exploration Society’s Survey of Memphis (SoM) team. This updated map includes additional site codes corresponding to new sites that were excavated and surveyed after the first publication of the SoM’s site codes map in 1985. Map by Rebekah Miracle, AERA GIS.
Map 5. The northern half of the Memphis ruin field with detail of the areas (birka = pond) and excavated sites as defined and subdivided by the Egypt Exploration Society’s Survey of Memphis team. Plan by Rebekah Miracle, AERA GIS.
The Plan for a Catalog Book

The idea of turning our work on the museum and its objects into a book coalesced as the amount of new, unpublished data increased, and as the value of the collection for helping to illustrate the overall history of Memphis became more obvious. Interestingly, this assemblage of objects demonstrates well the long process of the rediscovery and excavation of Memphis, beginning in the very early 19th century, and opens windows that will allow visitors to learn more about this ancient city through time.

This book, which does not claim to be exhaustive, aims to use the Open Air Museum's collection to introduce the non-specialist reader to the enthralling remains and history of ancient Memphis, while at the same time providing specialists with a handy detailed catalog—the first such attempt—of all objects on display, enriched with new information that may be relevant to their own research.
THE EXCAVATION OF MEMPHIS AND THE CREATION OF THE MUSEUM AND COLLECTION

The history of both the museum and its contents cannot be addressed without mentioning the long excavation history of the site of Memphis. The creation of the museum and the assembling of its collection of objects are both closely tied to the uncovering of the remains of this lost city. This starts with the museum’s building itself, a former version of which was built of mud-bricks, wood, and a tin roof to give shelter to the first significant discovery made in Memphis at the beginning of the 19th century.

The Discovery and Rescue of Abu’l-Hol, the Limestone Colossus of Ramesses II

In 1821, a superb colossus of Ramesses II (our MO85; fig. 3) carved from indurated limestone was unearthed by Giovanni B. Caviglia, a Genoese explorer and navigator working around Egypt in the early 1800s for various British collectors, notably at the Sphinx and Pyramids of Giza for the British Consul-General in Egypt, Henry Salt, and at Memphis and Giza for the British Consular official in Cairo, Charles Sloane (Jeffreys 1985: 24; 2010: 71, and passim). Though it was given to the British by Muhammad Ali Pasha (also known as Mehmet Ali Pasha), the Viceroy of Egypt and Sudan, this magnificent colossus of Ramesses the Great—which Caviglia named Abu’l-Hol (Arabic for “Father of Awe”), perhaps in reference to the similarly-named Great Sphinx in Giza—was never removed from Memphis due to the prohibitive costs of transporting the monument to the United Kingdom. As a consequence, this colossal statue was left for decades in its excavation trench, lying face down in the position in which it was found (fig. 4). Due to the clear artistic value of the colossus, several plans for re-erecting it were proposed but eventually abandoned. In 1887, a British weekly newspaper, The Graphic, published an illustrated article pointing to the alarming situation of this treasure, face down, and regularly exposed to water damage (fig. 5).
Figure 4. The Abu‘l-hol colossus lying face down in its excavation trench at Kôm el-Rabî’a, as photographed by H. Béchard some time before 1887. Reproduced with permission of Griffith Institute, University of Oxford (Gr. Inst.134).

Figure 5. The Abu‘l-hol colossus submerged face down in a pool of water, as sketched by H. Wallis and described in The Graphic, January 8th 1887 (pp. 30, 36).
Due to the emotion elicited by this article, a plan was adopted by British officials and entrusted to the Royal Engineers for rescuing the colossus. But owing to limited funds obtained through private donations, the initial plan for raising Abu’l-Hol to an upright position was abandoned in favor of a more modest project. In June 1887, the British Colonel Arthur H. Bagnold of the Royal Engineers—to whom the actual task of rescuing the 100-ton colossus was assigned—was able to turn the statue over and raise it to higher ground, some four and half meters above its original location (Bagnold 1888: 452–463). After five months of work, the project was successfully completed (figs. 6–7). During the same period of time, Bagnold (1888: 456–460) also rescued two other major pieces: the massive stela of Apries currently on display in the museum (MO24), and another beautiful colossus of Ramesses II carved from red granite, famous for its relocation from Memphis to Cairo in 1952 in order to adorn Midân Ramsîs railway station, and again to Giza in 2007 for its planned installation in front of the new Grand Egyptian Museum.

Bagnold’s newly-built exhibition space for Ramesses’s limestone colossus made the statue a major attraction for foreign travelers visiting Egypt, by allowing visitors to fully admire its outstanding artistic quality for the first time. After being rebuilt once in 1902 by the Department of Antiquities (Maspero 1910: 74), the Abu’l-Hol shelter was then entirely replaced by the concrete building that still houses the colossus today, when the present Museum of Mit Rahina was created by the Department of Antiquities in the late 1950s, as we will see further on (see also Jeffreys 1985: 24) (figs. 8–13).
Figure 7. The Abu'l-hol colossus (MO85) on February 19th, 1887 during the process of raising, as sketched by H. Wallis. After Bagnold 1888: pl. 2.

Figure 8. Plan, section, and elevation of the mudbrick shelter with viewing platform and tin roof, built by the British Royal Engineers in 1887 for accommodating the newly re-positioned colossus of Ramesses II. After Bagnold 1888: pl. 5.
Figure 9. Postcard showing the Abu'l-hol colossus (MO85) as displayed in its first mudbrick shelter. The picture was taken some time between 1887 and 1902, before the shelter was re-built by the Department of Antiquities. The image and caption below give an early visitor's impressions of the colossus to a friend back home. Author's private collection.

"Luxor. 3 Février 1914.
Annette. Ce grand monsieur aujourd'hui couché dans l'herbe, s'il était debout dans la rue La Boétie vous pourriez à peu près de votre balcon lui causer à l'oreille.
-- l'ami Godard."

"Luxor. 3rd February 1914.
Annette. This tall gentleman now lying in the grass, if he was standing upright in La Boétie street (a street in Paris, where the recipient of the postcard is living), you could almost talk into his ear from your balcony.
-- your friend Godard."
Figure 10, above. The second shelter of the Abu’l-hol colossus with its tin gable roof, as seen looking eastward in 1954. The shelter was facing a group of mudbrick houses known as ‘Ezbet Abu’l-hol el-gharbīya or “the western estate/land of Abu’l-hol,” where the antiquities inspector’s office was located, and which was dismantled when the museum was built. Mudbrick remains in the middle foreground indicate the position of the southern enclosure wall of the Great Ptah Temple, probably just before R. Anthes excavated it in 1955. Courtesy of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology Archives.

Figure 11. The second shelter of the Abu’l-hol colossus in 1956, as rebuilt by the Department of Antiquities in 1902. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 26).
Figure 12, above. Various stone pieces behind the second shelter of the Abu'l-hol colossal in 1956. These include objects that are currently displayed at the museum: the pair of column bases coming from Merneptah’s palace (MO4 and MO9), as well as a fragmentary statue of Ramesses II carved from Egyptian alabaster (MO22) and a much eroded theophorous statue (MO23). Both MO22 and MO23 appear to be standing on a pair of granite pedestals of Ramesses II (MO86 and MO87). Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 26).

Figure 13. The Abu'l-hol colossal lying inside its second shelter in 1949. Along its sides sit various stone pieces, including the torso of Ramesses IV (MO50) and the uraei-frieze (MO73), which are currently on display at the museum. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 18).
The Exploration of the Religious Complex of Ptah During the 19th–early 20th Centuries

The discovery of the Abu’l-Hol colossus in the early 19th century ushered in a period of intense excavation and significant discovery throughout the ruin field of ancient Memphis. First, the excavation of the limestone colossus led to the uncovering of a series of other remarkable pieces of statuary that—as later excavators would begin to understand—originally adorned a processional causeway leading to the South Gate of the vast religious complex of the god Ptah. Indeed, Caviglia, while exposing the colossus, also unearthed additional statues, including a colossal standard-bearing statue of Ramesses II (MO21) and a four-faced Hathor column capital (MO19) (Jeffreys 2010: 86 and 71).

Early Visitors

Even though only limited excavations were undertaken in this early period, the work conducted at Memphis during an 1843 expedition in Egypt and Nubia led by the German Egyptologist Karl R. Lepsius (on behalf of Friedrich Wilhelm IV, King of Prussia) was particularly crucial, as it contributed to establishing the first detailed map of the ruin field of the ancient city of Memphis, on the basis of which later plans and maps were developed (LD, B.I.202–204 ["Mitrahineh"] and Abth.I.B1.9–10) (figs. 14–15).

Figure 14. The first detailed map of the ruin field of Memphis, as established by G. Erbkam in 1843 in Memphis for the expedition in Egypt and Sudan led by K. R. Lepsius on behalf of the King of Prussia. Note that north is reversed in the Baedeker adaptation shown in Fig. 15. After LD, Abth.I.B1.9.
Then, in 1852 and 1854, Joseph Hekekyan Bey, a Turkish engineer of Armenian descent, was commissioned by the Scottish geologist Leonard Horner of the Geological Society of London to undertake trial drilling in the Nile alluvium of Heliopolis and Memphis in order to evaluate the rate of alluvial deposition since the 19th Dynasty (Jeffreys 2010: 89–182). On this occasion, Hekekyan, who was at the time funded by the British Royal Society, enlarged the excavation trench opened by Caviglia. He also dug additional research pits throughout the large, regularly-flooded depression (known as the *birka* or "lake") that cuts across the center of Memphis, and along the eastern edge of the ruin field where the ancient river bank of the Nile was known to have once been.

Driven by his personal interest in archaeology and Egyptology, Hekekyan also undertook several archaeological excavations throughout the *birka*, in various areas corresponding to the ancient religious complex of Ptah and its main gates. There he recorded remains of architecture and numerous fragments of royal statues and colossi, a number of which have since been rebuilt and are currently on display in the Museum of Mit Rahîna: a pair of colossi of Ramesses II (MO1 and MO26), a fragment of a pair-statue (MO18), the stela of Apries (MO24), a fragment of a seated statue (MO50), a colossus's
wrist (MO53), a colossal statue of a royal wife or royal daughter (MO60, fig. 18), possibly two sphinxes (MO69 and MO71), and the colossus later taken to Cairo railway station (figs. 16–17). Owing to Hekekyan’s background as a geologist, his records of the stratigraphy of Memphis and of the archaeological context of the artifacts and structures he unearthed are so unusually elaborate for the time that they still constitute a valuable source of data for geologists and archaeologists today. These records are currently kept at

Figure 16. Fragments of the superb granite colossus of Ramesses II (later transferred to the Ramsîs railway station in Cairo), and the upper part of a group statue featuring Ramesses II and Ptah (MO18, “E” on the sketch, at center foreground), as found and sketched by J. Hekekyan in 1854 in the Middle Bîrka. MS 37459.570, Courtesy of the British Library.

Figure 17. Travelers (?) admiring the granite colossus of Ramesses II (later transported to Cairo railway station), together with the colossal stela of Apries (MO24) and the fragment of a pair-statue of Ramesses II and Ptah (MO18). This photo was taken in 1900 after these pieces were raised and relocated at Kôm el-Qâl’a, not far from the current Open Air Museum, by A. H. Bagnold of the British Royal Engineers in 1887. Author’s personal collection.
the British Library in London. Last but not least, Hekekyan’s excavations also demonstrated that the birka depression actually corresponded to the location and expanse of the ancient religious complex of Ptah.

Following Hekekyan’s fruitful seasons in Memphis, several renowned Egyptologists and enthusiastic amateurs then came to visit the site, leading to additional, albeit sporadic, discoveries and recordings. Among them, a German missionary, Reverend Johann R. T. Lieder of the Church of England Missionary Society, and his wife, Alice Lieder (born Holliday), made a series of inscription squeezes from statues in 1853, now kept at the Griffith Institute, Oxford (Málek 1986: 101–112; Jeffreys 2010: 183; most notably of the colossus’s wrist [MO53] and the Abu’l-Hol colossus [MO85]). The German Egyptologist Heinrich F. K. Brugsch also visited Memphis several times, making additional observations. In 1853 he identified the stela of Apries (MO24; Jeffreys 2010: 183–184) and in the 1870s he recorded inscribed blocks referring to the cult of the sacred bull Apis (Brugsch 1878: 37–43). Likewise, in 1886, the British Egyptologist William M. Flinders Petrie included Memphis in his preliminary survey of Egyptian archaeological sites and identified an industrial area consisting of glazing kilns at Kôm Helûl (Jeffreys 1985: 19; 2010: 188).

Successive French directors of the Egyptian Antiquities Service were also interested in exploring the ruin field of Memphis. François A. F. Mariette in 1871–1875 (Jeffreys 2010: 184–185), followed by Gaston C. C. Maspero and Eugène Grébaut in 1885–1886 (Jeffreys 2010: 188), undertook exca-
vations at Kôm Khanzîr as well as at Mît Rahîna where the remains of the West Gate of the religious complex of Ptah were uncovered. In 1892–1894, Jacques J. M. de Morgan resumed work at the West Gate (Jeffreys 2010: 189–190) and made additional discoveries, among them the pair of beautiful colossal statues of Ptah that are now displayed in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo (figs. 19–20). Georges É. J. Daressy also visited the site in 1901, and carried on additional recording, mainly at the West Gate and in an area located slightly to the south, not far from the location of the Apis House (Daressy 1901: 240–243; 1902: 22–31).

**Petrie’s Years**

Large-scale exploration of the ancient city of Memphis only truly began after Petrie finally obtained the concession for the site in 1907. During six successive seasons of work, ranging from 1908–1913 and under the aegis of his newly-founded British School of Archaeology in Egypt, Petrie and his research assistants—among whom were Ernest J. H. MacKay, Gerald A. Wainwright, and Thomas E. Lawrence (better known as “Lawrence of Arabia”)—excavated extensively throughout the Memphis ruin field, with a particular interest in the ruins of the religious complex of Ptah.

In 1908, Petrie’s team conducted excavations along the limit between Mit Rahina and the *birka*, on the western edge of the former sacred precinct of Ptah where the main temple of the god once stood (Petrie 1909a: 5–6), especially at the West Gate of the temple enclosure and its adjoining West Hall,
both built by Ramesses II in the 19th Dynasty (fig. 20). Minor excavations were also undertaken in other areas of the ruin field, notably at Kôm el-Fakhry where a portion of the Apis House and a chapel were unearthed (Petrie 1909a: 10 [§31], 12–13 [§38]), and at Kôm el-Nawa where an ancient avenue leading to a religious structure dating from the Late Period was uncovered (Petrie 1909a: 10 [§31]). A column fragment currently on display in the Open Air Museum (MO39) may come from these early excavations. From 1909 to 1910, Petrie’s team next sought to explore the promising-looking ruins located on the north of the complex of Ptah, at Kôm Tumân, where the imposing remains of the palace of King Apries were exposed (Petrie 1909b; Kemp 1977: 101–108; Pagliari 2010: 333–342).

Finally, from 1911 to 1913, Petrie’s focus shifted back to the temple of Ptah. In 1912, he made prominent discoveries in various areas of the temple’s ruins. A monumental sphinx carved from a single piece of Egyptian alabaster (a common name for local calcite) and portraying an anonymous sovereign was uncovered in an area located near the South Gate of the sacred precinct (Petrie 1911: 23 [§50]); today, this magnificent sphinx constitutes one of the masterpieces of the Open Air Museum (MO14, figs. 21–23). Because of the importance of this discovery, the event was widely covered by the newspapers of the time, notably by The Times, June 4th, 1912, The Graphic, July 13th, 1912, and The New York Times, July 14th, 1912.
This exceptional discovery was followed shortly by the excavation of another monumental red granite sphinx inscribed by Ramesses II, together with other monumental pieces of statuary, including a remarkable pair-statue depicting Ramesses II with the god Ptah-Tatenen that now constitutes the centerpiece of the Egyptian section at the Carlsberg Glyptothek in Copenhagen. These were unearthed in the area of the North Gate where a temple devoted to the hybrid god Ptah-Tatenen may have once stood (Petrie 1913: 32–33 [§44–45]; Wegner and Wegner 2015: 24–30). Unlike his alabaster companion, this second sphinx was removed from Memphis and shipped to the USA, where the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in Philadelphia (then a sponsor of part of Petrie’s excavations in Memphis, now more commonly known as the Penn Museum) became its new home (Wegner and Wegner 2015: 25–81).

A few other pieces currently on display in the Open Air Museum also come from these final seasons of excavation in Ptah’s sacred precinct, including a monumental doorjamb from the architecture of the main temple of Ptah.
Figure 22. The colossal sphinx (MO14) tipped over on its left side, as found in 1913 by E. J. H. Mackay during W. M. F. Petrie’s excavations at Kôm el-Qâl’a. Courtesy of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology Archives.

Figure 23. One of the most emblematic sights of the ruin field of Memphis from the 1910s onwards: the colossal sphinx of alabaster (MO14). Copyright © CEDEA (Borchardt and Junker 1912 collection).
(MO34), and fragments of a seated pair-statue of Ramesses II and Ptah-Tatenen (MO44 and MO56) from the interior of the temple.

**The Exploration of the Southeastern Expanse of the City and the Discovery of the Palace of Merneptah**

Petrie's work at Memphis was prematurely interrupted in 1914 with the onset of World War I and was never resumed. In 1915 the concession of the site passed to the Penn Museum. This handover of the site concession inaugurated another phase of fruitful fieldwork and remarkable discoveries in Memphis. Clarence S. Fisher, a young but experienced American archaeologist, was entrusted by George B. Gordon, then director and head curator of the Penn Museum, to undertake new extensive excavations. These were conducted under the sponsorship of a wealthy American scholar, Eckley B. Coxe Jr. (as part of the eponymous "Eckley B. Coxe Jr. Expedition to Egypt") with the aim of uncovering monumental pieces of statuary and architecture to enrich the collections of the Egyptian section of the museum (Wegner and Wegner 2015: 88–97). Fisher applied for and received permission to excavate a vast area in Kôm el-Qal'a that had received little attention thus far (although Petrie found a temple dedicated to Ptah there), and which corresponded to an urban expansion of the ancient city during the Ramesside period on the southeastern side of the religious complex of Ptah.

There, near an impressive Roman mudbrick structure and beneath a complex stratigraphy of occupational deposits of the post-Ramesside settlement, he uncovered the remains of a palatial complex dated to the reign of Merneptah, son of Ramesses II (Fisher 1917: 211–237; 1921: 30–34; O'Connor 1991: 167–191; Wegner and Wegner 2015: 97–101). In 1915, Fisher first excavated the structure of a monumental gate—the South Portal—that had been accidentally exposed by local people looking for sebâkh (ancient deteriorated mudbricks used as fertilizer). Then, from 1916 to 1920, Fisher found the remarkably well-preserved remains of a ceremonial palace of Merneptah, built of mudbrick and stone, which burnt down shortly after the end of his reign. By the then-common practice of division of finds, a number of important stone pieces from this royal palace were moved from Memphis to the Penn Museum, where they are still displayed today. However, two remarkable column bases found in situ in the throne room of the palatial complex, on either side of the royal throne dais, can still be admired in the Open Air Museum (MO4 and MO9) (figs. 24–25).

**Discoveries Resulting from the Expansion of the Modern Settlement and Agricultural Practice at Mit Rahina**

Since Petrie's and Fisher's extensive fieldwork at Memphis, a succession of more limited excavations, unevenly documented, have been conducted
Figure 24. The royal throne room of Merneptah’s palace at Kôm el-Qal’a, as exposed by C. S. Fisher in 1916–1917 as part of the Eckley B. Coxe Jr. Expedition to Egypt. Courtesy of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology Archives.

Figure 25. The elaborately carved throne dais as found in Merneptah’s palace by C. S. Fisher, with the two large column bases MO4 and MO9 still engaged with the royal platform, its front ramp and side stairs. Courtesy of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology Archives.
throughout the Memphis ruin field. Most of these have been accidental discoveries due to the expansion and development of the modern settlement of Mît Rahîna and its irrigation system.

Until it was banned by the Egyptian government, the destructive practice of sebâkh collection—the digging of the upper layers of archaeological mounds for decomposed mudbrick to spread on agricultural fields as fertilizer—led to the discovery of new sites in Memphis. The collection of sebâkh was a direct consequence of the evolution of Egyptian agriculture that turned into a perennial practice after the building of the Aswan Dam in 1902 stopped the annual flooding and alluviation of the Nile Valley. Isolated objects were also recovered at Memphis from this practice, the archaeological context of which are now often difficult, if not impossible, to determine. A few objects on display in the Open Air Museum come from such sporadic discoveries. Such is apparently the case of a unique embalming table (MO27) dated from the reign of Amenhotep III that was found in the 1920s at Kôm Tumân in the north of Memphis (Habachi 1967: 42).

Likewise, the increasing need to build new houses and roads, dig wells, and move earth—also directly resulting from the expansion of the modern settlement and cultivated lands—led to additional discoveries, the detailed archaeological contexts of which are now lost to us. Such is the case of a standard-bearing statue of Ramesses II (MO51), a fragmentary group statue depicting the coronation of Horemheb (MO45), and of an unfinished statue of Pedubast (MO30), all found by accident in the 1940s in various areas of the ruin field of Memphis (Simpson 1956: 118; Habachi 1966: 70).

Accidental but Important Discoveries at Kôm el-Rabi’a and Kôm el-Fakhry

A number of these accidental discoveries occurring on the rich archaeological grounds of Kôm el-Rabi’a and Kôm el-Fakhry to the southwest of the complex of Ptah were particularly crucial, as they led to the unearthing of a new series of standing monuments and portions of the ancient settlement. Their exploration has gradually helped us understand both religious practice in Memphis and the ancient city’s expansion through time.

Following undocumented excavations conducted in 1931 by an anonymous inspector of the Department of Antiquities in Saqqara just outside the southwestern corner of the religious complex of Ptah, the well-known Egyptian archaeologists Ahmed M. Badawi and Mustafa M. el-Amir (Badawi 1944: 181–206; 1957: 153–177) fully exposed in 1940–1942 the cemetery of a family of High Priests of Ptah, descendants of King Osorkon II (22nd Dynasty) (fig. 26). Several of the tombs contained rich burial equipment, including reused pieces looted from New Kingdom tombs, notably a complete sarcophagus.
Figure 26. The cemetery of a family of High Priests of Ptah dated to the 22nd Dynasty and excavated at Kôm el-Rabi’a in 1940–1942 by A. M. Badawi and M. M. el-Amir. Amidst the burial equipment of these graves were found reused pieces originally coming from the burial of Amenhotep-Huy, governor of Memphis under Ramesses II, including the lid and bottom of his red granite sarcophagus (MO5 and MO8, which are currently displayed at the museum). Photo by Bassem Ezzat.

of red granite now on display in the Open Air Museum, which formerly belonged to Amenhotep-Huy, governor of Memphis under Ramesses II (MO5 and MO8). Though the two-storey structure of these tombs is still visible on site today, the decorated superstructure of one of them—built with beautifully carved blocks of limestone—is now exhibited in the front garden of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo. However, these were not the only important discoveries made by Badawi and el-Amir that year. While enlarging the excavation area, the two archaeologists came across a small temple with an entrance pylon dedicated to Ptah by Ramesses II (Badawi 1944: pl. XXIII–XXIV; Anthes 1959: 4). Visitors can still admire the remarkably well-preserved remains of this temple on site today (figs. 27–28).

Then, in 1941–1948, following earlier observations made by Brugsch and Petrie (see above), Badawi and el-Amir (el-Amir 1948: 51–56) conducted excavations in the southwestern corner of the sacred precinct of Ptah, exposing a building that belonged to the religious complex of the sacred Apis bull, as rebuilt by King Nectanebo II (30th Dynasty). Though this unique building was first interpreted as the stalls where the living bull was housed (the “sèkos” de-
Figures 27 (left), 28 (right). A view of the Small Ptah Temple built by Ramesses II and uncovered by A. M. Badawi and M. M. el-Amir at Kôm el-Rabî’a in the early 1940s. At the back of the temple, a beautifully carved doorway (MO31), which may have once belonged to a priest’s house, was found in 1956 during the work directed by R. Anthes on behalf of the Penn Museum. Photo at left by Bassem Ezzat, and at right by Amel Eweida.

Figure 29. The set of buildings known as the “Apis House” as it is currently visible to visitors at Kôm el-Fakhry. This is the embalming house of the 30th Dynasty, where the corpses of the successive sacred Apis bulls were mummified and purified before being transported to the Serapeum necropolis in Saqqara. Photo by Amel Eweida.
scribed in Greek sources), it is now widely acknowledged that the exposed structure was actually an embalming house where all or part of the embalming process of the bull corpses took place (fig. 29).

Additional important discoveries were made in 1948 in the same area when the Department of Irrigation dug through the archaeological area in order to drain and lower the ground water endangering the sanctuary of the Small Temple of Ramesses II (Anthes 1959: 4–5, pl. 1; 1965: 60). While digging eastwards, the team exposed an interesting chapel of Seti I, together with a portion of the Hellenistic enclosure wall that bounded the southern side of the religious complex of Ptah in later times. The unpublished excavations conducted there, both by local inspector H. ‘Assaf in 1948 (Perkins 1949: 41) and by the Egyptian Egyptologist Labîb Habachi in 1950 (Anthes 1965: 60; Jeffreys 1985: n. 574; Habachi also accidentally uncovered part of the entrance pylon of the nearby Small Temple of Ptah: Anthes 1959: 4–5), exposed the whole structure of the chapel as well as an important number of cultic/votive items and architectural pieces that came from dismantled monuments of the area. Among these, a piece of cornice (MO61) from the architecture of the chapel, and two blocks (MO59 and MO62) belonging to a now-lost chapel of King Tutankhamun or Ay (18th Dynasty) are currently displayed at the Open Air Museum (fig. 30).

A joint project initiated by the Penn Museum, utilizing American and Egyptian scholars under the direction of the German Egyptologist Rudolf R. G. P. G. Anthes, was set up in 1954 to re-investigate the archaeology of these three sites with an aim to both determine their chronological sequence and reconstruct the history of the area (Anthes 1959; 1965). During two successive seasons in 1955 and 1956, this international team thoroughly re-examined the structures and the exposed stratigraphy, and conducted additional excavations. On this occasion, the overall organization of the monuments was investigated and partially clarified, and a portion of the post-Ramesside settlement was methodically explored and recorded. A door lintel (MO31) now displayed at the Open Air Museum, which may have belonged to a priest’s house, was found when a test trench was dug at the back of the sanctuaries of the Small Temple of Ramesses II, in an attempt to locate the enclosure wall of this small complex.

Meanwhile, in 1954, local workers building a new road across Kôm el-Fakhry encountered a cemetery of undisturbed graves from the First Intermediate Period. To date, these constitute the earliest in situ remains found at Memphis. When M. ‘Abd el-Tawwâb el-Hitta excavated the cemetery in the same year (Lilyquist 1974: 27–30; Jeffreys 1985: 29, 68), he exposed an adjoining chapel that contained two false-door stelae (MO32 and MO33) now exhibited at the Open Air Museum, as well as a row of offering tables. As further excavations conducted later on—both in the early 1980s by Mohammed
Ashery (Jeffreys, Málek, and Smith 1983: 35) and in 2011 by Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA; Tavares and Kamel 2011: 2–7; see also below)—showed, these were accessible to and used by the inhabitants of a nearby Middle Kingdom residential area to communicate with their dead (fig. 31).

The Creation of the Open Air Museum and the Start of Its Collection

Though the available information is scarce, a tentative history of both the museum and the assembling of its collection can still be attempted. The following combines information gathered while investigating the history of the objects currently on display at the Open Air Museum with complementary data harvested while examining the unpublished Saqqara Photographic Archives (now kept at the CEDAE, Cairo).
Not much is known about what led to the foundation of the museum and when this exactly occurred. However, one can imagine that the accumulation, year after year, in the storerooms of the Department of Antiquities—as well as inside and around the Abu’l-hol shelter—of remarkable pieces coming from the excavations of Memphis gave rise to the idea of creating a museum where visitors could come and admire the area’s rich heritage. At that time, the shelter containing the Abu’l-hol colossus, already a must-see monument
for tourists in Egypt, likely appeared as an ideal spot in which to develop such a museum. A decision was therefore taken by the Department of Antiquities, sometime in the early 1950s, to improve the existing premises.

Because of its proximity, priority was given to enhancing the display of the monumental alabaster sphinx found by Petrie's team (MO14), which he had raised to higher grounds to protect from water damage (fig. 32). As early as 1953, this gigantic sphinx was set up on a concrete base in the same location where people admire it today. Concomitantly, the construction of a museum building was also envisioned. The first project, circa 1955, initially consisted of a spacious building with a hall dedicated to the colossus centerpiece of the collection and two adjoined exhibition galleries for displaying other Memphite objects, as well as storerooms and spaces for visitors. For some reason, this project was never completed as such (figs. 33–34).

Eventually, this plan was altered and only a portion of the initial project was pursued. Following a series of soundings conducted to detect the presence of archaeological remains (the museum is placed inside the ruin field of the
Figures 33 (above), 34 (below). Elevation and plan of the future museum as designed circa 1955 for accommodating the Abu’l-hol colossus (MO85) and an important collection of Memphite objects. The initial project comprised a hall dedicated to the famous colossal statue, as well as exhibition galleries, storerooms, spaces for visitors, restrooms, and a front garden. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 26).
ancient Memphis), a brand new shelter—the one well known to visitors today—was built in concrete around the famous colossus and completed in 1959. No adjoining galleries were erected. Much larger than the former shelters, the new building was still spacious enough for displaying additional objects and for hosting the offices of the future director of the museum, staff, and police officers. Some of the objects previously kept in the former shelter (such as the uraei-frieze MO73 and the royal statue MO50) were, by then, put on display around the colossus and at the entrance of the building (fig. 35), while others were removed, perhaps to the storerooms of the Department of Antiquities. Larger pieces (such as the column bases MO4 and MO9, and the statues and pedestals MO22, MO23, MO86, and MO87) that had long been gathered outside were simply kept around the new building until a solution could be found for their display.

This is essentially all that can be said about the newly-born museum and its first collection of objects. The collection then grew over the years as new discoveries were made and as objects from early excavations were rescued and moved to enrich the museum.
Rescuing the Monuments from the Ever-Expanding Modern Settlement

Building and digging activities occasioned by the ever-expanding modern settlement of Mit Rahîna led to more discoveries and excavations; a number of the pieces currently on display in the Open Air Museum come from such incidental findings. A number of other pieces that had been exposed in Memphis long ago and were endangered by the expansion of the modern village and cultivated land were also collected and transferred to the museum as part of a protection plan. At first, only a few of these objects actually joined the displayed collection, while others in need of substantial conservation work were temporarily kept in an open air workshop that was set up on the south of the colossus’s shelter.

Along these lines, between 1959 and 1962 ‘Abd el-Tawwâb el-Hitta of the Department of Antiquities (Jeffreys 1985: 20, 74–75) undertook a series of excavations on the eastern limit of Kôm el-Rabi’a, at the edge of Kôm el-Qal’a, after blocks in a chapel built by Ramesses II were accidentally exposed by local builders digging the foundations of a house (fig. 36). Here, el-Hitta fully exposed the chapel (commonly referred to as “Sekhmet Temple” or “Temple A”), which led to the discovery of a monumental group statue smashed into many small fragments (MO25) (figs. 37–38). While excavating farther south and west, he uncovered additional structures (respectively known as “B” and “C”) and fragments of royal statues and pedestals. These likely constituted—as scholars later understood—the much denuded remains of chapels set along the north-south processional alley leading to the South Gate of the religious complex of Ptah. A seated statue of Ramesses II (MO11) (fig. 39), a fragment of the face of a royal colossus (MO55) (fig. 40), and a stone vessel (likely our MO15)—all now displayed in the Open Air Museum—were also unearthed at this occasion. Such may have been also the case of a royal torso (MO37).

In 1962 it was decided to extract these pieces from their excavation trench and transfer them to the museum’s open air conservation workshop, where some of them were re-assembled (such was also the case of the group statue MO25, re-assembled in 1964, then rebuilt and put on display in 1981, as we will see below). Also in 1962 the same process was undertaken for a number of other monumental pieces uncovered by former explorers and accidentally re-unearthed when a local restaurant dug in this area of the ruin field. Thus the fragments of the two royal colossi found by H. Hekekyan in 1852–1854 (MO1 and MO26) were rediscovered after being lost for a century; these were then carefully removed from their trench by the Department of Antiquities, examined, and moved to the museum’s open air workshop where they were temporarily re-assembled. The two statues remained there until the late 1980s, when an ambitious joint project to make one of the colos-
Figure 36. Excavations in progress in 1962 to the south of the Open Air Museum (looking south) at the limit between Kom el-Rabî’a and Kom el-Qal’a. These were conducted by M. ‘Abd el-Tawwâb el-Hitta in 1962 to rescue monuments and stone pieces endangered by expanding modern settlement of Mit Rahina. Note the concrete structure of an aborted house, whose construction led to the discovery of a Chapel of Ramesses II (referred to as the temple of Sekhmet), of which the entrance structure flanked by two seated statues on pedestals are visible on the left. At that time, various in situ remains of paving and buildings were exposed; these correspond—as was understood later—to the southern approach of the Great Ptah Temple. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 44).

Figure 37. The middle sanctuary of the so-called temple of Sekhmet at Kom el-Qal’a, as seen during the excavations conducted there by M. ‘Abd el-Tawwâb el-Hitta in 1962. This photograph shows the flooded excavation trench from which many fragments of a monumental group statue featuring the king with the Memphite gods Ptah and Sekhmet (MO25) were extracted. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 44).
Figure 38. The group statue of Ramesses II, Ptah, and Sekhmet (MO25) as re-assembled by the Department of Antiquities in 1964 in the open air conservation workshop of the museum. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 44).

Figure 39, left. Bottom part of the seated statue of Ramesses II (MO11) when it was uncovered in 1962 at Kôm el-Rabi'ā by M. 'Abd el-Tawwâb el-Hitta of the Department of Antiquities. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 44).

Figure 40, right. Fragment of a royal colossus's face (MO55) as it was exposed in 1962 by M. 'Abd el-Tawwâb el-Hitta at Kôm el-Rabi'ā, among the remains of a possible way-shrine with an installation for purification or libation. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 44).
si the centerpiece for an exhibition abroad was undertaken by the city of Memphis, Tennessee (USA), and the Egyptian government, making it possible to reconstruct and raise them within the museum precinct (see below) (figs. 41–42).

We know from a photographic inventory undertaken by the Inspectorate of Saqqara as early as 1962 that several pieces had been selected by that time to increase the number of objects on display at the museum. This included long-excavated pieces such as the monumental stela of Apries MO24, the pair-statue MO18, and the colossus MO21; objects coming from more recent excavations, such as the royal statues MO51 and MO30, and the block MO59; and a series of objects whose excavation context is either undocumented (the statue of Bes MO54, the sphinxes MO69 and MO71, the fragment MO57, the statue MO37, the architectural pieces MO76, MO74, and MO78) or debatable (the offering table MO58 is known to have been exposed in the late 1970s or early 1980s, illustrating how questionable the provenance of many of these objects still remains) (fig. 43).
The museum grounds were extended and additional display areas were built to accommodate the new additions. This was apparently part of a broader project aimed at enhancing the visitors' experience in Memphis, as evidenced by another set of archival pictures dated to 1968 that shows the implementation of visitor paths and benches throughout the ruin field. The Inspectorate archives indicate, that some seven years after the completion of the new building in 1959, the open air area surrounding the museum was cleared, probed, and leveled so that rows of concrete platforms—those visible to visitors today—could be built to hold more objects (fig. 44).

On this occasion a series of limited excavations conducted by A. Tahir in 1966–1967 (Jeffreys 1985: 21), both around the alabaster sphinx and to the southeast of it, exposed various structures, including a church and a portion of the southern section of the enclosure wall of the Great Temple of Ptah (as rebuilt during Hellenistic times; this had already been sounded by Anthes for the Penn Museum in 1955). The top of this massive enclosure wall, which has been almost entirely reburied since then, is still visible to visitors on the southern side of the museum’s garden (see maps 1, 3, [pp. 7, 10], fig. 45). It is worth mentioning that the soundings undertaken both by Anthes and Tahir in this area, although successful in tracking the outline of the southern enclo-
sure wall, failed to identify the South Gate against which this massive wall likely abutted and in front of which the Abu'l-Hol colossus once stood. This may be understandable due to the fact that unlike the West Gate—which visitors can still admire today—the stones of the South Gate had been entirely robbed, leaving only a negative imprint that may have gone unnoticed during these early excavations (Jeffreys 1985: 23; 2010: 124).

A fence was finally installed to delineate the Open Air Museum compound; this was designed to enclose the monumental sphinx, a newly-planted garden, the section of the Hellenistic enclosure wall, pieces awaiting conservation work, and extra space to allow for future expansion of the display area (fig. 45).

Over the following years, more objects rescued from the expansion of the modern settlement were similarly transferred to the museum compound, as documented by the Inspectorate’s archives, some being kept either in the conservation workshop or at the back of the display area. Such is probably the case of the colossus’s wrist, MO53, and the column fragments MO42 and MO43 (now displayed in the museum), which were (re-)exposed in 1966, in an area that likely corresponded to the eastern entrance area of the Great Temple of Ptah (fig. 46).
Figure 45. Empty display platform on the south of the museum’s garden (left) and northern face of the Great Ptah Temple enclosure wall as showing on the surface (right). Photo by Amel Eweida.

Figure 46. The fragment of a colossus’s wrist (MO53) known to have been found by J. Hekekyan in 1854 in the Middle Birka, a millstone, and two fragments of lotus columns (MO42 and MO43) as re-exposed by the Department of Antiquities in 1966. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 47).
We know from the archives of the Inspectorate that new sets of objects were successively added to the existing collection of the museum in the 1970s and again in the early 1980s. Here again, some of these pieces were coming from salvage work. Others, however, may have been intentionally selected from amongst the many objects accumulated in the Department of Antiquities storerooms. Of particular note is the transfer in 1972 of the naophorous statue MO2, which had originally been uncovered by Zakaria Goneim in the Southern necropolis of Saqqara in 1955 (Altenmüller and Moussa 1974: 1). By decision of the Inspectorate, this remarkable piece—carved from a heavy block of red granite—was unearthed again and manually transported from Saqqara to the Open Air Museum. In 1979, the statue fragment MO56, the sarcophagus MO20, and the palm capital MO82 joined the display area; followed, in 1980, by the decorated block MO62, the cornice MO61, and the column fragments MO40 and MO41; in 1981, by the royal wife’s or royal daughter’s torso MO60, the freshly rebuilt group statue MO25, statue MO11, and the sarcophagus lid MO5; and in 1982, by the Late Antique columns MO12 and MO13. During that period, the Egyptian Egyptologist Ahmed M. Moussa, who worked extensively at Saqqara and Giza, published several of these objects at their incorporation into the collection of the museum, sometimes providing the only available information about their origin (Moussa 1981: 285–288; 1982a: 115–118; 1982b: 119–120; 1982c: 257–258; 1982d: 390; 1983: 209–210; 1990: 285–288) (figs. 47–48).

Figure 47. The naophorous statue of (Pa-)Rahotep (MO2) when re-exposed in 1972 by the Department of Antiquities in the necropolis area located southwest of the Monastery of Apa Jeremias. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 67).

Figure 48. The naophorous statue of (Pa-)Rahotep (MO2) in 1972 on its way to the Open Air Museum. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 67).
In 1981–1982 the car park of the museum was extended and an excavation area was opened by the Egyptian Antiquities Organization to the west of the colossus’s shelter, exposing more structures, including remains of the southern section of the enclosure wall of Ptah’s sacred precinct (Jeffreys 1985: 23).

**More Accidental Discoveries**

During the period of Egyptian military conflicts from the late 1960s until the early 1980s, some parts of the Memphis ruin field were turned into military areas, with extensive trenches being dug for the installation of underground air-raid shelters. In these instances, new sites and artifacts were uncovered. One of the most conspicuous discoveries made by these activities is certainly the temple dedicated to the goddess Hathor by Ramesses II, which was found at Kôm el-Rabî’a in 1969 by the Egyptian army and successively excavated, though not fully, by Abdulla el-Sayed Mahmûd in 1970, Huleil Ghâly in 1978, and ‘Abd el-Karîm Abû Shenab in 1984 (el-Sayed Mahmûd 1978; Jeffreys 1985: 25–26). The partially-buried remains of this beautiful small temple are still visible to visitors. Likewise, some scattered architectural elements of a Corinthian-style building dated from Late Antiquity were found in the same circumstances at Kôm Dafbâby in the 1970s (Jeffreys 1985: 43–44). These may correspond to our pieces MO72, MO74, MO77, and MO78 (although that remains tentative due to the reasons mentioned above), as well as a statue of a seated god dedicated by King Psamtik I and found at Kôm el-Nawa in 1981 (MO29; Moussa 1983: 210). All of these pieces are currently displayed in the museum, but little can be said about when they were added to the collection (fig. 49).

![One of the delicately carved column capitals of the temple that Ramesses II dedicated to Hathor, found accidentally during army trenching conducted at Kôm el-Rabî’a in 1969. Photo by Bassem Ezzat.](image)

**Figure 49.**
The Survey of Memphis Project

After almost 160 years of exploration of the site of Memphis, and over 150 excavations of varying scale and importance, the need arose to obtain an overall picture of the site, the many discoveries that were made, and of the data that had been collected.

Owing to the interest that the British always had in the Memphite area—we can mention the extensive work conducted by J. E. Quibell, C. M. Firth and W. B. Emery in Saqqara necropolis (Jeffreys 1985: x)—a British team funded by the Egypt Exploration Society (EES) in London, which included specialists David G. Jeffreys, Jaromír Málek, Lisa Giddy, and Janine Bourriau (ceramics lead) at various points, launched an essential undertaking: the systematic survey of Memphis. This resulted in the seminal Survey of Memphis I–VIII monographs published in the EES’s series of Occasional Publications and Excavation Memoirs, and the preliminary reports published in the EES’s Journal of Egyptian Archaeology from 1981 onwards. That project, which started in 1981 and carried on for almost four decades, consisted of a study of ancient sources related to Memphis and former excavation campaign records, a thorough mapping of the entire ruin field (comprising both excavated and unexcavated areas), and an epigraphic survey and re-contextualization of as many sites and Memphite artifacts as possible. This “Survey of Memphis” (SoM) was soon supplemented by a series of excavations, soundings, and drill cores in already-excavated and untouched areas (some conducted as recently as 2011 and 2014, as a new project funded by AERA and ARCE, with David G. Jeffreys and Mark Lehner as co-directors: see Tavares and Kamel 2011). These activities aimed to clarify what we knew about the development and evolution of the urban and natural landscapes of ancient Memphis, and, in particular, locate the original urban nucleus from which the early city of Memphis developed, while reconstructing the migration of the Nile River over time.

That long-term survey was of particular importance for our investigations into the collection of objects housed in the Open Air Museum, as it shed light on the origin of a number of pieces. The SoM helped exhume and elucidate the work of early excavators, in particular the valuable contribution of Hekekyan, as well as help document recent excavations that are unpublished or poorly documented (as exemplified in the following catalog section). Likewise, the SoM team recorded the position of pieces from undocumented excavations and illegal diggings that were sitting loose over the ruin field at the time of the survey, but have since been moved to the museum (as is the case for the alabaster wall slab MO28, as well as the sawn fragment of lotus column MO39) (fig. 50).
A Renewed Interest in the Monuments of Memphis

The 1980s also saw a series of Egyptian and international projects aimed at new surveys and studies of the few standing ancient buildings uncovered in Memphis that had managed to escape the desire for stone that fueled the creation of Fustât during the Middle Ages, which resulted in the destruction of most of the ancient monuments of Memphis.

From 1982 to 1987, the “Apis House Project in Mit Rahina” led by Michael Jones on behalf of New York University, undertook a new survey and recording of a set of buildings at Kôm el-Fakhry that belonged to the religious complex of the sacred bull Apis—the living vessel in which the god Ptah could materialize (Jones 1982: 51–58; 1983: 33–45; Jones and Jones 1984: 14–22; Jones 1985: 17–28; 1987: 35–46; 1988: 105–116; 1990: 141–147). This consisted of an architectural survey, a series of targeted soundings and excavations, the study of pottery and small finds from both former and new excavations, and an epigraphic record of inscriptions and graffiti. This new survey contributed greatly to our understanding of the chronology and purpose of the Apis buildings, which we know now constituted the embalming house where the bull’s corpse was mummified before being transported to the Serapeum necropolis in Saqqara. To date, the Apis House in Memphis is the only place throughout Egypt where the stable of a sacred bull—in addition to where it was also worshipped and mummified—has been uncovered, making it a particularly unique place (figs. 51–52).

Likewise, a new survey of the nearby Chapel of Seti I, located at Kôm el-Rabî’a, was also undertaken in 1982–1983 by the Egyptian and French Egyptologists Labib Habachi and Jocelyne Berlandini with a view to study the decoration
and unpublished archaeological material coming from the excavation of the building and its surrounding area (Berlandini 1984: 28–49; 1988: 35–36). Though prematurely aborted when Habachi died in 1984, the study season nevertheless shed light on the purpose of this small unique monument, in particular on the unusual entities worshipped alongside the god Ptah inside the chapel (fig. 30).

The year 1986 was another turning point in the history of the Open Air Museum in Mit Rahina. At that time, the city of Memphis, Tennessee (USA) and the Egyptian Antiquities Organization set up an ambitious project for reconstructing one member of the pair of colossi (MO1) uncovered by H. Hekekyan a century prior and left unrestored since 1962 due to a lack of funding. This magnificent colossal statue, which had been broken into many pieces in ancient times, was selected to become the centerpiece of an important exhibition dedicated to the reign of Ramesses II and organized in cooperation with the Memphis Brooks Museum of Art and the Institute of Egyptian Art and Archaeology of Memphis State University (Freed 1987). The Egyptian team of conservators in charge of the restoration of the colossus decided to take advantage of the piecemeal condition of the statue and reconstruct it in three separate parts that could more easily be transported and slotted together. After touring the USA in 1987, the colossus of Ramesses II was shipped back safely to its homeland and re-erected in 1989 in the garden of the Open Air Museum—where it still stands today (figs. 53–54).
Figure 53. Final installation and re-assembling of the three-piece red granite colossus of Ramesses II (MO1) in the garden of the Open Air Museum in 1989, after the statue was restored in order to become the centerpiece of an exhibition that toured the USA in 1987, prior to its return to Egypt. Copyright © CEDEA (Archives of Saqqara Inspectorate, Folder 110).

Figure 54. The red granite colossus of Ramesses II MO1 as visible today in the museum’s garden, with the two side rows of objects as re-arranged in 1989. Photo by Freya Sadarangani.
The return of this beautiful piece to Memphis greatly enriched the collection of the museum and was the impetus for the creation of an additional display area inside the open air compound. We know from the Saqqara Photographic Archives that in 1989 a series of separate concrete plinths were built in the garden of the museum, so that the returned colossus could be highlighted and six other pieces of interest (MO2, MO4, MO5, MO8, MO9, and MO11) displayed on either side—as they still are today. It seems that a few endangered pieces that had been left in the ruin field were rescued by the Antiquities Organization and transferred to the museum for the collection at about the same time (for instance, the Hathor “totem” MO19).

The following year, substantial enhancements were undertaken inside the museum compound. First, the twin counterpart (MO26) of the colossus that toured the USA was also restored and raised again over a platform built near the open air display area located on the east of the shelter. Concomitantly, a ditch was dug around the base of the monumental alabaster sphinx (MO14) for securing the monument (figs. 55–57).

The records of the Inspectorate of Saqqara about Memphis (Saqqara Photographic Archives) cease after the 1990s, precluding any reconstruction of the museum’s activities between then and now, although from what we understand, little to no change seems to have been made to the collection and to the display area, apart from the normal maintenance of the museum compound.

Towards a Revival of Memphis’s Archaeological Sites and Museum

It was not until 2015 that a large-scale plan for reviving and developing the museum’s site was undertaken. During the recent work conducted from 2015–2017 by Ancient Egypt Research Associates (AERA) and the University of York’s Memphis Development Project (MDP), under the auspices of the Ministry of Antiquities (MoA) and funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), eight sites, including the Open Air Museum, were equipped, renovated, or enhanced (as appropriate) in order to make them accessible, appealing, and understandable to visitors. On this occasion, the museum’s building, the outdoor display areas, and some of the visitors’ facilities (benches, etc.) were renovated. In addition, a children’s area was also created. Documentation for tour guides and visitors was produced (website, social media posts, promotional videos, brochures, and guidebooks), and no less than 36 new enameled panels devised by the 77 MoA inspector-students trained during four field school seasons, were implemented around the museum (figs. 58–62).
Figure 55, above left. Reconstruction by the Department of Antiquities of the second member of the pair of red granite colossi of Ramesses II (MO26) in 1990, so that it could stand on the other side of the open air compound of the museum. Courtesy of D. G. Jeffreys.

Figure 56, above right. The second red granite colossus of Ramesses II (MO26) as admired today by visitors on the south of the museum’s compound. Photo by Amel Eweida.

Figure 57. The colossal alabaster sphinx of an unknown sovereign of the 18th Dynasty (MO14), as visible today with the protection ditch dug in 1990. Photo by Amel Eweida.
Figure 58. New bilingual interpretative signage installed at the entrance of the museum as part of the new walking circuit created by the MDP. Photo by Freya Sadarangani.

Figure 59. A new interpretative panel installed inside the freshly-painted museum in 2017 as part of the MDP. Photo by Freya Sadarangani.
Figure 60. The exterior of the museum in 2017 as part of the MDP. Photo by Freya Sadarangani.

Figure 61. Open air display area east of the museum, as renovated and equipped with new display features and interpretative signs in 2017, as part of the MDP. Photo by Freya Sadarangani.
Figure 62. Children's area landscaped in 2017 by the MDP at the back of the museum's garden, for the MoA school outreach inspectors to do activities with local school children. Photo by Freya Sadarangani.
THE SCOPE OF THE COLLECTION OF
THE MUSEUM: A GLIMPSE INTO THE HISTORY OF
THE ANCIENT CITY OF MEMPHIS

As we have seen, the collection displayed at the Open Air Museum in Mit Rahîna testifies to the long and complex history of the archaeological exploration of Memphis. But that is not the only interesting aspect of this collection—far from it. This assemblage of 81 objects also constitutes a substantial sample of pieces that can introduce the visitor to what is currently known about the history of this ancient capital city, most notably relating to aspects of the topographical evolution and development of ancient Memphis through time.

Memphis’s Earliest In Situ Remains

Considering the importance of Memphis in ancient sources from very early times, the visitor may be astounded to learn that little to nothing is known archaeologically about the early city of Memphis as founded at the dawn of the Old Kingdom (it is usually assumed that Memphis was founded during the first two Pharaonic dynasties, ca. 3000–2686 BC, some time before the beginning of the Old Kingdom). Surprisingly, while some early royal tombs of the 1st and 2nd Dynasties have been found in Saqqara, the nearby royal city—the original Memphis—is yet to be uncovered (about where to search for the very early Memphis, see Jeffreys and Tavares 1994: 143–173 and Málek 1997: 90–101).

Apart from some Old Kingdom sherds observed at the bottom of Kôm el-Fakhry (Jeffreys 1985: 29; Jeffreys and Tavares 1994: 154–155, 159 for relevant bibliography and discussions), the earliest in situ remains found thus far consist of a cemetery and a group of houses at Kôm el-Fakhry dated, respectively, to the first dynasties of the First Intermediate Period (ca. 2160–2025 BC) and to the early Middle Kingdom (beginning ca. 2055 BC) (fig. 63). Although this site is no longer accessible to visitors today for conservation purposes, one can still admire at the museum two false-door stelae (MO32 and MO33) that came from the excavation of that lone known fragment of earliest Memphis (fig. 31). Located in the westernmost archaeological mound of the ruin field, these remains show that the late Old Kingdom nucleus of the city must be sought somewhere in that area (after likely migrating from farther northwest). From there, indeed, Memphis grew in scale and expanded eastwards, following the course of the Nile river as it gradually receded farther and farther to the east. A large, beautifully carved offering table (MO58), dated to the early Middle Kingdom (ca. 1985–1773 BC) and dedicated by an official to a Memphite god, also gives an indication of the artistic sophistication achieved in the official and religious monuments of the time.
Memphis under the 18th Dynasty, a Place Favored by Pharaonic Royalty

Surprisingly too, very little is known archaeologically about the topography of the city of Memphis under the reign of kings as famous as the ones of the 18th Dynasty (ca. 1550–1295 BC). Apart from two foundation deposits and a possible “cachette” dated to the reign of Thutmose IV on the edge between Kom el-Fakhry and the middle Birka (see recent discussion in Gabolde 2016: 35–52), none of the numerous fragments of royal monuments excavated thus far and dated to this period were found in their primary context. Therefore we can only speculate about the location of the great monuments of the period—even the Great Ptah Temple (Málek 1997: 92–95; Pasquali 2011). The excavation of New Kingdom priests’ and artisans’ quarters at Kom el-Rabi’a, on the western side of the ruin field and to the immediate south of Kom el-Fakhry, may argue in favor of the Temple of Ptah of the time being located somewhere near the late Old Kingdom nucleus of the city (Jeffreys 1996: 287–290). From what we understand, as the city was expanding eastward, the monuments of these periods were, to a large extent, dismantled, and their fragments reused throughout the site in new monuments erected by later kings. Such is the case, for instance, of a temple complex that Amenhotep IV/Akhenaten dedicated to the sun-god Aten (Málek 1997: 95–99).
The magnificence of a number of these scattered pieces—a sample of which is currently kept at the Open Air Museum (especially one of its centerpieces, the alabaster sphinx MO14, fig. 64)—confirms, however, the importance that Memphis had for the kings of the first half of the New Kingdom. All this material testifies to the existence of temples and chapels of importance. In addition to the monumental sphinx that may have been carved for Queen Hatshepsut (MO14), indubitably for adorning a large-scale monument (perhaps even the Great Ptah Temple of the time), museum visitors can admire two blocks that originally belonged to a chapel associated with the celebrations of the royal jubilee of Tutankhamun or Ay (MO59 and MO62), and a fragmentary group statue commemorating the coronation of Horemheb (MO45). Additionally, the embalming table MO27, another refined piece dated to the period, recalls the presence in this royal city of the many officials living and working there.

Memphis Under the Ramesside Dynasties and the Development of a New City Nucleus

Comparatively, much more is known about the topography of Memphis from the Ramesside dynasties onwards, since the new monuments built during this period became the new nucleus from which the city carried on its expansion until its eventual twilight in the early Middle Ages.
At some point in the very beginning of the 19th Dynasty (ca. 1295–1203 BC), a decision was made to re-situate the Great Temple of the main god of Memphis, Ptah, farther east, on the new, unsettled lands created by the shifting of the Nile’s course (Jeffreys and Tavares 1994: 158; Jeffreys 1996: 290). There, a vast sacred precinct—the famous Hut-ka-Ptah or “temple of the ka of Ptah”—was erected to accommodate the new temple of Ptah and various satellite buildings dedicated to his various manifestations (like the sacred bull Apis), as well as to other local and national gods, and to deified kings (maps 6–8, pp. 74–76). The unusual Chapel of Seti I exposed at Kom el-Rabi’a (from which cornice MO61 comes, see fig. 30) may have been built to commemorate the creation of this new temple precinct, which would very shortly become comparable in size and importance to the religious complex of Amun in Karnak (personal communication, D. G. Jeffreys). This complex still constitutes a major feature of Memphis’s landscape today: located in the middle of the ruin field, the temple’s compound forms a depression known as the middle Birka, or “lake,” where the resurgent ground water tends to create ponds of standing water (figs. 20, 65).
Although this project was initiated under Seti I, the actual construction and development of the new temple was undoubtedly conducted by his son, Ramesses II. This prolific builder-king not only erected the main temple of the god, but also the original enclosure wall of the sacred precinct as well as most or all of its four monumental gates, a range of subsidiary temples and chapels inside and outside the temenos, and numerous statues, including several colossi. Several of the standing buildings visible to visitors today were built by Ramesses II, like the West Gate providing access to Ptah’s precinct, the Small Temple of Ptah, the Temple of Hathor, and the so-called Temple of Sekhmet. It should be noted that the Apis House, as currently visible, was rebuilt during the 30th Dynasty (ca. 360–343 BC), but we know from archaeology and epigraphy that the current set of buildings replaced successive structures including the original complex built by Ramesses II (Jones 1990: 143). The bulk of the objects displayed at the museum come from this extensive building program, and can be dated to the reign of Ramesses II, whether they are genuine pieces of Ramesses II, or reused pieces that had been adapted for the sovereign (see, for instance, fig. 66).

Among them, indeed, are pieces that correspond to new architecture and statuary specifically commissioned and executed under his reign (such as the great limestone colossus MO85, the standard-bearing statues MO21, MO51, and MO37, the group statues MO25, MO44, MO56, and MO18, the seated statues MO11 and MO22, the statue pedestals MO86 and MO87, and architectural elements MO40, MO41, MO34, MO57, and perhaps MO39 and MO66); while others had been collected—probably as part of a vast dismantling program aimed at providing more building material for the new monuments of the king—from former monuments located in Memphis and in the nearby necropolis extending from Dahshur to Abu Rawash. We can cite the emblematic case of the colossi pair (MO1 and MO26) that were likely reused by Ramesses II from a predecessor king of the Middle Kingdom, the possible case of the alabaster sphinx (MO14), two smaller sphinxes (MO69 and MO71), and various other architectural pieces, including two fragments of columns (MO42 and MO43).

Among the objects displayed in the Open Air Museum, a naophorous statue (MO2) and the lid and bottom of a stone sarcophagus (MO5 and MO8) testify to the quality of the objects produced for the benefit of the elite of the time.

Continuing the work of his father, Ramesses II, the king Merneptah developed a second vast sacred precinct shortly after his father’s death, also dedicated to the god Ptah, just east of the former one (Jeffreys and Tavares 1994: 158; Jeffreys 1996: 290). From what we know, this was comprised of temples dedicated to Ptah and a palatial complex, in which the two large column bases MO4 and MO9 were found (map 6, p. 74).
Almost a Millennium of Additions, Renovations, and Transformations

We know from epigraphic and archaeological records that the new core of Memphis, and the city around it, then benefited from the successive additions, renovations, transformations, and embellishments undertaken during the following nine centuries, from the last Ramesside kings (ca. 1186–1069 BC) until the sovereigns of the Ptolemaic Dynasty (ca. 305–30 BC). This testifies to the ongoing interest that various rulers of Egypt kept, through time, in this place so emblematic of Pharaonic kingship.

Though few in number when compared to the numerous pieces dated to the reign of Ramesses II, some objects currently displayed at the museum illustrate this continued royal concern for Memphis. The museum houses statues that had been dedicated by Ramesses IV (MO50) and Ramesses VI (MO53) of the following 20th Dynasty (ca. 1186–1069 BC). Likewise, visitors to the museum can view statues commissioned by Pedubast (MO30, unfinished) of the 23rd Dynasty (ca. 818–715 BC; about Memphis during the Third Intermediate Period, see Aston and Jeffreys 2007: 61–82), and by Psamtik I (MO29) of the 26th...
Dynasty (ca. 664–610 BC), known for his many additions to Memphis’s temples (on the king’s policy during the late Dynastic Period, see Ladynin 2013). They can also admire one member of a pair of monumental stelae (MO24), carved at the request of Apries of the 26th Dynasty (ca. 589–570 BC) to adorn the entrance area of Ptah’s Great Temple. To be noted, the embalming table of Egyptian alabaster present at the museum (MO27), and dated to the New Kingdom, also indirectly recalls another vast building project undertaken during the 26th Dynasty: this unique object was found in a layer of what likely corresponded to the fill or leveling material spread in the time of Apries on the north of Memphis, prior to the building of his palatial complex at Kôm Tumân (map 9, p. 77).

The section of Ptah’s enclosure wall visible on the surface along the southern side of the museum’s garden (fig. 45; map 6, p. 74) also testifies to the importance of the renovations undertaken at the Great Temple of Ptah late in Pharaonic history; this wall follows approximately the outline of the original Ramesside enclosure rebuilt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty (ca. 305–30 BC; on the importance of Memphis for the Lagids, see Thompson 2012). Some undated objects kept at the museum may also have once belonged to important additions made to the temples of Memphis during that period, such as a monumental statue of the god Bes (MO54), which we assume may date to the Greco-Roman Period.

Other objects kept at the museum, as well as some of the sites accessible to visitors today, testify to the continuity during the Third Intermediate Period (ca. 1069–664 BC), Late Period (ca. 664–332 BC), and Ptolemaic Period (ca. 332–30 BC) of the worship of Ptah and his various forms, as performed by an active priesthood. A door lintel (MO31) that may have belonged to a priest’s house dated to the reign of Psusennes I of the 21st Dynasty (ca. 1039–991 BC) recalls the presence of priests inside the sacred precincts of temples—in this particular case, at the back of the Small Temple of Ptah built by Ramesses II. In another case, the lid and bottom of a sarcophagus displayed at the museum (MO5 and MO8), originally carved for a Memphite governor of Ramesses II, were found reused in the cemetery of a family of High Priests of Ptah of the 22nd Dynasty (ca. 945–715 BC) granted the privilege of being buried with rich funerary equipment within the city of Memphis itself, inside (or very close to) the sacred ground of the Great Ptah Temple; some of the unusual structures of this set of tombs are still visible today at Kôm el-Rabi’a (fig. 26; map 6, p. 74). Likewise, the visitor can walk around a building that belonged to the complex of the sacred Apis bull, as re-built by Nectanebo II of the 30th Dynasty (ca. 360–343 BC; see figs. 29, 51, and map 6, p. 74). This probably replaced an earlier complex described by Herodotus in his time (ca. 450 BC); the present-day buildings were likely in use for centuries, with very few changes under the Ptolemaic sovereigns (ca. 305–30 BC), until the 1st–2nd centuries AD (Roman Period).
Roman Memphis until Its Final Twilight in the Early Middle Ages

Though less conspicuously, the collection of the Open Air Museum also gives the visitor a glimpse of Memphis at its twilight, when Egypt became a province of the Roman and Byzantine Empires (respectively, ca. 30 BC–395 AD and ca. 395–639 AD), and later, of the Arab Islamic Empire (ca. 639–642 AD).

Some architectural pieces on display at the museum speak to how cosmopolitan this city was during ancient times, and, increasingly so, as Egypt was conquered by successive foreign powers. A set of fragmentary column, capitals and cornice of Corinthian design (MO77, MO74, MO78, and MO72), which may have belonged to a Roman pagan temple, illustrates the introduction of foreign designs and beliefs in the city of Memphis—a phenomenon that we know started particularly early at Memphis, during the New Kingdom, and increased from the Late Period onwards (see Tallet and Zivie-Coche 2012: 436–456 for information regarding imported cults in Roman Egypt).

By the 5th century AD, Egypt had become a Christian land (for more information, see Hahn, Emmel, and Gotter 2008). Remnants of Memphite Coptic churches (see column fragments MO12, MO13; MO80, MO84; and MO76) testify to the ever-increasing Christianization of Egypt from the Roman Period throughout Late Antiquity. This accompanied the gradual decline and eventual closing of the temples of Memphis, including the Great Ptah Temple, which probably occurred some time after 391–394 AD when the Christian Theodosius, last Emperor of the united Roman Empire, forbade the worship of pagan deities and ordered the closure of their temples throughout Egypt (about the steps that led to the gradual decline of Memphis and of Ptah’s priesthood during the Roman Period, see Thompson 2012: 247–257).

Deprived of its religious aura, Memphis—already considerably eclipsed by the development of another glorious city, Alexandria (founded ca. 331 BC, although Strabo during the 1st century BC still describes Memphis as the “second city” after Alexandria)—declined precipitously. During Roman Period and Late Antiquity, the many disused and likely derelict monuments of Memphis fell victim to vandals and stone-robbers looking for building material and stone for lime kilns (see, for instance, what was observed at the Apis House from the 1st–2nd centuries AD: Jones 1987: 36–42 and Jones 1988: 107). Later, after Egypt was conquered by the Arabs (ca. 639–642 BC, inaugurating the Egyptian Middle Ages), the dismembering of ancient Memphis intensified, when the founding of a garrison city at Fustât, ancestor of Cairo (ca. 641 AD) some 15 km to the north, quickly resulted in a growing demand for building material as the new city expanded (Raymond 2000). In an ironic twist, the strategic location and magnificence of Memphis likely accelerated its disappearance, its many stone-rich monuments becoming an inexhaustible and easy source of material for the new capital city of Egypt.
The condition of many of the sites and pieces excavated in Memphis still bear the deep lasting traces of this intense process, when the ancient temples and monuments were readily turned into open-air quarries. The West Gate of the Great Temple of Ptah was particularly hit hard, with its structure literally ripped open and chopped into pieces, allowing visitors to observe the inner core structure of the monumental pylon and a sample of stone elements abandoned at various stages of the cutting process (figs. 1, 20). Conversely, a few of the monuments excavated to date also escaped this dismantling, likely because at that time these buildings were already lost and covered by later phases of urbanization of Memphis (e.g., the Chapel of Seti I, the Small Temple of Ptah, and the Temple of Hathor). The observant visitor will notice, under their modern restorations, the scars and fragmentary condition of a number of objects displayed at the museum, which were found sawn and broken into pieces with wedges in order to be reused. The case of the red granite pair of colossi (MO1 and MO26) is particularly emblematic (fig. 67), and perfectly illustrates both the tragic fate of Pharaonic Memphis and the challenging—though fascinating—task of studying and reconstructing this lost city.
Another important aspect of the collection kept at the Open Air Museum in Mit Rahina is unquestionably the insight it provides into aspects of religion, daily life, and death in the ancient city of Memphis at various periods of its history. The following catalog of objects on display is broken down into a range of topics aimed at gathering together objects that are relevant to each other, notably in terms of purpose and context, and to use these topics as a means of introducing the visitor to the realities of this ancient lost city, as reconstructed by specialists.

Presentation of the Objects

This catalog is organized into a series of notes presenting single objects as well as sets of objects, either because they belonged to the same piece or monument, or because they share similarities in use and/or shape. Each note is introduced by a sort of “ID” of the object(s), which provides:

- the museum object(s) number (MO) as renumbered for the purpose of the MDP;

- the material of the object(s). Based on characteristics that are visible to the naked eye, the identification of the material (stone exclusively) refers only to broad categories (limestone, granite, etc.) and remains in many cases tentative (until a further examination is conducted by a geologist at microscale). For the reader’s convenience, some stones are designated under their vernacular name (e.g., the common, though improper appellation “Egyptian alabaster” is used here to refer to calcite/travertine stone);

- where relevant, the other numbers known for the object(s) are mentioned, especially the numbers under which the objects are registered in the museum’s record (“Mus.” number), and the excavation number (“Exc.” number) that corresponds to the temporary number that each artifact or group of artifacts received on site at the time of the excavation, prior to their transfer to the MoA storerooms (often written on the object itself);

- the provenance of the object(s), ranging from the most general (Memphis or Saqqara) to the most accurate location (archaeological mound > area-monument > space inside this monument), followed (where relevant) by the site code as recorded/referenced by the SoM project (see maps 4–5, pp. 13–14). The entry “no site code” is used when the approximate location of the object(s) is known but
was not surveyed by the SoM team (this applies only to five objects found either accidentally during the expansion of the modern settlement or lying loose in the ruin field);

- the period to which the object(s) is/are dated, ranging, where possible, from the broader period to the reign of a specific king.

A question mark ("?"") indicates when the provenance or the period is hypothetical, tentative, or debatable. The text following the "object ID" offers a detailed description of the object(s) and a discussion about its/their purpose, and, when known, its/their provenance and context of excavation. The note is accompanied by photographs showing as many faces of the object(s) as possible, noting that the current display of some objects—against a wall or at the corner of the museum’s shelter—precluded a photograph of their back and side faces.

For the non-specialist reader, crowns, scepters, and architectural terms marked with an asterisk (*) in the following text are depicted in the appendix at the back of this catalog (pp. 273–275).

**Organization of the Contents**

The object notes are then organized in sections and sub-sections that aim to present and exemplify a range of topics, as follows:

1. **Worshipping the Gods in Memphis**

This first section, which constitutes the most substantial part of the catalog owing to the number of objects it contains, addresses religion in Memphis as illustrated by the collection. The bulk of these objects consists of pieces of architecture and statuary that originally belonged to pagan temples, as well as—albeit in a much smaller number—to Coptic churches. Two sub-sections present objects coming from the excavation of the Great Ptah Temple, as rebuilt under Ramesses II and developed under his successors. These illustrate how a great complex of this scale was organized, and how religious activities were structured around specific architectural or cultic features.

2. **Living and Dying in Memphis**

The second part of the catalog, though comparatively shorter, gathers a range of objects that recall that Memphis—beside being a major religious center for Pharaonic Egypt—was also, and no less importantly, one of the biggest Egyptian cities of the time in terms of physical extent and population. From what we know, at the peak of its expansion (which it probably reached as early as the Ramesside Period), Memphis covered an area of about 550–600 hectares (a surface area also reached by other major cities like Thebes: Bietak 2010: 12) and housed a population of perhaps 20,000–40,000 inhabitants.
This is particularly noteworthy for the period, considering that the whole population of New Kingdom Egypt is estimated at about 2.1 million, and its total urban population at only 105,000–168,000 inhabitants (Hassan 1993: 560, 563).

The objects presented in the three subsections of this part of the catalog are of particular interest as they introduce the visitor to the daily existence of the people of Memphis, who were also living and dying within its walls. Again, with a few exceptions, the museum’s collection mainly portrays the city of Memphis during the New Kingdom.
Map 6. Map showing what is known about the sacred precinct of the god Ptah—the famous Hut-ka-Ptah—at Memphis south, with its internal organization, and immediate approaches. This map combines structures and monuments of various periods, ranging from the beginning of the 19th Dynasty (when the new temple was presumably founded) up to the Hellenistic Period. It shows the reconstructed outline of the enclosure wall (rebuilt many times), which defined and secluded the sacred ground (or temenos) of the god’s precinct from the outside world. It also shows the known or supposed positions of the processional ways, main gates, and subsidiary entrances. Inside the precinct are shown the estimated extent of the main temple of Ptah, with its main entrance area on the east facing the Nile River (which was closer to the ruin field then), and ancillary religious structures such as the Chapel of Seti I and the Apis’s embalming house. In its immediate surroundings are smaller temples built by Ramesses II (also dedicated to Ptah, Hathor, and the deified king), a cemetery of the high priests of the 22nd Dynasty, and another precinct of the 19th Dynasty containing another temple of Ptah and the Palace of Merneptah. Rebekah Miracle, AERA GIS.
Map 7. Provenance (when known) of the museum’s stone artifacts (identified by their MO number) found throughout the southern half of Memphis’s ruin field. A distinction is made between objects for which a rather accurate findspot was identified (a black number with a red dot), and others for which we only know the general area or kôm (a blue number with no dot). Occasionally, a more nuanced, yet still hypothetical, findspot was indicated by research. In this case, a question mark follows the object number. Rebekah Miracle, AERA GIS.
Map 8. Approximate findspots of the museum’s stone artifacts (identified by their MO number) uncovered around the southern approach to the sacred precinct of Ptah, either in the front area of the South Gate or among cultic installations set along the processional way that led to it. Rebekah Miracle, AERA GIS.
Map 9. Provenance (when known) of the museum’s stone artifacts (identified by their MO number) found throughout the northern half of Memphis’s ruin field. A distinction is made between objects for which a rather accurate findspot was identified (a black number with a red dot), and others for which we only know the general area or kôm (a blue number with no dot). Occasionally, a more nuanced, yet still hypothetical, findspot was indicated by research. In this case, a question mark follows the object number. Rebekah Miracle, AERA GIS.
WORSHIPPING THE GODS
IN MEMPHIS

التعبد للآلهة في منف
في رحاب المعبد بتاح

IN THE PRESENCE OF PTAH
A veritable city-within-a-city, the sacred precinct (in ancient Greek, temenos) of Ptah at Memphis measured about 27 hectares, and was defined and protected by a massive enclosure wall pierced by four main monumental gates and subsidiary entrances opening in every direction, respectively to the east, west, north, and south (see maps 6–8, pp. 74–76; for discussions about the temple enclosure’s outline and the location of its gates, see Jeffreys 1985: 23, 34–37, 70, 103; 2010: 8, 94, 123–126, 145, 162). Only accessible to kings and priests who were in charge of performing the daily cult, the temenos comprised the main temple of Ptah where the god was worshipped, and which archaeologists locate in the middle of the enclosure (Jeffreys 1985: 36; 2010: 94). Oriented east-west, this temple opened eastwards in the direction of the Nile River, which was the main corridor of transportation and communication throughout the country. The whole structure of this temple extended from the East Gate, where a vast entrance area was erected, to the west, where the West Gate (the only portion of the temple visible today) provided access through its huge pylon and hypostyle hall to the back of the complex.

A range of objects displayed at the museum actually comes from the excavation of the main temple of Ptah. A large doorjamb (MO34) coming from the architecture of the temple, and few scattered pieces (MO42, MO43) that may have belonged to the structure of the eastern entrance spaces, testify to the monumentality of the building and to the tendency of ancient builders to re-use pieces taken from older monuments. The architecture of the temple was complemented by the presence of numerous statues of varying size (from just over life-sized to colossal), meant to represent through either singular depictions of the king or group statues, the divine interaction that brought the sovereign—the ultimate priest in ancient Egypt—and the gods face to face in the temple’s sanctuary (see the colossus’s fragment MO53, and the group statues MO44, MO56, and MO18). Portraits of close members of the royal family were sometimes similarly erected inside the temenos, as evidenced by a fragmentary colossus of a Ramesside royal wife or daughter (MO60) found in the entrance area of the temple. Temples were also favored places where kings could commemorate specific events of the reign through the erection of an enduring monument. Such is the case of an inscribed monumental stela (MO24) that Apries added to the entrance of the temple, in order to immortalize an important donation he renewed to the benefit of the god’s estate.
Beside illustrating the monumentality and sophistication of the now-de-nuded temple of Ptah, these objects also exemplify the importance of the high-quality stones used in these monuments by Egyptian royalty for religious buildings, which were sometimes quarried hundreds of kilometers away. We can cite the extensive use of the beautiful red granite stone of Aswan from which many of our objects are made (e.g., MO34, MO44, MO56, and MO18), as well as the enormous piece of Egyptian alabaster from which the museum’s monumental sphinx (MO14) was carved.

Beyond the simple concerns of aesthetics and durability, the choice of carving a statue or an architectural element in a specific stone was meant to meet a range of symbolic and religious purposes (Aufrère 1991). For instance, granite, a particularly hard and solid stone used for massive architectural elements, pedestals, and large pieces of statuary, may have been associated with the annual Nile flood, owing to the location of the Aswan quarries to the far south, at the entrance of the cataracts’ area. White/light-colored stones that intensely reflected sunlight (like limestone or Egyptian alabaster) were closely associated with the notion of divine celestial light. The color white was also associated with purity, which led the Egyptians to favor such stones (Egyptian alabaster above all else) when carving a range of objects that required ritual cleanliness (such as embalming tables, see MO27). Likewise, we know that in the Memphite region a variety of reddish sandstone, the quartzite quarried from the nearby Gebel el-Ahmar, was appreciated for its color that could be associated with an episode of the sun god’s mythology. Remnants of pigment found on some pieces (e.g., MO1) also indicate that these monuments were enhanced with additional colored details that were also indubitably laden with symbolism (for instance, yellow paint was often used to evoke gold and sunlight; gilding was also a common practice, albeit not illustrated by the heavily-eroded objects displayed at the museum).

Through time, the worship of Ptah, certainly one of the most prominent and oldest of Egyptian deities, developed and became more complex (Sandman-Holmberg 1946). When his Great Temple was re-built under the Ramessides, the main god of the city had long been considered a major state deity, closely related to Pharaonic kingship (notably through his role in the jubilee celebrations), and as a demiurgic god responsible for the creation of the universe (see the "Memphite theology" on the Shabaka stone: Breasted 1901: 39–54 [British Museum, EA498]). At that time, various hybrid forms of the god (Ptah-Tatenen, Ptah-Sokar, Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, etc.) developed. Associating Ptah with other local or national gods, these aimed to emphasize various aspects of Ptah’s divine power. One of these forms, Ptah-Tatenen, represents Ptah as a primordial god, and gained such prominence under Ramesses II (Manouvrier 1996: 466) that numerous statues (see, for instance, MO44 and MO21) and even a temple were dedicated to this deity (Egyptologists assume this temple may have been located on the northwestern
corner of the temenos, see Wegner, and Wegner 2015: 24–30) . A network of ancillary temples and chapels were, likewise, erected inside Ptah’s sacred precinct in order to worship the many aspects of the god, perform specific ceremonies and celebrations (like the royal jubilee: see the two blocks MO59 and MO62), and commemorate particular events (see above regarding the Chapel of Seti I, where MO60 was found, see fig. 30).

Among the most conspicuous aspects of Ptah’s cult we can mention the worship of Apis, a sacred bull thought to be the living vessel in which the god could materialize, be worshipped, and perform oracles (see Jurman 2010: 224–267 and Devauchelle 2010: 49–62). Long associated with the fertility and strength of the king, Apis was bred and received a cult in its own complex of buildings, located in the southwestern corner of the temenos (as mentioned above, only the embalming house of Apis, which was used for mum-mifying the sacred bull once dead, has been excavated to date). We know from ancient texts that a range of other sacred animals were, similarly, bred somewhere inside the sacred precinct of the god Ptah: among them, the Isis cow, mother of Apis, and a baboon of Thoth kept in the temple of a form of Ptah known as “he-who-is-under-his-moringa-tree” (a cult to which object MO68 may refer; about animal cults in ancient Egypt, see Dodson 2009). A sacred tree, probably the moringa-tree just mentioned, was likewise tended inside the temenos.

Unlike churches or mosques, Egyptian temples were not meant to be open to the public nor to provide praying space for everyone (Wilkinson 2000: 65–71, 86–94). These religious buildings were, above all, devised as secured places where a qualified ritualist (in theory the king, in practice the priests) could carry out the daily ritual—usually a series of codified actions, gestures, and speeches performed in front of the god’s statue, including the care of the statue—which was crucial to the stability and durability of the created world. Such a key-concept was represented by the goddess Maât; the king, by offering a miniature of this goddess, stated his role as a protector of the order and stability of Egypt, at the scale of human society, and beyond, at the scale of the universe (see MO34).
This piece of a doorjamb is beautifully carved from a large block of red granite. The embrasure and back, though undecorated, show a smooth surface. The front of the doorjamb is embellished with two scenes carved in sunken relief and placed on top of each other. In both scenes the king—Ramesses II, identified through inscriptions and attired in different sets of regalia—is depicted performing two stages of the divine cult before the patron-god of the city of Memphis, Ptah, standing inside his shrine. On the upper register, Ramesses is wearing the White Crown of Upper Egypt (hedjet) as well as a royal shendyt-kilt and a royal beard. He offers a miniature figure of Maât to the god; this represents the ethical concept of truth and justice, and the universal harmony that ensures the stability and peaceful order of the created world, for which the Egyptian king was responsible.

On the lower register, Ramesses, who wears a nemes-headdress topped with a shuti-crown, a royal beard, and royal kilt, presents burnt incense to the god and pours water from a libation hes-vase into two offering stands.
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GROUP STATUE OF RAMESSES II AND PTAH-TATENEN

Museum Object Number: MO44; MO56

Material: red granite

Other numbers: Mus. 52 (MO44); Mus. 6, Exc. 2 (MO56)

Provenance: Memphis, Middle Birka, Ptah temenos, area of the Great Temple of Ptah (BAC)

Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

These two fragments of statues carved from red granite may have once belonged to a single over-life-sized seated pair-statue featuring Ramesses II with a deity, probably Ptah-Tatenen as evidenced by the inscriptions (see for comparison similar pair-statues that were found in the same area: PM III²: 835 [statue JE 30167/CG554 which features Ramesses II and Ptah-Tatenen] and Jeffreys and Málek 1988: pl. V [1-2: statue SCHISM 3783 which portrays Ramesses II and Ka-nekhet]).

Besides being of the same scale, these two pieces seem to have been carved from the same block of granite, as is apparent from the very similar grain structure and color of their stone. Additionally, these fragments were both found in the Middle Birka, in an area located inside the Ptah temenos that corresponded to the main temple of the god. We know for certain that MO44 was exposed in 1913 by W. M. F. Petrie (PM III²: 847; Petrie 1915: 33 [§ 77] and pl. LVI [21]; Jeffreys and Málek 1988: 28 and n. 14) amidst various architectural elements (including MO34) and pieces of statuary dated mostly to the Ramesside period, which were sawn into pieces some time during the Late Antiquity–Middle Ages when the temple was exploited as a quarry for stone. MO56 is also assumed to have been found somewhere within the area corresponding to the location of the temple of Ptah, but nothing more can be said about its exact excavation context (Moussa 1983: 209 and pl. I [a-b]).

Although no immediate connection between the two fragments can be made, it is likely that these correspond respectively to the upper part of a king and to the lower part of a god that were originally sitting side by side on a double throne. One fragment (MO56) shows the head and torso of Ramesses II, whose face was intentionally mutilated and whose back rests against an inscribed slab mentioning his name. He appears dressed in royal regalia, including a royal beard and a nemes-headaddress* adorned with a royal uraeus-cobra (now broken). The sovereign was originally portrayed sitting shoulder to shoulder with another figure, as evidenced by the shape of the break along his left arm and by the back slab. Presumably this was the hybrid god Ptah-Tatenen, whose name is also mentioned on the back slab (about Ptah-Tatenen, see MO21). The other fragment (MO44) may conversely show the lower part of the god’s body, seated on the throne with his left hand resting on his knee (now destroyed; his hand may have initially clasped an ankh-symbol) and his back against the inscribed dorsal slab. Here, the god is dressed in a way most similar to Ptah-Tatenen as portrayed in the aforementioned pair-statue displayed in the Cairo Museum (see above, JE 30167). He wears a pleated kilt adorned with a belt and an ornamental front flap, with a bull tail hanging between his legs. Similarly, the throne on which our figure sits is comparable to the seat of the Cairo group statue; it is inscribed on the front with the names and titles of Ramesses II, and on the sides with a dado and panels bearing the sema-tawy—the intertwined papyrus and lily plants of Upper and Lower Egypt symbolizing the unification of the land under a single king.

Such group statues, featuring a king beside one or more deities, are common in Pharaonic statuary, and become noticeably more common under the reign of Ramesses II (Manouvrier 1996: 466). These were usually meant to represent the face-to-face meeting between the Egyptian king (as an intermediary for mankind) and the gods, and were commonly placed in strategic places within temples, where they often served as an object of worship (Laboury 2000: 85; see for instance the triad statue MO25).
تمثال جماعي لكل من رمسيس الثاني وبيتاه تا تن

مادة الصنع: جرانيت أحمر

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: متحف متحف 6 (MO44); متحف متحف 52 (MO44); متحف متحف 52 (MO44)

مكان العثور عليه: حرم الكرنك الواقف، حراس متحف 6، منطقة متحف الكبير (BAC)

التاريخ: مصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، الملك رمسيس الثاني

مع المعبود، ويتضح ذلك من شكل الكأس الموجود على طول الذراع السري، والكتلة الحجرية النموذجية التي يستند عليها ظهر التمثال.

ويُفترض أن المعبود المصاحب للملك هو بتاه تا تن المذكور اسمه على الكتلة الحجرية التي يستند عليها ظهر التمثال.

والكانت تا تن المذكور اسمه على ظهر التمثال، وهي منحوتة بأسلوب تشبه ظهره على كتلة حجرية منقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظهر المعبود في نفس هيئة يرتدي للتمثال المشرف على التمثال، حيث يرتدي حزام يتدلى منه حلية، كما يتدلى ذيل الثور بين ساقيه، والمقصورة فإن شكل كرسي العرش مختلف عن الكتلة الحجرية المنقوشة. يظر
This neck and torso of a standing colossus carved from a block of dark quartzite portrays an unknown Ramesside royal wife or daughter. The details of the royal lady's outfit and anatomy are beautifully chiselled. This fragment of colossus testifies to the fashions typically worn by the elite of the time. This lady wears a long tripartite wig above a finely pleated fringed dress with sleeves, tied up under the right breast with a sash made of two dangling ribbons. Her neck is adorned with a large necklace made of rows of beads.

This royal torso was uncovered in 1852 by J. Hekekyan (see fig. 18 in the introduction), along with other fragments of royal colossi, in the Middle Birka, slightly south of Kôm Khanzîr. The excavation trench opened by Hekekyan was located in the eastern entrance area of the Great Temple of Ptah, presumably inside his temenos (Jeffreys 2010: 146–148 [Excavation VIII] and fig. 39; the problem of the location and arrangement of the East Gate is discussed in Jeffreys 2010: 145 and 162). This colossal statue is certainly to be added to the many colossi that once adorned the main approach to the temple of the god (see also MO53).
FRAGMENTS OF LOTUS COLUMNS

Museum Object Number: MO42; MO43

Material: crystalline limestone?

Other numbers: Mus. 50, Exc. 59 (MO42); Mus. 51, Exc. 58 (MO43)

Provenance: Memphis, Middle Birka, Ptah temenos, main entrance area of the Great Temple of Ptah (BAF)?

Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II (reused from an older monument)

These two architectural elements, carved from a very crystalline form of limestone, are reused pieces that have been reshaped from the fascicular (bound sheafs) shafts of lotus columns. Such lotus columns were intended to represent a bundle of lotus flowers, the column shaft corresponding to the tied stems and the column capital representing either their closed buds or open flowers (Arnold 2003: 54). These two fragments both correspond to the lower portion of an eight-stemmed column shaft, but are currently displayed head-down in the museum. This can be inferred from the specific shape and decoration of the stems, which taper downwards to the base (displayed as the top) and bear stylized elements (striped) meant to represent the sheaths protecting the bases of the stems. MO42 has clearly been re-cut in such a way that the original ribbed stems and their tapered base are flattened, and an inscription was carved in sunken relief on this new flat surface. This inscription bears the cartouche of Ramesses II, thus at least providing a date for the reuse of the block.

Very little is known about the provenance and archaeological context of these stone elements. Some information can, however, be inferred from the available data. Firstly, we know from archive pictures that these pieces were exposed (perhaps for the second time) by the Department of Antiquities in 1966, together with a fragment of a wrist of a colossal statue of Ramesses VI (our MO53) that we know had been formerly found by J. Hekekyan in 1854 while he was excavating in the depression of the Middle Birka, in an area corresponding to the eastern entrance of the Great Temple of Ptah (see fig. 45 in the introduction; Jeffreys 2010: 142–143, 145–146 [Excavation VII] and fig. 30 [F]). This indicates that our stone elements may have been reused at some stage in the architecture of the entrance area of the temple, inside the temenos. Secondly, the obvious traces of re-cut and inscription show that these were removed from an older monument of unknown date, located either in Memphis or in its nearby cemeteries of Saqqara and Abusir, as part of a dismantling program probably commissioned by Ramesses II in order to provide building material for his own monuments (see for comparison Petrie 1909a: 6[15]).
أجزاء من أعمدة، على شكل زهرة اللوتس

MO43: MO42

مادة الصنع: حجر جيري متكلس؟

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل الحفائر 50، سجل الحفائر 59 (MO42); سجل الحفائر 58 (MO43)

مكان العثور عليه: منفر، البركة الوسطى، حرم معبد نتاج، منطقة المدخل الرئيسي لمعب نتاج الكبير (BAF)

التاريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، الملك رمسيس الثاني (تم إعادة استخدامهما من آثار أقدم)

عام 1854 خلال عمله في تنفيذ البناء يعترف بوجود نزيف 18.189 في المنطقة البارودية المدخل إلى الناحية الشرقية للمعب.

Jeffreys (2010) [Excavation VII] and fig. 30 [F]

هذا يشير إلى أن تلك العناصر المعمارية ربما أعيدت استخدامها في إحدى المراحل في البنيات المعمارية المدخل إلى الناحية الشرقية. وتاريخياً تشير آثار إعادة القطع الواضحة والنص المسجل إلى أن هذه القطع قد تم إزالتها من آثار أخرى غير معروفة تاريخها، يقع إما في منف أو في جبائي سقارة. وأصور القريبين كجزء من النشاط المعماري لملك رمسيس الثاني الذي رماه استخدام أحيانًا في بناء منشآت أثره الخاصة (المقارنة: Petrie 1909a: 6 [15)

لا توافق إلا القليل من المعلومات عن السياق الأثري الأول لهذه القطع. ولكن يمكن استنتاج اعتبار بعض المعلومات من خلال المواد المتاحة، أولياً أن يتضح من خلال الصور الأثرية القديمة أنه قد تم الكشف عن هذه القطع (ربما للمرة الثانية) من خلال قسم الآثار عام 1966 بصحبة جزء من مصطلح ومضمار الملك رمسيس السادس (القطعة المحفوظة بالحفظ تحت MO35)

والتي تعود سابقاً أن قد تم الكشف عنها بواسطة ج. حقيقين
WRIST OF A COLOSSUS OF RAMESSES VI

Museum Object Number: MO53
Material: quartzite
Other numbers: Mus. 3, Exc. 14
Provenance: Memphis, Middle Birka, Ptah temenos, main entrance area of the Great Temple of Ptah (BAF)
Period: New Kingdom, 20th Dynasty, probably Ramesses VI

This fragment of wrist and hand once belonged to a royal colossal statue of Ramesses VI carved from quartzite. This fragment shows the front part of the king’s fist clutching what may be either a folded cloth or a mekes-container of documents, and part of the bracelet adorning his wrist. This cuff bracelet features two royal cartouches surmounted by a sun-disk and flanked (at least for one of them) by two protecting cobras whose heads are also topped by a sun-disk. The name of the king, Ramesses VI, though intentionally defaced, could be identified (PM III²: 837 [wrongly associated with a statue of Ramesses IV—our statue MO50—based on a misinterpretation of a drawing by J. G. Wilkinson that shows a sketch of statue MO50 together with a sketch of wrist MO53, see the following reference]; Christophe 1954–1955: 26 [3: described as lost] and pl. VII [top right: sketch of J.G. Wilkinson, in which the orientation of the two cobras seem to have been mistakenly inverted]; Málek 1986: 106–107 and fig. 2 [squeeze by A. Lieder]).

Such colossal royal statues found inside and in the vicinity of temples were usually meant to act as a mediator to the gods. This fragment of a royal colossus was probably found by J. Hekekyan in 1854 while he was excavating in the depression of the Middle Birka, in an area close to the eastern entrance of the Great Temple of Ptah (Jeffreys 2010: 142–143, 145–146 [Excavation VII] and fig. 30 [F]). This fragment once belonged to one of the many royal colossi adorning the main approach to the temple of the god, likely inside his temenos (see also MO60; the problem of the location and arrangement of the East Gate is discussed in Jeffreys 2010: 145 and 162). It was exposed again by the Department of Antiquities in 1966, together with two fragments of lotus columns (our MO42 and MO43) that, to our knowledge, do not appear in any previous archaeological record, but might have been part of the architecture of the entrance area of the temple (see above MO42 and MO43, and fig. 46 in introduction).
GROUP STATUE OF RAMESSES II AND PTAH

Museum Object Number: MO18
Material: red granite
Other numbers: Mus. 25, Exc. 8
Provenance: Memphis, Middle Birka, Ptah temenos, main entrance area of the Great Temple of Ptah (BAE)
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

This life-sized group statue, of which only the upper part remains, is carved from red granite. The present fragment argues in favor of a pair-statue featuring King Ramesses II and the god Ptah, standing or seated against a back slab whose four faces are covered with columns of inscriptions (Moussa 1990: 285–286 and pl. 7). Such group statues were particularly in favor during the reign of Ramesses II (see above, MO44 and MO56, as well as MO25). Despite a mutilated nose, the god is recognizable by his characteristic look consisting of a skullcap (here adorned with a royal uraeus-cobra), a beard, a cloak, a large necklace, and a composite scepter* that he clutches with both hands. Shoulder to shoulder with the god, Ramesses II can be identified by his names mentioned in the inscriptions of the back slab. Though his head is destroyed, the shape and dimensions of the broken headdress indicate that he may have worn a kephresh-crown.* The condition of the statue shows that it was split into pieces, likely in order to be reused.

This group statue most certainly corresponds to a life-sized pair-statue or dyad of Ptah and Ramesses that was first exposed at the Middle Birka, in an area corresponding to the main approach of the Great Temple of Ptah, by J. Hekekyan in 1854 (Jeffreys 2010: 138–139 [Excavation VI] and fig. 28 [rounded fragment E’]), and again in 1887 by A. H. Bagnold when he lifted the Ramsis Railway Station colossus of Ramesses II (Bagnold 1888: 458; for another attempt at identification, see Christophe 1954–1955: 7 and n. 1, who links Bagnold’s description with another Ramesside pair-statue found in Memphis by W. M. F. Petrie, an opinion tentatively followed by D. G. Jeffreys; however a photograph taken by visitors at the turn of the 20th century confirms that the group statue at issue was definitely our MO18, see fgs. 16–17 in introduction).

تمثال جماعي لرمسيس الثاني و بتاح

MO18

مادة الصنع: جرانيت أحمر

أرقام الحفاظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 25، سجل الحفائر 8

مكان العثور عليه: منف، البركة الوسطى، حرم معبد بتاح، منطقة المدخل الرئيسي له معبد بتاح (BAE)

التاريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، الملك رمسيس الثاني

يرجع أن هذا التمثال هو نفس التمثال الذي تم الكشف عنه لأول مرة بواسطة ج. هيجري茞 عام 1854 على الطريق الرئيسي المؤدي لمعبد الكبير (139–138). ثم (Excavation VI) [rounded fragment E’] أعيد الكشف الكشف عنه ثانية عام 1887 بواسطة أ. ه. بيجنولد عندما قام برفع التمثال الضخم للملك رمسيس الثاني المعروف باسم "قلّم رمسيس II" (Bagnold 1888: 458), للمزيد عن إحدى المحاور الأخرى للتعريف على هذا التمثال، انظر: بيجنولد 1954–1955: 7 and n. 1, حيث يربط بين اتجاهات معزول. مثال مزدوج آخر يبرز لفترة الرعاية كتكمل عليه و.م. في. بيتر، وهو رأي يعود إلى D. جي. ف. جي. في البداية، ولكن من خلال إحدى الصور التي نقلتها أحد الزوار للعنوان في مطلع القرن العشرين تم التأكيد أن ذلك التمثال الجماعي هو نفس التمثال المحفوظ بالتحف تحت رقم رقم 17–16 بالقدمية.)
This large, round-topped or lunate stela is beautifully carved from a single block of quartzite. It has been partially damaged due to water exposure. The upper part of this stela is adorned with a scene combining texts and depictions in a very ingenious way; the aim of such an elaborate composition was obviously to put the commissioner of the stela, King Apries, under the protection of the gods. The scene is surmounted by the hieroglyphic Egyptian sky sign and by the god Horus of Edfu, depicted as a winged sun-disk from which hang two uraei-cobras. Its sides are bounded by two was-scepters, used as symbols of dominion. Within this frame the names of King Apries (contained in a cartouche and two serekh-palace frames) are flanked by and intertwined with depictions of the Memphite gods Sokar and Ptah. On the right, Sokar is portrayed as a striding hawk-headed man, while on the left, Ptah stands in his shrine. Both gods hold a divine scepter from which the ankh-sign of life emerges to benefit the two Horus-falcons standing at the top of the royal serekh-frames.

Below this scene is a partially damaged, fifteen-line hieroglyphic text, consisting of a royal command intended to renew the provisions of an older royal decree (of unknown date) that dedicated a whole district of the Memphite area to the god Ptah, with its allocated lands, labor force, and income, to serve as part of the revenue of his temple. The location of this district “between the waterways,” as mentioned by the text, may indicate that the city of Memphis was formerly bounded on the west by an ancient waterway (perhaps recognizable today in the Bahr Libeini), and on the east by the Nile river, which may have been closer than it is today (Jeffreys, Malek, and Smith 1983: 41). As was common during the 26th Dynasty, the archaizing style of the stela, as well as the phraseology of the text, seems to deliberately imitate and refer back to prototypes dating from the Old Kingdom (various scholars have commented on and translated this stela, for instance, see Gunn 1927: 211–237).

Although he failed to recognize it as a stela, J. Hekekyan may have observed this piece as early as 1854, while he was exposing the red granite Ramesside colossus that later adorned Ramsis Railway Station in Cairo until 2006. But it is usually acknowledged that this stela was first officially reported by H. K. Brugsch in the late 1850s as lying in the depression of the Middle Birka, in an area located in the east-center of the Ptah temenos that corresponds to the main approach of the Great Temple of the god (PM III²: 840 [D]; Mariette 1872: 7–8; Jeffreys 1985: 24 and n. 200; Jeffreys 2010: 183–184 [likely Excavation VI]). This stela was then extracted and moved to higher ground by A. H. Bagnold in 1887 (together with the red granite colossus of Ramsis Station and likely the pair-statue MO18), north of the current Open Air Museum, in order to protect it from further water damage (Bagnold 1888: 459; Jeffreys 1985: fig. 8 [site QAT]). Some time before 1962, it was relocated inside the museum compound. Nothing more is known about its archaeological context, but the orientation of its inscription (from left to right) may indicate that this stela was the righthand member of a pair, possibly flanking the entranceway of the temple.
لوحة تذكارية للملك أبريس

MO24:

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: 24

مادة الصنع: كوارتزيت

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: Sجل المتحف 19، Sجل الحفائر 9

مكان العثور عليه: منف، البركة الوسطى، حرم معبى بناها، منطقة المدخل الرئيسي معبى بناها الكبير (BAE)

التاريخ: العصر المتأخر، الأسرة السادسة والعشرين، الملك أبريس

أصل هذا المنظر، يوجد نص هيروغليفية مكون من 15 سطر متدر، جزئياً بارزة عن مرئي، يوصى باللتزيم تجريد أمر ملكي أقدم (غير معروف تاريخه) كان يشير إلى منف وحياته الحالية (عصر م 공간ية لـ "الدمار القديمة" وانفصال مياه منف، في وقت لاحق ينخض ناحية اليمين، ربما يشير إلى أن موضعها كان ناحية اليمين في مقابل واحدة مغيرة لـ "なかなか بناها"

على الرغم من عدم قيام حقيقيين من مهيزه لهذه القطعة كلوحة، فإنه يتحمل مهسيته لها عام 1854 أثناء الكشف عن التمثال الضخم الشهير لملك أكريس الثاني من الجرانيت الأحمر، الذي كان يزين ميدان دومسي بالقاهرة أمام متحف السك الحديدية حتى عام 2006. ورغم ذلك فإنه عادة ما يذكر في المراجع أنه قد تم اكتشاف هذه اللوحة بواسطة ه... ك. برولوجش في أواخر الخمسينيات من القرن التاسع عشر، حيث كانت تقع داخل متفرع منفرة الموتا، عند المركز الشرقي لمنطقة معبى بناها، وهذا PM III: 840 (D); Mariette 1872: 7-8; Jeffreys 1985: 24 and n. 200; Jeffreys 2010: 183-184 [likely Excavation VI].

ويعتقد، أن تم استخراجها من ميدان دومسي بالقاهرة وإعادة تثبيتها في كورونا، حيث اندمجت مع المجموعة الموتية لـ "الدمار القديمة" وانفصال مياه منف، في وقت لاحق ينخض ناحية اليمين، ربما يشير إلى أن موضعها كان ناحية اليمين في مقابل واحدة مغيرة لـ " للغاية بناها".

وفي عام 1987، تم إعادة وضع اللوحة ضمن مجموعة المتحف، ويدعى مايكيل فير (غير متوفر تاريخه) كان يستخدم �لاً منف، في وقت لاحق ينخض ناحية اليمين، ربما يشير إلى أن موضعها كان ناحية اليمين في مقابل واحدة مغيرة لـ " للغاية بناها".

أضف هذا المنظر، يوجد نص هيروغليفية مكون من 15 سطر متدر، جزئياً بارزة عن مرئي، يوصى باللتزيم تجريد أمر ملكي أقدم (غير معروف تاريخه) كان يشير إلى منف وحياته الحالية (عصر م غرارى المائي) وانفصال مياه منف، في وقت لاحق ينخض ناحية اليمين، ربما يشير إلى أن موضعها كان ناحية اليمين في مقابل واحدة مغيرة لـ " للغاية بناها".

وقبل عام 2691، تم إعادة وضع اللوحة ضمن مجموعة المتحف، ويدعى مايكيل فير (غير متوفر تاريخه) كان يستخدم منف، في وقت لاحق ينخض ناحية اليمين، ربما يشير إلى أن موضعها كان ناحية اليمين في مقابل واحدة مغيرة لـ " للغاية بناها".

وفي عام 1987، تم إعادة وضع اللوحة ضمن مجموعة المتحف، ويدعى مايكيل فير (غير متوفر تاريخه) كان يستخدم منف، في وقت لاحق ينخض ناحية اليمين، ربما يشير إلى أن موضعها كان ناحية اليمين في مقابل واحدة مغيرة لـ " للغاية بناها".

ويتماشى مع المحور الرئيسي لـ "الدمار القديمة" وانفصال مياه منف، في وقت لاحق ينخض ناحية اليمين، ربما يشير إلى أن موضعها كان ناحية اليمين في مقابل واحدة مغيرة لـ " للغاية بناها".

وقبل عام 2691، تم إعادة وضع اللوحة ضمن مجموعة المتحف، ويدعى مايكيل فير (غير متوفر تاريخه) كان يستخدم منف، في وقت لاحق ينخض ناحية اليمين، ربما يشير إلى أن موضعها كان ناحية اليمين في مقابل واحدة مغيرة لـ " للغاية بناها".

ويتماشى مع المحور الرئيسي لـ "الدمار القديمة" وانفصال مياه منف، في وقت لاحق ينخض ناحية اليمين، ربما يشير إلى أن موضعها كان ناحية اليمين في مقابل واحد...
Though severely eroded on the left side, and with its front paws cut off from the main body, this colossal royal sphinx is beautifully carved from a massive block of calcite or travertine (a stone often called “Egyptian alabaster,” a material particularly favored by Egyptian kings because it was regarded as highly precious and pure [Aufrère 1991: 696–698]). It is one of the masterpieces of the museum. This sphinx portrays an unidentified king whose human head, decorated with royal regalia (nemes-headdress, *royal uraeus-cobra, and royal beard), surmounts a recumbent lion body, the tail curled around its right haunch, over a base which is now damaged. If there was an inscription on it, it is no longer visible; the base may have been intended for re-carving (the re-use or usurping and re-moulding of such statues is well attested). The details of the king’s regalia and of the lion’s mane, musculature, and sharp claws are exquisitely chiselled in relief. To date, this sphinx is the second largest sphinx found in Egypt after the Great Sphinx in Giza, and the largest intact freestanding Pharaonic monument carved from Egyptian alabaster, although new fragmentary colossi carved from this material recently exposed in Amenhotep III’s funerary temple at Kôm el-Hettan, Luxor, may have once rivaled this sphinx in scale (Sourouzian 2008: 820).

When uncovered, the sphinx was tipped on its left side. In 1913, Petrie used blocks that he found in the vicinity (and possibly associated with it) to turn it upright and raise it up out of the ground water. One of these blocks bore the cartouche of a Ramesside king (the block is visible in fig. 64 in introduction). Its findspot suggests that this sphinx was originally facing east (although it was clearly not in its original position and may have been turned), and possibly adorned a monument located just inside Ptah’s temenos, close to the southern wall and South Gate of the god’s sacred enclosure. This location, together with the style of the sphinx and the discovery of the Ramesside block, suggests that this sphinx may have been carved during the 18th Dynasty (perhaps by Hatshepsut) before being reused and re-sited by Ramesses II or one of his immediate successors during either the construction or the expansion of the new Great Temple of Ptah under the 19th Dynasty. This sphinx was repositioned on a concrete base in 1953 (Jeffreys, Mälek, and Smith 1983: 42) before the Open Air Museum was founded. In 1990, a ditch was dug around the sphinx, likely for security purposes.

We know that such hybrid statues combining a royal head and a lion body aimed to emphasize and make incarnate certain aspects of kingship. In this imagery, the Egyptian sovereign was envisaged both as a powerful warrior whose lightning attack and dominant force triumphs over the enemies of Egypt, serving as a guardian and protector who watches over and secures Egyptian territory. This is the reason why such sphinx statues, which the Egyptians called “living images” (*shesep-ânh, though this name was also used to designate other types of statues), were usually erected as protective entities (singly, in pairs, or as groups) beside entrances or along procession-al alleys of official and religious buildings (see for instance Zivie-Coche 1997: 15–24; Cabrol 2005: 2051–2052; for a detailed study of sphinxes, see Cabrol 2001: 171–174 and 347–420, and Wegner and Wegner 2015: 148–191).

بين الثمانية والثمانية والثلاثين من الفصل الثاني عشرة، بعد استخدامه من عصر الأسرة الثامنة عشرة، ربما عصر الملكة حتشبسوت.


في عام 1990، تم حفر خندق حول التمثال، ربما لضمان تأمينه.


تمثال ضخم على هيئة أبو الهول

MO14

مادة الصناع: ألباستر مصرى

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 26، سجل الحفائر 3 (QAS)

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم القلعة، حرر معبد بناية، المنطقة الجنوبية الشرقية (QAS) مباني، حجم المعبد، الأسرة الثامنة عشرة).

التأريخ: الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، فترة الرعامسة (معاد استخدامه من عصر الأسرة الثامنة عشرة، ربما عصر الملكة حتشبسوت).
CAVETTO CORNICE OF A
CHAPEL OF SETI I

Museum Object number: MO61
Material: limestone
Other numbers: Mus. 11, Exc. 15
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabî’a, Ptah temenos, debris around the Chapel of Seti I (RAD)
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Seti I

This limestone architectural fragment consists of the left corner of a cavetto cornice,* with its stylized stripes splaying out from the bottom up, like a row of palm fronds. This sort of cornice is common in Pharaonic architecture and is used for embellishing the top of a wide range of structures, including walls and doorways (Arnold 2003: 46–47; see also cornice MO67). The block is adorned with the incised royal cartouches of King Seti I, which rest on the hieroglyph for gold and are topped with a sun-disk and two ostrich feathers. These symbols were meant to emphasize the divine nature of Pharaonic kingship (Spieser 2010); when featured in this way, royal names may become an object of worship (see for instance MO31).

This fragment was found among the debris of the Memphis Chapel of Seti I (sometimes called an “oratory”) in Kôm el-Rabî’a, when it was excavated by the Department of Antiquities in 1948 and 1950 (Moussa 1982a: 118 and pl. II; Brand 2000: 149–150 [3.37]). It most likely comes from the architecture of the chapel which was built by Seti I inside the sacred precinct of Ptah for worshipping the god together with two goddesses personifying emblematic areas of the city of Memphis, respectively: Tjesemet, likely the enclosure wall or gate of the temple through which Ptah could hear the prayers of the people, and Men-nefer, which represents either a quarter of the city of Memphis or the city as a whole (Berlandini 1984: 28–49). The purpose of this chapel is uncertain. A possibility is that Seti I built this monument featuring Ptah and the personifications of the city of Memphis in order to commemorate the construction of the new Great Temple of Ptah in the 19th Dynasty (personal communication, D. Jeffreys).

* عنصر معماري عبارة عن الجانب الأيسر من إفريز ربع دائري


This limestone architectural fragment consists of the left corner of a cavetto cornice,* with its stylized stripes splaying out from the bottom up, like a row of palm fronds. This sort of cornice is common in Pharaonic architecture and is used for embellishing the top of a wide range of structures, including walls and doorways (Arnold 2003: 46–47; see also cornice MO67). The block is adorned with the incised royal cartouches of King Seti I, which rest on the hieroglyph for gold and are topped with a sun-disk and two ostrich feathers. These symbols were meant to emphasize the divine nature of Pharaonic kingship (Spieser 2010); when featured in this way, royal names may become an object of worship (see for instance MO31).

This fragment was found among the debris of the Memphis Chapel of Seti I (sometimes called an “oratory”) in Kôm el-Rabî’a, when it was excavated by the Department of Antiquities in 1948 and 1950 (Moussa 1982a: 118 and pl. II; Brand 2000: 149–150 [3.37]). It most likely comes from the architecture of the chapel which was built by Seti I inside the sacred precinct of Ptah for worshipping the god together with two goddesses personifying emblematic areas of the city of Memphis, respectively: Tjesemet, likely the enclosure wall or gate of the temple through which Ptah could hear the prayers of the people, and Men-nefer, which represents either a quarter of the city of Memphis or the city as a whole (Berlandini 1984: 28–49). The purpose of this chapel is uncertain. A possibility is that Seti I built this monument featuring Ptah and the personifications of the city of Memphis in order to commemorate the construction of the new Great Temple of Ptah in the 19th Dynasty (personal communication, D. Jeffreys).

ملاحظة: * عنصر معماري عبارة عن الجانب الأيسر من إفريز ربع دائري


This limestone architectural fragment consists of the left corner of a cavetto cornice,* with its stylized stripes splaying out from the bottom up, like a row of palm fronds. This sort of cornice is common in Pharaonic architecture and is used for embellishing the top of a wide range of structures, including walls and doorways (Arnold 2003: 46–47; see also cornice MO67). The block is adorned with the incised royal cartouches of King Seti I, which rest on the hieroglyph for gold and are topped with a sun-disk and two ostrich feathers. These symbols were meant to emphasize the divine nature of Pharaonic kingship (Spieser 2010); when featured in this way, royal names may become an object of worship (see for instance MO31).

This fragment was found among the debris of the Memphis Chapel of Seti I (sometimes called an “oratory”) in Kôm el-Rabî’a, when it was excavated by the Department of Antiquities in 1948 and 1950 (Moussa 1982a: 118 and pl. II; Brand 2000: 149–150 [3.37]). It most likely comes from the architecture of the chapel which was built by Seti I inside the sacred precinct of Ptah for worshipping the god together with two goddesses personifying emblematic areas of the city of Memphis, respectively: Tjesemet, likely the enclosure wall or gate of the temple through which Ptah could hear the prayers of the people, and Men-nefer, which represents either a quarter of the city of Memphis or the city as a whole (Berlandini 1984: 28–49). The purpose of this chapel is uncertain. A possibility is that Seti I built this monument featuring Ptah and the personifications of the city of Memphis in order to commemorate the construction of the new Great Temple of Ptah in the 19th Dynasty (personal communication, D. Jeffreys).
**WALL PANELS OF A CHAPEL OF TUTANKHAMUN OR AY**

Museum Object number: MO59; MO62

Material: limestone

Other numbers: Mus. 9, Exc. 28 (MO59); Mus. 12, Exc. 18 (MO62)

Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabî’a, Ptah temenos, debris around the Chapel of Seti I (RAD)

Period: New Kingdom, 18th Dynasty, Tutankhamun-Ay

These two decorated limestone slabs can be dated to the reign of Tutankhamun or Ay, as evidenced by the typical 18th Dynasty style of carving and by the fact that the king’s names were intentionally erased (Pasquali 2011: 66–67 [A.137] and 67–68 [A.138]). These were both found among the debris of the Memphite Chapel of Seti I in Kôm el-Rabî’a when this monument was excavated by the Department of Antiquities in the late 1940s (Moussa 1982a: 115–117 and pl. I [a]). The presence of three circular holes on each of these slabs indicates that these have been reused. These two slabs may have originally come from the structure of a now-dismantled chapel, perhaps dedicated to the royal jubilee, which was once located in the same area.

This is suggested by the iconography of one of them, lintel MO59, which bears mirrored scenes illustrating the royal jubilee festival, or heb-sed. The jubilee festival, which finds its roots in the first dynasties of Pharaonic history, sought to regenerate and reassert the rule of the Egyptian king after 30 years of reign. However we know that a few kings celebrated “anticipated” jubilees after only a few years of reign, such as was the case of the king depicted on the present slab, providing that its dating is correct. Surprisingly, we know very little about the actual proceedings of the heb-sed. From what we understand, this festival included a series of heavily symbolic ceremonies, among which was a ritual “run” intended to enable the king to reaffirm his sovereignty over the Egyptian territory, and enacted in ceremonial surroundings, such as the southern forecourt of Djoser’s Step Pyramid at Saqqara. This ceremony is shown on the present lintel. Here we see, in finely carved sunken relief, an unidentified king (likely Tutankhamun or Ay) shown twice while performing this ritual run before the god Ptah of Memphis, who is depicted clutching his composite scepter* with both hands in his open shrine (see the open door leaf in front of the structure). Dressed with the royal shendyt-kilt and a bull tail, the monarch is shown on the right wearing the Red Crown of Lower Egypt (deshret)* and holding two libation hes-vases, while on the left he wears the White Crown of Upper Egypt (hedjet)* and clutches an oar and a hepet or setsquare. He runs around horseshoe-shaped markers representing the boundaries of Egyptian land. The fact that the king is shown here performing the ceremony before the god Ptah is not coincidental, for Ptah of Memphis, besides being one of the main state gods of the time, was also intimately involved in the jubilee ceremony since its inception.

Whether the iconography of the second slab (MO62) refers to the royal jubilee or not cannot be asserted with certainty. This slab bears a fragmentary cultic scene, again finely carved in sunken relief. In this depiction, the king is dressed in the shendyt-kilt and bull tail, while being twice-depicted performing a ceremony before the city god of Memphis, Ptah, and his consort goddess, Sekhmet. Though the upper part of the slab is missing, these deities are still perfectly identifiable. On both sides, Ptah is shown in his shrine, clutching his composite scepter* with both hands, while Sekhmet, depicted as a lioness-headed woman, stands close by. The inscriptions indicate that the king was presenting offerings (notably wine) to please the two Memphite deities.
لوحات جدارية من مقصورة لِتوت عنخ أمون أو آي

MO59: MO62
مادة الصنع: حجر جيري

أرقام الحفريات الأخرى: سجل الحفائر 9، سجل الحفائر 28 (MO59: سجل الحفائر 12، سجل الحفائر 18 (MO62) (RAD)
مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الربيعة، حرم معبد بناح، وسط الرديم حول مقصورة سيتي الأول (RAD)
التاريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة الثامنة عشرة، الملك توت عنخ أمون-آي


تظهر الثقوب الثلاث الموجودة على كل كتلة حجرية على إعادة استخدامهما لاحقاً، وهي كانت ضمن مقصورة قائمة لنافذة أو معبد بناح، وتم تفكيكها وإعادة استخدام أحجارها في العصور اللاحقة.

أما بالنسبة للقطعة الثانية، فإنها تحت رقم MO62

الذي تحتوي على التصميم المحفوظ، فإنه يظهر قابضاً على صولجانه المركب بالكتلتي


توضح قيم بعض بعض الملك بالإحتفال بهذا العيد بعد مرور سنوات معدودة من حكمه، وهو ما ينطوي على هذه القطعة ويدعم صحة تأريخها. والمراعاة للدفعة كتلة دينية منذ الفتح، فإنها كانت قابضة على صولجانه المركب بالكتلتي، بينما تقدم سحابات هيئة سيدته برأس بؤرة. كما يظهر بالمنظر قيم الملك بقدمين القرابين (مثل النبيذ) لإرضاء آلية منف.
عند بوابات مقاطعة بتاح المقدسة

AT THE GATES OF PTAH’S PRECINCT
Only liminal spaces, such as the temples’ main entrance areas (Wilkinson 2000: 62–64) were usually accessible to non-priests wanting to pray and interact with the gods. Such interactions can sometimes be seen in the form of small votive offerings of varying sorts and qualities, which private dedicators deposited in this part of the temples (figurines, stelae, etc.; see Pinch and Waraksa 2009). Although this was also done, more exceptionally, through the presence of a proper statue immortalizing the donor in the act of worshipping (not everyone was granted the permission to implement such important private monuments in temples: see a common statue type known as “block statues” in Schulz 2011; see also for comparison statue MO2, although this was not found in a temple context). Religious life, as experienced by private people, was therefore restricted to specific locations and events.

Outdoor areas located in the immediate vicinity of the Great Temple of Ptah (enclosure wall and gates) were also the setting of an intense religious life (Wilkinson 2000: 54–61). The South Gate of Ptah’s enclosure, upon which the Open Air Museum is set, seemed to have been a particularly favored place for personal piety—the development of personal piety is a widespread phenomenon observed all over Egypt, intensifying from the New Kingdom (especially the Ramesside period) onwards, and growing during the following millennium (Luiselli 2008). The excavation of the entrance courtyard to the Small Ramesside Temple of Ptah at Kôm el-Rabî’a led to the discovery of many votive offerings dedicated by private people to the god Ptah “he-who-listens-to-the-prayers” (Berlandini 1984: 28–49). Many took the form of miniature fortifications and gates with human ears, or evocations of the temple’s enclosure through which Ptah could be reached. The Chapel of Seti I located inside the temenos may specifically refer to the importance of the temple’s gate for the people of Memphis: in the chapel, the god Ptah is flanked by a goddess—Tjesemet “the fortified gate/wall”—crowned with a tower, who likely represents the hearing enclosure wall or gate at the feet of which the inhabitants could call upon the god.

One of the main occasions for common people to address the gods and ask them for help or oracles were religious festivals, where specific celebrations would require the god’s statue to physically leave the temple and travel in a ceremonial barque led by a procession of priests (Wilkinson 2000: 95–99; Stadler 2008). To facilitate this, a network of paved roads was built to connect Ptah’s temenos to the Nile, as well as to other temple precincts throughout the city, and were used as ceremonial pathways along which the inhabitants of Memphis could gather to catch a glimpse of the god. Kings paid particular attention to developing and embellishing these ceremonial arteries, as well
as the immediate approaches to the temple’s enclosure. These approaches were vital to religious life and were often the only feature of the temple visible to everyone (Cabrol 2001). The collection of objects displayed at the Open Air Museum provides an interesting picture of such approach areas in Memphis under the Ramessides.

At that time, rows of royal sphinxes were installed on either side of the processional paths in order to place the walkways under the protection of the king, envisaged as a mighty lion (see, for instance, the sphinxes MO69 and MO71 that may have originally adorned the causeway leading to the main entrance gate to Ptah’s precinct on the east); to be noted, such sphinxes could also protect the entrance of temples inside the temenos (like MO14). Statues of the king featuring the sovereign in various postures and activities—such as striding (MO1, MO26, MO85), sitting (MO11, MO50), or bearing one or two processional divine standards (MO21, MO37)—were likewise erected in front of the gate pylons and along the processional alleyways leading to Ptah’s precinct. A substantial number of such royal statues from the approach areas of the sacred precinct of Ptah are on display at the Open Air Museum (see maps 7–9, pp. 75–77); they all come from the excavation of the southern approach to the precinct (Jeffreys 2010: 123–126; many similar statues were also exposed at the West Gate but are not represented at the museum). Among them are some of the must-see pieces of the museum’s collection (the Abu’l-hol colossus MO85, the colossi pair MO1 and MO26, the standard-bearing colossus MO21, and the colossal group statue MO25). Although many of these colossi were meant to emphasize the king’s power, we know from ancient sources that some were also meant to be actual objects of worship themselves. Under Ramesses II, indeed, a cult to royal colossi developed, and colossal portraits of the deified king were produced as a means by which to highlight the divine dimension of Pharaonic kingship, which Egyptians thought was inherited from the gods (Manouvrier 1996: 700–701, passim). Some of these colossi were even erected inside their own temples, like the colossal group statue MO25, which features a deified Ramesses II together with the gods Ptah and Sekhmet. Remains of buildings excavated in the same area also show that subsidiary chapels, way-shrines, and stations for libation and purification were an integral part of this complex network of cultic installations. A single Hathoric capital (MO19) found in the same area, and which may have served as a cult model, illustrates the diversity of ways that ancient Egyptians used for communicating with the gods.
TWO SPHINXES OF RAMESSES II

Museum Object number: MO69; MO71
Material: quartzite
Other numbers: Mus. 13, Exc. 27 (MO69); Mus. 14, Exc. 26 (MO71)
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm Arba‘în, east side (AAC)?
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II (reused from a predecessor king?)

These two fragmentary anthropo- or andro-sphinxes, or sphinxes with human heads, are both carved from quartzite. Though they were both found headless and missing their fore-paws, their attitude and appearance are still identifiable. Surmounting their lion bodies, set in recumbent position over a base slab, with their tails curled on their right sides, the heads of these two sphinxes once portrayed a human king attired in royal regalia, notably a nemes-headdress and a royal beard of which some parts are still visible. The sovereign, Ramesses II, is identified through his cartouches engraved over the shoulders and chest of sphinx MO69, and over both shoulders and the base of sphinx MO71. Though very similar in their dimension and attitude, these two sphinxes differ slightly from each other in style. First, in the way the anatomy of the lion is rendered, in particular the muscles and the position of the tail and back paws. But the most prominent difference between the two is in the presence, on sphinx MO69’s neckline and chest, of a large necklace and a lion’s mane carved in low relief with engraved stripes. Compared to the back and sides, the flatter surface of the front part of the mane, which may have been shaved in order to be re-inscribed with the cartouches of Ramesses II, argues in favor of it being a reused sphinx of a predecessor king (a common practice under Ramesses II, see Wegner and Wegner 2015: 211–215). Sphinx MO71 was modified by King Merneptah, who added his name on the right shoulder of the sphinx.

Although nothing is known about the provenance and archaeological context of these two sphinxes, we should mention the possibility that one or both of them may correspond to a headless sphinx statue (yet to be identified) that was exposed in 1854 by J. Hekekyan while he was excavating a site located on the eastern side of Kôm Arba‘în, between the site of the so-called “Nilometer” on the north, and the gorge leading to the Middle Birka on the south, on which the east–west Saqqara-Badrasshein modern road is roughly aligned (Jeffreys 2010: 166–167 [Excavation XI]; for the location of this site, see Jeffreys 1985: 32, 76, and fig. 46). There, a collection of New Kingdom architectural elements including granite column drums (inscribed with the names of Amenhotep III and Ramesses II) and a recumbent headless sphinx statue were found reused in a late paved road, slightly north of where the New Kingdom alleyway to the East Gate of the sacred precinct of Ptah may have been located. It is likely that the two sphinxes MO69 and MO71—if their identification with the one(s) found by Hekelkyan is correct—originally belonged to the processional road that led from the Nile to the main entrance of the vast compound of Ptah. Such hybrid creatures often served as defensive entities beside entrances or along processional alleys of official and religious buildings (for more detail about sphinxes, see MO14).
اثنين من تماثيل أبو الهول رمسيس الثاني

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: MO71: MO69

مادة الصنع: كوارتزيت

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 13، سجل الحفائر 27 (MO69); سجل المتحف 14، سجل الحفائر 6 (MO71)

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الأربعين، الجانب الشرقي (AAC؟)

التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة (معاد استخدامهما من عصر ملك سابق؟)

الأربعين، ما بين موقع يطلب عليه اسم "مقياس النيل" في الشمال، والمرمر الضيق (الخليج) المؤدي إلى الكرة الوسطى في الجنوب. وهي المنطقة التي يواريها تقرباً طريق سفارة - البدرين (محور شرق - غرب) [Jeffreys 2010: 166-167، والمزيد عن Jeffrey 1985: 32، 76، و fig. 46]

تعد هذه المنطقة منظراً:

عُثر في هذه المنطقة على مجموعة من العناصر المعمارية المؤرقة لعصر الدولة الحديثة عبراء من أجزاء من أمجاد جرينية (تعمل أسماً المولود أمنتجتل الثالث ورمسيس الثاني) وهي تمثال أبو الهول مضطجع فاقد الرأس تم العثور عليه في غير سياق الأصلي حيث أعيد استخدامه ل качيد أحد أطر الاحترق زمنياً.

وهذا إلى الشمال حيث كان يوجد طريقاً ضيقاً (رقاق) يرجع لعصر الدولة الحديثة يؤدي إلى البوابات الشرقية لقطع المتقدمة التي يعتقد وجودها هناك. ففيما أن تمثال أبو الهول رقم 71 - 71، MO69 - MO71 يضمن سهل ورش أجزة Evacuation XI [Excavation XI]، وربما تزامن مع الربيع. And evicting 255 أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 27 (MO69)

الحيل على البوابات الشرقية لقطع المتقدمة، وتعيد استخدامها ل качيد أحد أطر الاحترق زمنياً.

الCAF (مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الأربعين، الجانب الشرقي) [Excavation XI]

تحديد هذه المنطقة منظراً:

تحديد هذه المنطقة منظراً:

MO14

التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة (معاد استخدامهما من عصر ملك سابق؟)

التمثال الثاني يعد دليلاً على قيام رمسيس الثاني بإعادة استخدام التمثالين من ملك آخرين (وهو سلوك وتصرف معتاد من رمسيس الثاني، انظر Wegner and Wegner 2015: 21

125

بالرغم من عدم توافر معلومات دقيقة عن السياق الأثري الأصلي للتمثالين، يمكن العثور عليها، إلا أنه يمكن إيرادده أن

احدهما أو كلاهما تفقق مع ما تم ذكره من قيم الطريق. حيث يمكن العثور على تمثال بيئة أبو الهول فاقد الرأس (MO71). وتم تجديد تمثال رقم 125. وتم ترك طول مساحة ملقياً عند خط الرقبة ومنطقة الصدر على التمثال رقم 71، كما تجدر الإشارة إلى السياق الأصلي للموقع والموقع. MO69، وعلى الرغم من التشابه الكبير في الهيئة والتماثيل بينهما، إلا أن هناك بعض الاختلافات في الشكل، أولها في الصفات التشريحية للأسد خاصة في تمثيل العضلات، ووضع الذيل، والأقدام الخلفية، ولكن الاختلاف الأكثر أهمية هو وجود قلادة كبيرة

الحجم على البوابات الشرقية لقطع المتقدمة، وتعيد استخدامها ل качيد أحد أطر الاحترق زمنياً.

MO69

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 27 (MO69)

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الأربعين، الجانب الشرقي (AAC؟)

التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة (معاد استخدامهما من عصر ملك سابق؟)

التمثال الثاني يعد دليلاً على قيام رمسيس الثاني بإعادة استخدام التمثالين من ملك آخرين (وهو سلوك وتصرف معتاد من رمسيس الثاني، انظر Wegner and Wegner 2015: 21

125

التمثال الثاني يعد دليلاً على قيام رمسيس الثاني بإعادة استخدام التمثالين من ملك آخرين (وهو سلوك وتصرف معتاد من رمسيس الثاني، انظر Wegner and Wegner 2015: 21

125

التمثال الثاني يعد دليلاً على قيام رمسيس الثاني بإعادة استخدام التمثالين من ملك آخرين (وهو سلوك وتصرف معتاد من رمسيس الثاني، انظر Wegner and Wegner 2015: 21

125

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 13، سجل الحفائر 27 (MO69); سجل المتحف 14، سجل الحفائر 6 (MO71)

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الأربعين، الجانب الشرقي (AAC؟)

التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة (معاد استخدامهما من عصر ملك سابق؟)

التمثال الثاني يعد دليلاً على قيام رمسيس الثاني بإعادة استخدام التمثالين من ملك آخرين (وهو سلوك وتصرف معتاد من رمسيس الثاني، انظر Wegner and Wegner 2015: 21

125

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 13، سجل الحفائر 27 (MO69); سجل المتحف 14، سجل الحفائر 6 (MO71)

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الأربعين، الجانب الشرقي (AAC؟)

التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة (معاد استخدامهما من عصر ملك سابق؟)

التمثال الثاني يعد دليلاً على قيام رمسيس الثاني بإعادة استخدام التمثالين من ملك آخرين (وهو سلوك وتصرف معتاد من رمسيس الثاني، انظر Wegner and Wegner 2015: 21
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أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 13، سجل الحفائر 27 (MO69); سجل المتحف 14، سجل الحفائر 6 (MO71)

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الأربعين، الجانب الشرقي (AAC؟)

التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة (معاد استخدامهما من عصر ملك سابق؟)
COLOSSUS OF RAMESSES II KNOWN AS ABU’L-HOL, OR “FATHER OF AWE”

Museum Object Number: MO85
Material: limestone
Other numbers: Mus. 1
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabi’a, South Gate of Ptah temenos (RQB)
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

Beautifully carved from a single massive piece of high-quality indurated limestone, this colossus of Ramesses II is one of the masterpieces of the museum. Although both the bottom of the legs and the top of the headaddress are missing, this statue still measures approximately 12 m long. Ramesses II—identified by his names and titles carved in sunken relief on the belt, pectoral, cuff bracelets, makés-containers, and right shoulder of the colossus—is portrayed striding, his left foot forward and his arms hanging at his sides, clasping a makés-container of documents in his right fist and what may have been either another container or a folded cloth with his left fist. Attired in royal regalia, the king wears a pleated royal shendyt-kilt and a dagger with double falcon-headed handle tucked into his belt, a large necklace with a pectoral pendant, and a royal false beard. His headaddress consists of a nemes surmounted by the pschent—Double Crown* of Egypt united (of which only the bottom portion corresponding to the Red Crown* of Lower Egypt is preserved), adorned with a royal uraeus-cobra. The figure of an unidentified royal son (probably Khaemwese) was carved in sunken relief between the legs of the king, and a now-missing unidentified King’s wife, evidenced by a fragmentary inscription and by the fragment of an arm and hand resting at the back of the left leg of the colossus, was portrayed in low relief.

Though partially defaced on the back due to water damage, the anatomy and details of this colossus testify to the level of mastery reached by the royal craftsmen of the early 19th Dynasty. Indeed, this colossus probably constitutes one of the few colossi found at Memphis that can be considered as an original piece of the 19th Dynasty (Jeffreys 2010: 107). Some have even suggested that the fine carving of this statue may argue in favor of it being commissioned by Seti I shortly before his death and later finished under his son Ramesses II (Brand 1997: 113, n. 76; see for comparison the more heavy-handed style of a number of pieces produced under Ramesses II, for instance the standard-bearing statue MO51).

The current location of this colossus, within the museum shelter and facing up with its head to the west, is close to where it was originally found. Its discovery is attributed to G. B. Caviglia, a Genoese shipbuilder working for H. Salt in the early 1800s at various sites, including the Sphinx and Pyramids of Giza (Jeffreys 2010: 71). While working for the British Vice Consul in Alexandria, C. Sloane at Memphis and Giza, he excavated the present colossus in 1821 (Baedeker 1929: 155), and called it Abu’l-hol, “Father of Awe,” a name still in use today and normally employed for designating a sphinx in Egyptian Arabic, and historically used for the Great Sphinx at Giza (Jeffreys 2010: 107; Zivie-Coche 1997: 28). The colossus was given to the British by the Viceroy of Egypt and Sudan, Muhammad Ali Pasha, but was never transported to Britain due to the cost. For decades, it was left in the position in which it was found, lying face down in its regularly-flooded excavation trench (see figs. 1–3 in introduction). Only its eroded dorsal pillar was then visible to visitors, resembling “a sort of stone crocodile basking on the surface of a pool of water” (Bagnold 1888: 454). All this changed in 1887, when following several aborted attempts and the publication of a taunting press article, A. H. Bagnold of the British Royal Engineers managed to extract and turn over the colossus, and raise it to its current location, where a shelter with viewing platform was built to house it and make it accessible to visitors (Bagnold 1888: 452–463). This shelter was rebuilt once in 1902 (Maspero 1910: 74), before being replaced by the current concrete building of the Open Air Museum in 1959. Since its discovery, this colossus has been examined and discussed by many specialists and travelers (see for instance: PM III²: 836–837; Málek 1986: 103 and 111; Jeffreys, Málek, and Smith 1987: 20; Jeffreys 2010: 75, 77, 107, 110–115).

This colossus once adorned—together with other colossi (MO1, MO26, MO21)—the north-south paved processional path leading to the (yet to be found) South Gate of the sacred precinct of the god Ptah. The remains of the foundations of the colossus’s pedestal, found in situ by J. Hekekyan in 1852 immediately to the south of the statue (Jeffreys 1985: 24; Jeffreys 2010: 107–115 [Excavation I]), indicate that this colossus was initially facing south (Jeffreys 1985: 23). This colossus is almost certainly one of a series (the others being broken up or lost: see MO1 and MO26), and possibly stood in front of the eastern tower of the entrance pylon to the sacred precinct. Such royal colossi, placed in the vicinity or in the first court of temples, were not only meant to commemorate and testify to the king’s power, but also acted as mediators to the gods for the passerby, and often constituted actual objects of worship and loci for private devotion (about colossi of Ramesses II as objects of worship and representations of the divine aspects of Pharaonic kingship, see Manouvrier 1996: 464–492).
التمثال الضخم للملك رمسيس الثاني المعروف باسم "أبو الهول"

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: MO85
مادة الصنع: حجر جيري
أرقام الحفاظ الأخرى: سجل المحفوظ 1
مكان العثور عليه: متحف أبو الهول، الأقصر، مصر
الификаز: مصرية، باللغة العربية، "التمثال الضخم للملك رمسيس الثاني المعروف باسم "أبو الهول""

و الحفاظ على التمثال، تأكد جسم الأسدة والرأس الأدوم (والتالي يقابلها في الإنجليزية لفظ "Scottnis") (Jeffreys 2010: 107; Zivie-Coche 1997). وقد أتم محمد علي باجنولد، الذي يتوجه إلى إيطاليا، لتصنع التمثال، كما تأسس لبناء مأوى للتمثال.


وقد اقترح البعض بسبب أسلوب النحت الرائع أن الملك سيتي الأول هو الذي اقترح هذا التمثال قبل وفاته ثم تم الإنتهاء منه في عهد ابنه رمسيس الثاني.

MO1, MO26, (MO21). كتب كان هذا التمثال واقفاً ناظراً ناحية الجنوب، وبدلاً من نظيرتها اليمنى، كانت موضحة هذه الحفظ في موقعها.

MO85. وذكر طرق المراقب الذي كان قائمًا من الصغيرة بعدة محاولات غير موفقة. وقد اقترح البعض أن نقوبته الجيولوجية، هو "Pschent Bagnold 1888: 452–463.

MO85. كتب كان هذا التمثال واقفاً ناظراً ناحية الجنوب، وبدلاً من نظيرتها اليمنى، كانت موضحة هذه الحفاظ في موقعها.

MO85. كتب كان هذا التمثال واقفاً ناظراً ناحية الجنوب، وبدلاً من نظيرتها اليمنى، كانت موضحة هذه الحفاظ في موقعها.

MO85. كتب كان هذا التمثال واقفاً ناظراً ناحية الجنوب، وبدلاً من نظيرتها اليمنى، كانت موضحة هذه الحفاظ في موقعها.

MO85. كتب كان هذا التمثال واقفاً ناظراً ناحية الجنوب، وبدلاً من نظيرتها اليمنى، كانت موضحة هذه الحفاظ في موقعها.

MO85. كتب كان هذا التمثال واقفاً ناظراً ناحية الجنوب، وبدلاً من نظيرتها اليمنى، كانت موضحة هذه الحفاظ في موقعها.

MO85. كتب كان هذا التمثال واقفاً ناظراً ناحية الجنوب، وبدلاً من نظيرتها اليمنى، كانت موضحة هذه الحفاظ في موقعها.
NAOPHOROUS STATUE

Museum Object number: MO23
Material: red granite
Other numbers: Mus. 20, Exc. 24
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabî’a, South Gate of Ptah temenos (RQB)?
Period: New Kingdom?

This much-eroded carved piece of red granite likely corresponds to the lower part of an over-life-sized naophorous statue, or a statue presenting the effigy of a deity in a naos. Despite the poor condition of this piece, we can still see the outline of a small static figure standing in what looks like a naos, before a larger striding figure, with his left foot forward. The whole group stands upon a base that was once adorned with a line of inscriptions, of which only remnants are visible at the back and on one side. These do not provide any clue as to the date or identity of the naophorous figure or of the god that he presents. The New Kingdom date is tentative. However, the large size of the statue suggests that it portrayed a king, rather than a private individual; likewise, the shape of the deity’s effigy, which recalls a figure wrapped in a cloak, may argue in favor of the gods Ptah or Osiris.

Very little is known about the provenance and archaeological context of this statue. This piece may have been discovered in the immediate vicinity of the Abu’l-hol colossus (MO85) as early as 1821 or 1852, either by G. B. Caviglia or J. Hekekyan, and may have originally adorned the approach area to the South Gate of the sacred precinct of the god Ptah. An archival picture that was likely taken in 1887, just before the colossus was raised and turned over by A. Bagnold, shows this piece standing within the excavation trench, at the feet of the colossal statue (see fig. 6 in introduction). Nothing indicates with certainty that the red granite pedestal (MO86, of unknown provenance) upon which this statue is presently displayed was part of the original assemblage. However, it should be mentioned that both pieces have long been displayed together, starting as early as 1956, as confirmed by another set of archival pictures that show the statue standing on top of pedestal MO86 near the old shelter of the colossus, before the museum was created (see, for instance, fig. 12 in introduction).

The much-eroded carved piece of red granite likely corresponds to the lower part of an over-life-sized naophorous statue, or a statue presenting the effigy of a deity in a naos. Despite the poor condition of this piece, we can still see the outline of a small static figure standing in what looks like a naos, before a larger striding figure, with his left foot forward. The whole group stands upon a base that was once adorned with a line of inscriptions, of which only remnants are visible at the back and on one side. These do not provide any clue as to the date or identity of the naophorous figure or of the god that he presents. The New Kingdom date is tentative. However, the large size of the statue suggests that it portrayed a king, rather than a private individual; likewise, the shape of the deity’s effigy, which recalls a figure wrapped in a cloak, may argue in favor of the gods Ptah or Osiris.

Very little is known about the provenance and archaeological context of this statue. This piece may have been discovered in the immediate vicinity of the Abu’l-hol colossus (MO85) as early as 1821 or 1852, either by G. B. Caviglia or J. Hekekyan, and may have originally adorned the approach area to the South Gate of the sacred precinct of the god Ptah. An archival picture that was likely taken in 1887, just before the colossus was raised and turned over by A. Bagnold, shows this piece standing within the excavation trench, at the feet of the colossal statue (see fig. 6 in introduction). Nothing indicates with certainty that the red granite pedestal (MO86, of unknown provenance) upon which this statue is presently displayed was part of the original assemblage. However, it should be mentioned that both pieces have long been displayed together, starting as early as 1956, as confirmed by another set of archival pictures that show the statue standing on top of pedestal MO86 near the old shelter of the colossus, before the museum was created (see, for instance, fig. 12 in introduction).
PAIR OF COLOSSI REUSED BY RAMSESSES II

Museum Object Number: MO1; MO26
Material: red granite, painted
Other numbers: Mus. 34 (MO1); Mus. 27 (MO26)
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabî’a, southern approach to Ptah temenos (RQA)
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II (reused from a Middle Kingdom king, probably 12th Dynasty, Senwosret I)

This pair of royal colossi, found together in a very fragmentary state, has been entirely reconstructed for display. Carved from fine red granite and initially painted, they were broken up sometime in antiquity when their bodies were sawn at the waist and knee, and split into several pieces using wedges, in order to be reused. The face of colossus MO26 has been intentionally mutilated (see fig. 67 in introduction).

The two colossi are very similar in style and appearance. They both portray a striding king, his left foot forward, with his arms braced at his sides, clasping a folded cloth in his right fist and a mekes-container of documents in his left fist. In both cases, the king stands upon an inscribed base and backs onto a wide inscribed dorsal pillar or back slab (here a modern slab replaces the almost completely destroyed original back slab of colossus MO1). As a sign of his function, the sovereign is shown in a classic set of regalia: the White Crown of Upper Egypt (hedjet),* the royal false beard, a large necklace, the royal shendyt-kilt with a dagger tucked into his belt, and a bull tail hanging behind his legs. Additionally, colossus MO1 also wears a cuff bracelet on the right wrist.

Ramesses II is identified on both colossi by his names, which are inscribed on the belt and statue base of colossus MO1 and on the back slab of colossus MO26. However, as evidenced by stylistic characteristics and by details which correspond to later modifications (details of the face and a widened chin-strap) and additions (such as names and jewelery), it is clear that this pair of colossi originally belonged to a Middle Kingdom king, presumably Senwosret I of the 12th Dynasty, and were later reused by Ramesses II (Sourouzian 1988: 233–254 and pl. 68). An interesting detail to note is the nose replacement of colossus MO1: the original nose has been removed and a new “Ramesside” one, now lost, was fastened with a mortise and tenon (a slot is still visible). Likewise, two now-fragmentary figures carved in sunken relief have been added on either sides of the plinth between the striding legs of the two colossi. These presumably portray a royal son and a royal daughter; Princess Bentanat is identified by name on colossus MO26.

J. Hekekyan uncovered this pair of colossi for the first time in 1852 when he opened an excavation trench at Kôm el-Rabî’a to the southwest of the findspot of the Abu’l-hol colossus (MO85) (Leclant 1963: 86 [12]; Jeffreys 2010: 116–119 [Excavation II] and fig. 21). The main three pieces of colossus MO1 were found lying together with the nine fragments of its twin counterpart, MO26. These striding colossi were then exposed again and fully excavated by M. Abd el-Tawwâb el-Hitta in 1959–1961 (unpublished results: see Jeffreys, Málek, and Smith 1983: 35), and their fragments finally moved to the back garden of the museum. The fragments remained overlooked and unpublished for decades, until the American city of Memphis, Tennessee, and the Antiquities Organization decided to rebuild one of them, MO1, such that the colossus could become the centerpiece of an exhibition that toured the USA in 1987 (Memphis, TN and Denver, CO: Freed 1987: 1–10). The colossus was then shipped back to the Mit Rahîna Museum in 1989 where it is displayed today. A copy of this statue was made and displayed in front of the Memphis Pyramid Arena in Tennessee after the exhibit returned to Egypt; it now stands on the University of Memphis Campus in Tennessee. The second colossus, MO26, was also rebuilt subsequent to the restoration of its twin, in 1990.

As evidenced by their findspot, these twin colossi once adorned the main south causeway leading to the South Gate of the sacred precinct of the god Ptah. A contemporary private stela may provide a depiction of these two colossi in context (Mariette 1872: pl. 30 [a]).
زوج من التماثيل الضخمة. تم إعادة استخدامها بواسطة الملك رمسيس الثاني

MO26: MO1

مادة الصنع: جرانيت أحمر، ملون

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: Sجل المتحف 34 (MO1), Sجل المتحف 27 (MO26)

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الربيعة، الطريق الجنوبي المؤدي لحرم معبد بناح (RQA)

التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، الملك رمسيس الثاني (معاد استخدامهما من عصر الدولة الوسطى، ربما الأسرة الثانية عشرة، الملك سنوسرت الأول)

بين أرجل التمثالين، يفترض أنهما أثيلان أحد الأسر، وإحدى الأسر، وهي الأسرة寅 نت نت التي تم العثور عليها من خلال اسمها المنقوش على التمثال رقم MO26.


تم العثور على الكائنات الثلاث الرئيسية في الحفرة الخارجي. ثم نقل هذه القطع إلى الحفرة الداخلية للمتحف حيث ظلت هناك موقعة ومتم شرارة حتى قررت الهيئة الأمر بإعادة التعامل مع مدينة "ميس" بواسطة تجسيم الأمريكية لإعادة بناء أحد هذه التمثالين، والذي أصبح شهد التمثال رقم MO1 في المتحف الأمريكي عام 1987 (Memphis and Denver; Freed 1987: 10-11).

تم العثور على التمثال رقم متحف المونتانا عام 1989 حيث عثر في الحفرة وعلى النشاطية. وقد تم صنع نسخة من عزته بعد انتهاء العرض في ميدان مفيس برميد، أربا، لجامعة ميس. ثم نقل إلى الحرم الجامعي في ميدان مفيس برميد، أربا، لجامعة ميس الأمريكية حيث يقف حاليا. بينما التمثال رقم MO1، فقد أيضا إعداده لاحقا بعد ترميمه وذلك عام 1990.

وكم يبدو من مكان العثور عليهما. يمكن استنتاج أنهما كانا زينان الطريق الجنوبي الحاد في البوابة الجنوبية لمنطقة تابعة بناح الإقتصاد، كما ذكرت إحدى كتابات الأحرف المعاصرة لهما زمنيا إلى تصوير هذين التمثالين في مكانهما الأصلي (Mariette 1872: pl. 30 [a]).

زوج من التماثيل الملكية الضخمة من السجائر الأحمر، عثر على أجماليها مكورة. وقد إعادت تجسيمها للكمال بوضعها على قائمة المنحوتات. ثم تكرر التمثالين عصر العصور القديمة عند منطقتي الوسط والرقة، بواسطة أثاثا بهدف إعادة استخدامها والاستفادة من أحجارها، كما تم تنوبه وجه التمثال رقم MO26 عن عميد.

يشابه كلا التماثيل في الشكل وأسلوب النحت، وكلاهما يصور الملك واقفا مقدما ساقه اليسرى، وذراعيه مفرودتان بجانب جسده، وتقبض يده اليمنى على قطعة قماش مطوية، بينما تقبض اليسرى على لفافة المكس. وفي كلا الحالتين، يقف تمثال الملك على قاعدة منقوشة بينما يرتكز ظهره على عمود أو كتلة حجرية عريضة منقوشة أيضا (تم استبدال الكتلة الحجرية القديمة بالأخرى الحالية في التمثال رقم MO1). يظهر الملك مشروعاً القوام بديلاً للأشكال الملكية الرسمية بسبياتها المميزة طوال القرن المصري القديم. فرئيتي الملك ناج صرع العليا الأبيض (الحيدر) الدقة الملكية الرسمية، وقمة ضيوفة إلى قبة الشهد الملكية مع نجم ثابت على سطح الملك، وهو الثور الذي يدل خلف ساقيه. كما يرئي الملك أسرة على رأسه الأمين في التمثال رقم MO1.

تم نسب التمثالين للملك رمسيس الثاني من خلال أسمائه المنقوشة على كل من: الحرام وعلى قاعدة التمثال رقم MO1، وعلى الكتلة الخلفية التي تدعم hypothetical رقم MO26. تشير السمات الفنية وبعض التفاصيل التمثالين إلى بعض التفاصيل الإعجابية (خاصة في ملامح الوجه وتوضيح رياض الذقن). كذلك كلا التمثالين، بجانب أنهما أثيلان من منطقتي الوسط والرقة.

ومع الوقت، قد تم التمثالين لاحقا. وفي الحالة الثانية، تم إنشاء الأثر الكامل. ومن الانتهاء، تم وضع النقوش على التمثالين. تم إنشاء التمثالين لاحقا. ومع ذلك، فقد تم إضافة بعض العناصر بالنقش الغائر.
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STANDARD-BEARING COLOSSUS OF RAMESSES II

Museum Object Number: MO21
Material: red granite
Other numbers: Mus. 22, Exc. 4
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabi’a, southern approach to Ptah temenos (RQA)
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

This colossal statue of Ramesses II is carved from a single piece of red granite. The king is depicted striding, his left foot forward. His left arm holds a standard surmounted by a miniature head of the Memphite god Ptah-Tatenen, while his other arm likely hung straight down on his right side. Despite being broken and three-quarters eroded, the identity and general appearance of the king are still recognizable. The eroded inscription running down the divine standard mentions, though in an uncommon way, the name of Ramesses II (Jeffreys, Málek, and Smith 1983: 39); for this reason, this colossus was long thought to have been reused by Ramesses VI or VII (PM III²: 837; Christophe 1954–1955: 26–27 [7]; Málek 1986: 109–110 [12] and fig. 3). The king is portrayed with various regalia; he wears a short ibes-wig adorned with a diadem and a royal uraeus-cobra, a royal beard, and a royal shendyt-kilt, of which part of the belt and the finely pleated fabric are still visible. A hole at the top of the head indicates that the king was originally wearing a headdress, perhaps an atef-crown.* The colossus is standing against an inscribed back pillar of which only the upper columns of texts have survived. The base of the colossus is missing.

Though it was likely found in 1821 by G. B. Caviglia to the south-southwest of the large limestone colossus of Abu'l-hol (MO85) at Kôm el-Rabi’a, this colossal statue was only officially reported for the first time in 1847 by J. Bonomi and later fully exposed in 1852 by J. Hekekyan (Málek 1986: 109–110; Moussa 1990: 286–288 and pl. 8; Jeffreys 2010: 86, 115–116 [Excavation II] and fig. 20). It once stood along the processional path leading to the South Gate of the sacred precinct of the god Ptah. Such standard-bearing statues were particularly in favor during the reign of Ramesses II. These were meant to portray the king as an officiant, holding one of the sacred wooden poles topped by an image of a deity that were carried during religious processions and festivals as protective entities; these standards were actual objects of worship, and as such, were also kept inside temples (Chadefaud 1982; Manouvrier 1996: 534–541; Cabrol 2001: 747). This type of statue was not restricted to royalty. Private individuals were also granted the honor of being portrayed as standard-bearers and having their statues set in sacred precincts.

With this colossus, Ramesses II is honoring and placing the processional path under the protection of Ptah-Tatenen, literally Ptah "he-of-the-risen-ground," a specific form referring to his role as a demiurge, who created the world by forming a mound of solid, fertile soil emerging from the primordial waters. Ptah-Tatenen is distinguished from the classic god Ptah by his shuti-headdress, consisting of a long wig with a pair of ram’s horns surmounted by a sun-disk and two tall feathers. This hybrid manifestation of Ptah gained particular prominence during the reign of Ramesses II, who deliberately associated this liminal deity with his own royal function in order to emphasize the divine legitimacy and cosmic dimension of Pharaonic kingship (see Manouvrier 1996: 645–652).
تمثال ضخم للملك رمسيس الثاني حاملًا ألوية أحد المعبودات

MO21

مادة الصنف: جرانيت أحمر

أرقام الحفاظ الأخرى: SFL II 22، SFL II 4 (RQA)

مكان العثور عليه: منف، الطريق الجنوبي المؤدي لحرم معبد نباه (J.-P. Moussa 1990: 286–288 and pl. 8)

التاريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، الملك رمسيس الثاني

بتاج الحامل. كانت مثل هذه التماثيل معروفة خلال عصر الملك رمسيس الثاني، ويعقد بإجابتها كمثال على الثقافة الدينية حاملًا واحدًا من الأعمدة الخشبية يُحمل في يديه صورة أحد المعبودات (ألوية المعبودات). وكانت تلك الألوية تُحمل وترفع خلال الإحتفالات والمصادر الدينية كقوية حاسمة. كما كانت تتطلب لتنباه كروموز مقدسة للألوية. وتحفظ داخل المعابد (Manouvrier 1996: 534–541; Cabrol 2001: 747)
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SEATED STATUE OF RAMSES IV

Museum Object Number: MO50
Material: red granite
Other numbers: Mus. 16, Exc. 3
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabî’a, southern approach to Ptah temenos (RQA)
Period: New Kingdom, 20th Dynasty, Ramesses IV

This seated statue of Ramesses IV—of which only the head, torso, and part of the back pillar remain—is carved from red granite. Ramesses is identified by his names inscribed on its back pillar. His appearance testifies to the fashion worn by the elite of the time. The king is wearing a half-length wig and a finely-pleated long kilt of which only the top part and the belt are still visible. However the royal status of the sovereign is emphasized by the presence of regalia, in particular the uraeus-cobra that once adorned his forehead. The face and headdress of the statue have been intentionally mutilated, and the lower part of the statue is missing, his arms broken at the elbows. Nevertheless, the position of the elbows form an angle that indicates the king was originally seated, his hands likely resting on his lap (Christophe 1954–1955: 21–22 [3: described as lost] and pl. VII [left: sketch of G. J. Wilkinson]; PM III²: 837 [about a confusion between this seated statue of Ramesses IV and a wrist belonging to a colossal of Ramesses VI, see MO53]; Gohary 1978: 194–196; Ghoneim 1983: 179–183).

J. Hekekyan found this royal torso in 1852 on the southern side of the excavation trench where the Abu’l-hol colossal (MO85) was exposed by G. B. Cavigilia (Moussa 1982: 119–120 and pl. I; Málek 1986: 107; Jeffreys 2010: 175 [Excavation II] and fig. 35). This findspot indicates that this seated statue of Ramesses IV may have adorned the area along the processional path that lead to the South Gate of the sacred precinct of the god Ptah.

MO50

تمثال جالس للملك رمسيس الرابع

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: 50
مادة الصنع: جرانيت أحمر
أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 16, سجل الحفائر 3
مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الربيعة، الطريق الجنوبي المؤدي لحرم معبد بناج (RQA)
التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة العشرون، الملك رمسيس الرابع

تمثال جالس للملك رمسيس الرابع من الجرانيت الأحمر، لكن لم يتبقي منه سوى الرأس والجدوع. وجزء من عقد الظهر منقوش عليه ألقاب الملك رمسيس الرابع ومن هنا تُنسب إليه التمثال الذي يعتبر مثالًا على أزياء الطبقة الحاكمة والنخبة خلال هذا العصر. فيظهر الملك مرتديًا أوراء متوسطة الطول، ونقوش طولية ذات طيات لم يتبقي منها إلا الجراب والطرف العلوي منها. كما عمد الفنان إلى تأكيد الهيئة الملكية بوضعه الصل الملكي الذي كان يزيد جهية الملك. وقد تم تدمير وجه التمثال ورداء الرأس عن عمد، بينما الجزء السفلي للتمثال مفقود، والذراعين مكسورين من منطقة الكوع. وتشير زاوية وضع الكوعين إلى أن التمثال كان في الأصل جالساً، وباستخدام ذراعيه على ركبتيه. (بكتبيه -3: de- scribed as lost) and pl. VII [left: sketch of G. J. Wilkin-

قام. ج. حققًا بالكشف عن هذا الجزء من التمثال الملكي عام 1852 بالناحية الجنوبية. وعند العثور على التمثال الضخم لرمسيس الثاني (المعروف باسم أبو الهول في المراجع الأجنبية القديمة)، والمحفوظ بالمتحف تحت رقم MO85 الذي قام Moussa 1982: 119–120 and pl. I; G. J. Wilkinson-

ق. ب. كافجليا باكتشاف (G. J. Wilkinson-

Málek 1986: 107; Jeffreys 2010: 175 [Excavation II] and (G. J. Wilkinson-

يفضل منطقته المتصلة بـ طريق الماكوب والبوابة الجنوبية لمصحة

بتاح المقدسة. 144
HATHORIC “TOTEM”
Museum Object number: MO19
Material: limestone
Other numbers: Mus. 24
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabî’a, southern approach to Ptah temenos (RQA)
Period: New Kingdom?

This small, four-faceted Hathoric column capital made of limestone likely dates to the New Kingdom. Unlike the Hathoric column capitals found in the Hathor temple built by Ramesses II at Kôm el-Rabî’a, which are bifacial, the capital of this column is carved with four depictions of the mask of Hathor, goddess of love and maternity. Hathor is here portrayed as a woman with cow’s ears. She wears a large necklace and a wig, her head probably surmounted by the now-missing frame of a sistrum, an ancient musical instrument similar to a rattle that was used during ritual performances inside Pharaonic temples. The ritual sistrum, used for worshipping and appeasing the gods, was commonly adorned with a depiction of Hathor, also known as the patron goddess of music. The entire column was supposed to represent this musical instrument (Arnold 2003: 103–104), with the column shaft imitating the shape of the handle, and the capital imitating the upper decorative part of the handle and the frame, which contained jangling loops of metal. Interestingly, this device was also commonly used for mirror handles (Husson 1977).

This Hathoric column seems to have been found on its own by G. B. Caviglia in 1821, among other architectural debris that perhaps formed part of the foundation or core of a wall, in an area located south-southeast of the limestone Abu’l-hol colossus (see MO85; PM III²: 841 [F]; Jeffreys 2010: 71, 122–123, 126–128 [Hekekyan’s findspot, Excavation III (RQC), corresponds to a place where this column was transported after its discovery by Caviglia]). Rather than being part of a colonnade, like the bifacial capitals found in the nearby Ramesside Temple of Hathor, this single column may have initially been free-standing and served as a cult model. This seems to be corroborated by both its uniqueness and relatively small size, as well as by its findspot, close to the Hathor temple and to the processional path leading to the South Gate of the sacred precinct of the god Ptah. Such “totems” were placed in the vicinity of sacred areas where they could have received offerings from private individuals who were not allowed inside the temples, for example at Serabit el-Khadim in Sinai (Pinch 1993: 154–159).
مَمَّا يَكَن هذَا التِّاج جِزءًا مِن صَالة أَو صف أعْمَدة كَيْبَا هِوَ الحال فِي تِيجَان الأَعمَدة الثنائيَّة المُوجُودة بِعَدَد حَتْحور الَّذِي بَناهُ رُمْسِيَّس الثانِي، وَلَكِن يُرجِح أَن هذَا التِّاج كَانَ فِي الأَصل وَاقِفًا مَنفَرِداً حِيثٌ لَعب دُور أَخْرَ كَعَتَنِي دَني مَرَتِبٍ بِالْتَّعِيد، وَيُرجِح هذَا الرَأي بَدلٌ يَمْيَز هذَا التِّاج عِن نَبَقِي الأَعمَدة سَوَاء مِن نَاحِية الشَكل أَو صَغر حُجَمِه بِالمِقَارَة بِهَا، بِالإِضَافَة إِلَى مَكان العْتَر علَى بِالْقَرب مِن كَل مِن معْبَد حَتْحور وَطُرِيقَ المَواكِب الْمُؤْدِي لِلْبَوَابَة الجَنوَبِيَّة لِمَقاطعة بِنَاحِية المَقْدِسَة، فَمَثَل هذَا الْرَمْوَة "الطُوطَمِيَّة" كَانَ تَوْضَع علَى مَقْرَبة مِن النَّاحِيَة المَقْدِسَة حِيثَ يَنْتَقد عَلَيْهَا وَتَقَدِّمُ الْقُرَابِيَّة إِلَى مِن قِبْلِ الأَفْرَادِ وَالْعَالَمِ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يَكُن يَسْمح لِهُم بِالْمُخْلَق إِلَى الْمَعْبَد، وَقَدْ سَيَلَى مَعْبَد صَرَبِيَّة الْخَادُم في سِبَايْنِ (159–154: 1993).

وَعَلَى ما يَبَدُو فَقُد تَأَكِشَف هذَا التِّاج الحَتْحوري الأمْلِي مَنفَّرِداً بِبَوَاطِع الإِيطَالِي جَب. كاَفِيجِليَا عَام 1821 وَمَسَط رَدِيم لَعْدِن عَلَى النَّعَمَاء العَمَايِرِيَّة الأَخْرِيَّة وَلَتُ رِيَا قَد تَكُون جَزِئًا مِن طَبَقَة أَسَاسَة أو نَاوَة دَاخِلِيَّة لأَحَد الأَجْدَانَ، فِي إِنْدِي النَّاحِيَة الْوَاقِعَة نَاحِيَة الْجَنْبِ الشَرَقِي مِن مَكَان العْتَر علَى النَّمَالَ الْبَصِيرِي الثاني - الْبَرَعُوف فِي الْمَجْرَع الْقَدِيمَ بَيْنَ ابْوِ الْهُوَلَ (انظِرِ المَثَال المْخَطْفِ بِبِتَحَف تحت PM III²: 841 [F]; Jeffreys 2010: 71, SQCO 35 122–123, 126–128 [Hekekyan’s findspot, Excavation III Q12 أَيْنَ يَتَقُو مَكَان العْتَر علَى النَّمَالَ الْبَصِيرِي الذي ذُكِر كَذَا حَقِيقِيَّة فِي تَقْرِير الأَحْفَرِيَّة بِمَكَان الَّذِي تُنَقَّل العْتَر إِلَيه لَاحَقًا بِعَدِ اكْتِشَافِ بِبَوَاطِع كَافِيجِليَا.)

رَمَز "طُوطَمِيَّ" لِلإِلَهَة حَتْحور

مَرْكَح الْحَتْحور بِبِتَحَف 19
مَادَة الصَّنَع: حَجَر جِرِي
أَرْقَام الْحَتْحور الأَخْرَى: سِجل الْحَتْحور 24
مَكَان العْتَر علَى: مَنِف، كَوم الْرَبِيَّة، الْطَرِيقِ الجَنوَبِي الْمُؤْدِي لِحَرَم مَعْبَد بِتَحَر
(RQA)
التَّارِيخ: عصر الدَّولة الْمُحِيَّة؟
This statue group, carved from a massive block of red granite, depicts one of the iconic Memphite triads. It features the god Ptah in the middle, flanked by his consort goddess Sekhmet on the right and by the deified Ramesses II on the left, here possibly acting in place of the child-god Nefertum. Despite being badly damaged, each of the three standing figures of the Memphite triad is still recognizable. Ptah is wrapped in his usual cloak or shroud and clutches his well-known composite scepter* with both hands. His consort Sekhmet is depicted as a lioness-headed woman holding a divine scepter in front of her and an ânkh-sign of life on her right side (of which traces are still visible); her head is surmounted by a sun-disk adorned with a uraeus-cobra at the bottom. Ramesses II is portrayed wearing a pleated kilt, whose front is embellished by a row of uraei-cobras on the bottom, a large necklace, a royal beard, and a short ibes-wig adorned with a uraeus-cobra. His deified state is indicated by the inscription, which identifies the king as "object-of-love-like-Ptah" (meaning this was a deified form of the king that could be worshipped by a passerby) and is emphasized by his headdress—a sun-disk—and by a divine scepter that he clasps in front of him. These three divine figures stand upon a base that is poorly preserved and against a wide back slab, with front and back faces that still bear inscriptions mentioning the gods Ptah and Sekhmet, together with the names and titles of Ramesses II.

This group statue of the Memphite triad was found in several fragments in the northeastern corner of Kôm el-Rabî’a by M. Abd el-Tawwab el-Hitta in 1961–1962 and was restored in 1980 (el-Sayed Mahmud 1978: p. 1; Moussa 1981: 285–288 and pl. VI–VIII; Jeffreys, Málek, and Smith 1983: 35; Jeffreys 1985: 20, 75, and fig. 42). The findspot of the statue was inside the axial chamber of the sanctuary of a small temple (Temple A) built by Ramesses II, next to the processional path leading to the Southern Gate of the sacred precinct of the god Ptah (see figs. 36–37 in introduction). Although now mostly destroyed, this temple may perhaps be identified with a Memphite temple of Ramesses II known from Ramesside texts as the “temple of Ramesses beloved of Amun, object-of-love-like-Ptah” (Pasquali 2010: 222–227). If this identification is correct, it would mean that the access to the present triad statue, and to the temple in which it was found, was not restricted to priests alone, and that this was left open to the public as a place for private devotion (perhaps as late as the Ptolemaic Period, as shown by the discovery of a later pavement and a terracotta Baubo figurine in the courtyard, see Jeffreys, Málek, and Smith 1983: 33).
مثار جماعي للملك رمسيس الثاني بصحبة بتاح وسخمت

MO25

مادة الصنع: جرانيت أحمر

أرقام الحفاظ الأخرى: رقم المتحف 18. رقم الحفائر 1

أعماله: منف. كوم القلعة. الطريق الجنوبي المؤدي إلى حرم معبد بتاح. معبد سخمته المعروف أيضاً معبد A (RQA)

التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة. الأسرة التاسعة عشرة. الملك رمسيس الثاني

مجسم تماثل جماعي منحوت من كتلة واحدة ضخمة من الجرانيت الأحمر، يجسد ثالوث منف المكون من الإله بتاح واقفاً في المنتصف محاطاً بزوجته الإلهة سخمته على اليمين، والمؤله رمسيس الثاني على اليسار حيث يحتمل أنه هنا يمثل الإله الطفل نفرتوم. برغم وجود آثار التدمير الشديد على التمثال إلا أنه يمكن تمييز سمات الثالوث المجسدة في التمثال: فيظهر بتاح بهيئته المعتادة ملفوفاً في عباءته قابضاً بكلتا يديه على صولجانه المركب* المميز، بينما تظهر زوجته سخمته على هيئة سيدة برأس أنثى الأسد ممسكة صولجان مقدس ممثل أماماً بالإضافة إلى علة المنع رمز الحياة على جانبها الأيمن (لا تزال بعض بقاياه ظاهرة). كما يعود رأسها قرص الشمس المنحاز بالصل الملكي، أما رمسيس الثاني فرتدت نقيبه ذات طيات محلاة بصف من حيات الكوبرا ناحية الأمام في الجزء الأفقي منها، بالإضافة إلى الأفراز الأخرى ذات القلايلة كبرة الحجم والذوق الملكي، وتاريخة إلقاء القصيدة المماثلة بالصل الملكي. أما عن دليل تأليف رمسيس الثاني، فيذكر النص المسجل على التمثال، الملك رمسيس الثاني أنه "المحبوب مثل بتاح" (وهذه صيغة تأليف الملك يعود إلى الكهنة فقط، وإن كان مفيداً للأفراد من عامة الشعب). يحتفظ حدوث ذلك في العصر البطلمي حيث عثر على منصة تنتمي للفترة لاحقة، ومنها تم التمثال على فيها، نظرًا للاهتمام بالتمثال. (Jeffreys, Málek, and Smith 1983: 33)

بجوار طريق المواكب المؤدي إلى البوابة الجنوبية لمدينة عين أبو سنغور، في المنصف، يتميز بوجود مجمع من أعمدة ممتدة (انظر أشكال 36، 37 بالمقصدة). وبالرغم من تدمير معظمها، فإن هذا المجمع راها الذي كان يشار إليه في النصوص المؤرخة بقرة الرعاسة كـ"معبد رمسيس الحبوب من أمون، الحبوب مثل بتاح" في منف (227-222 قبل الميلاد) (Pasquali 2010: 222). وإذا صح هذا الإفتراض فإن دخول هذا المجمع أو التمثال لم يكن قائماً على الكهنة فقط، وإن كان مفيداً للأفراد من عامة الشعب.

كما يعود رأسها قرص الشمس المنحرف إلى ناحية الأمام (وهذه صيغة تأليف الملك يعود إلى الكهنة فقط، وإن كان مفيداً للأفراد من عامة الشعب). يحتفظ حدوث ذلك في العصر البطلمي حيث عثر على منصة تنتمي للفترة لاحقة، ومنها تم التمثال على فيها، نظرًا للاهتمام بالتمثال. (Jeffreys, Málek, and Smith 1983: 33)

WALL SLAB OF A TEMPLE

Museum Object Number: MO28
Material: Egyptian alabaster
Other numbers: Mus. 42, Exc. 45
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Qal’a, southern approach to Ptah temenos, southeast of Sekhmet temple (QAW)
Period: New Kingdom?

This fragment of a decorated block of Egyptian alabaster is of unknown date (the New Kingdom date is tentative). It shows traces of being re-cut, but we can still infer from its decoration that it was initially part of the casing of a temple wall or gate or other religious structure. Its decorated face still shows a portion of a larger scene beautifully carved in sunken relief. This portrayed a god, probably Ptah of Memphis, of whom only the bottom part is visible. Wrapped in his cloak, the god is standing inside his shrine, clutching his composite scepter.* The base of the shrine shows alternating hieroglyphic signs for both life (ânkh) and dominion (was). The orientation of the god, looking to the right, as well as the traces of another personage on the left edge of the block, indicate that the scene initially extended on both sides.

Very little is known about the provenance and archaeological context of this block, except that it was exposed at Kôm el-Qal’a in the early 1980s by ‘Abd el-Karîm Abû Shenab when he conducted excavations in a small area approximately 50 m southeast of the so-called Sekhmet temple (RQA) and 80 m east of the southern processional path that leads to the South Gate of the sacred precinct of the god Ptah (unpublished results; personal communication of David Jeffreys, who saw the block before it was moved to the museum). The evidence of recutting indicates that this block was likely found out of context; it may have been removed from one of the numerous ancillary chapels and temples nearby.

الكتلة الجدارية من أحد المعابد

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: MO28
مادة الصنع: ألباستر مصري
أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 42، سجل الحفائر 45
مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم القلعة، الطريق الجنوبي المؤدي لمعبد بتاح، جنوب شرق سخمت (QAW)
التأريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة؟

جزء من كتلة منقوشة من الألباستر المصري، غير معروفة التاريخ (تم تأريخها بعصر الدولة الحديثة بشكل مبدئي)، يظهر عليها آثار تشير لإعادة قطعها، ولكن من خلال القطع نستطيع أن نستنتج أنها كانت في الأصل جزء من كساء باب معبد أو بوابة أو باباً معبداً آخرين ذات طبيعة دينية، والكتلة الجزء من منظر آخر، منفذ براحة بالحرف الغائر، ممثل فيه أحد المعابد، يحتمل أنه بناية مرتبطة، حيث لم يبق منه إلا الجزء الأسفل الذي يصور بناية بأشكال مميزة. * في عقباته واقفاً داخل مقصورته، قابلاً على صواريه المركب. أما قاعدة المقصورة فهي عبارة عن اثنين من العلامات الهيروغيليفية: العنخ (رمز الحياة)، والواس (رمز الحكم والسيطرة) مكررة بالتناوب. يقف المعبود ناظراً ناحية اليمين، كما توجد آثار تدل على وجود شخص آخر على الجهة البريس من الكتلة وهو ما يدل أن المنظر كان ممتدًا في الإتجاهين.

ولاأ يوجد الكثير من المعلومات عن السياق الأثري الأصلي لهذه القطعة، ولأن العثور عليها سوي أن قد تم الكشف عنها في كوم القلعة في أوائل الثمانينات بواسطة عبد الكريم أبو شنب الذي قام بإجراء حفائر في منطقة صغيرة تقع على بعد حوالي 50 مترًا جنوب شرق البلدة المسماة بخدم سخمت (RQA)، و8 مترًا شرق طريق المواقب الجنوبي المؤدي للبوابة الجنوبية لمقاطعة بناية المقدسة (نتائج غير منشورة، تم معرفتها من خلال التواصل الشخصي مع ديفيد جيفريس الذي شاهد هذه القطعة قبل نقلها للمتحف).

بدلاً إعادة قطع هذه الكتلة إلى العثور عليها خارج سياق الأثر الأصلي، حيث ربما أُزيلت من أحد المعابد أو من المقابر العديدة القريبة التابعة لها.
SEATED STATUE OF RAMESSES II

Museum Object Number: MO11
Material: red granite
Other numbers: Mus. 32, Exc. 23
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabî’a, southern approach to Ptah temenos, area of Temple B (RQA)
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

This larger-than-life-size seated statue of Ramesses II, carved from red granite, was found broken in two pieces with its head and arms missing. Most of the surface of the seat, base, and back pillar is damaged, showing only a few remnants of inscriptions. However, the general appearance and attitude of the king, as well as the names preserved at the back of the statue, identify this as Ramesses II. He is portrayed sitting on a throne covered with inscriptions, most likely with his hands resting on his lap. He is attired in royal regalia, including a nemes-headaddress, a royal shendyt-kilt, and a royal beard (now broken).

This statue was found by M. Abd el-Tawwâb el-Hitta in 1962 near a chapel (the so-called Temple B, more likely a way-shrine) located in the northeastern corner of Kôm el-Rabî’a (see fig. 39 in introduction). The findspot of the statue indicates that it probably once stood upon one of the two large inscribed pedestals found (although not in situ) farther south in the vicinity of the chapel; this statue may have actually adorned the front of one of the numerous ancillary temples and way-shrines set along the processional path leading to the South Gate of Ptah’s sacred precinct (PM III²: 846 [L]; Jeffreys, Malek, and Smith 1983: 38–39; Jeffreys 1985: 74 and fig. 40).
تمثال جالس للملك رمسيس الثاني

رقم الحفاظ بالمتحف: MO11
مادة الصنع: جرانيت أحمر

أرقام الحفاظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 32, سجل الحفائر 23
مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الربيعة، الطريق الجنوبي (RQA) B
المؤدي لحرم معبد بتج، منطقة معبد B
التاريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، الملك رمسيس الثاني

تمثال جالس للملك رمسيس الثاني أكبر من الحجم البشري الطبيعي من الجرانيت الأحمر تم العثور عليه مكسوراً إلى جزئين بدون الرأس والذراعين. تشغل قاعدة التمثال الجزء الأكبر من الكرسي الجالس عليه الملك. بينما عمد الظهر أصابه التدمير وعليه بقايا قليلة من الكتابات. يشير منظر وهيئة التمثال العامة بالإضافة إلى الأسماء الباقية على ظهر التمثال إلى أن هذا الملك هو رمسيس الثاني الذي يظهر جالساً على كرسي العرش المغطى بالنقوش والكتابات، بينما يرجح أن الذراعين كانتا مفرودتين على ساقيه. يظهر الملك بالهيئة الملكية مرتدياً رداء الرأس الملكي (النمس)، ونقبة الشنديد والذقن الملكية (مكسورة حاليا).

FRAGMENT OF THE FACE OF A ROYAL COLOSSUS

Museum Object Number: MO55
Material: limestone
Other numbers: Mus. 5, Exc. 30
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabi’a, southern approach to the Ptah temenos, area of Chapel C (RQA)
Period: New Kingdom, Ramesside period?

This massive fragment of limestone once belonged to the face of a royal colossus of unknown date (the Ramesside date is tentative). This fragment, though badly damaged and weathered, still shows the eyes, nose bridge, and ears of an unidentified king. The remnants of his headdress, showing gaps where some additional pieces of stone may have initially been set, indicate that he was attired with royal regalia, namely a nemes-headdress adorned with the royal uraeus-cobra.

This piece was found by M. Abd el-Tawwâb el-Hitta in 1962 along the eastern side of the paved processional causeway leading to the South Gate of the sacred precinct of Ptah, near the remnants of a possible way-shrine of which only a small tank was visible (Jeffreys 1985: 74 and fig. 40 [chapel C (?)]; see fig. 40 in introduction). The findspot of this fragment indicates that this colossus probably once adorned the southern approach of the religious complex of Ptah before being sawn into pieces at some point in antiquity, in order to be reused.
This much-eroded torso once belonged to a royal colossus carved from red granite. Found headless and split into two pieces, this fragmentary statue was sawn apart at some point in antiquity for reuse. The remaining fragments were likely left face up and exposed to the elements, explaining why the front is now totally defaced and eroded, while the inscribed back pillar appears comparatively intact. Not much can be said about this statue except that it once portrayed Ramesses II standing against a back pillar inscribed with his names and titles. Very little remains of his clothing or his arms, but he seems to have been bare-chested and may have held one or two divine standards, as is suggested by the angle formed by his stretched arms (see for comparison other standard-bearing statues of Ramesses II also displayed at the museum: MO21 and MO51).

This torso appears on various archival pictures, once in 1962 and again in 1971, in the open air conservation workshop of the museum, where several pieces of statuary extracted from the southern approach of Ptah's precinct in 1959–1962 were gathered in order to be reassembled and restored (see fig. 42, right, in introduction). This may indicate that the torso fragment MO37 was unearthed in the same area.

This much-eroded torso once belonged to a royal colossus carved from red granite. Found headless and split into two pieces, this fragmentary statue was sawn apart at some point in antiquity for reuse. The remaining fragments were likely left face up and exposed to the elements, explaining why the front is now totally defaced and eroded, while the inscribed back pillar appears comparatively intact. Not much can be said about this statue except that it once portrayed Ramesses II standing against a back pillar inscribed with his names and titles. Very little remains of his clothing or his arms, but he seems to have been bare-chested and may have held one or two divine standards, as is suggested by the angle formed by his stretched arms (see for comparison other standard-bearing statues of Ramesses II also displayed at the museum: MO21 and MO51).

This torso appears on various archival pictures, once in 1962 and again in 1971, in the open air conservation workshop of the museum, where several pieces of statuary extracted from the southern approach of Ptah's precinct in 1959–1962 were gathered in order to be reassembled and restored (see fig. 42, right, in introduction). This may indicate that the torso fragment MO37 was unearthed in the same area.
تطور الأفق الديني

A PIECEMEAL RELIGIOUS LANDSCAPE
The museum’s collection also contains a number of pieces whose provenance is either completely unknown or very poorly documented, usually because these were exposed accidentally in various areas of the ruin field that were not fully or thoroughly excavated, thus complicating their re-contextualization. Among them: various pieces of stone architecture and statuary, as well as an offering table, ranging from the Middle Kingdom (MO58) until the Greco-Roman Period (MO54). Even though little or nothing is known about their original context, these pieces still testify to various aspects of the religious landscape of Memphis, albeit in a very piecemeal manner.

They illustrate the presence of many other religious structures and installations outside of the Great Ptah Temple, although it is necessary to point out that some of these objects may have been found in a secondary context, such that we cannot determine their original provenance. Whether this range of objects originate from the Ptah Temple or from other Memphite temples (known from ancient sources but yet to be identified archaeologically), they remind the visitor that a range of deities of varying origin and importance were also worshipped in the city of Memphis. We know, for instance, that several forms of the Theban god Amun as well as Heliopolitan solar deities (Ra-Horakhty, Atum) were worshipped in the Memphite region (Guermeur 2005: 9–71; Pasquali 2009: 67–90; Eaton 2012: 124–130). The inscriptions present on our objects mention, besides Ptah and Sekhmet, deities as varied as the crocodile-god Sobek (MO58; usually worshipped in the Fayum area), the god Amun or Atum (MO45; here associated with the coronation of a king), Thoth (MO51 and perhaps MO68; known to have had a temple in Memphis and a sacred animal necropolis in Saqqara), the funerary god Osiris (MO29; who gained more and more prominence in Memphis during the Late Period), and the apotropaic deity Bes (MO54; who is also represented in Saqqara).

Organized by periods, the objects presented in this section also illustrate the diversity of Egyptian monumental architecture, with its various sorts of columns (MO39; MO66; MO40 and MO41; MO75, MO79, MO81, and MO83), wall blocks (MO57; MO36; and MO38) and cornice elements (MO73 and MO67), carved from a range of stones, including red granite, limestone, Egyptian alabaster, and quartzite.
OFFERING TABLE OF IMENY-SONEB
Museum Object Number: MOS8
Material: basalt
Other numbers: Mus. 8, Exc. 17
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Nawa (no site code)
Period: Middle Kingdom, 12th Dynasty?

This offering table is carved from a large block of basalt. Despite a broken corner, it is very well preserved. Its design is of the classical T-shape type, characterized by a gutter for draining away libation water poured over the table. Its central shallow surface is adorned with low-relief offerings set upon a mat, forming the hieroglyph sign of the “offering” hetep; they depict various sorts of bread loaves (two round and one rising from a mold) and what may be two sealed beer jars with their pointed mud stoppers. The table is bounded by a low rim inscribed with an offering formula addressed to a form of the crocodile god Sobek named “Sobek-of-the-net,” and dedicated to an official, the estate overseer, accountant of ibexes, Imeny-soneb, born of the lady It. Though no royal name is mentioned, a 12th Dynasty date can be inferred from the onomastics of the names of Imeny-soneb and It, which were particularly in favor at this time.

Nothing is known about the exact provenance and archaeological context of this offering table except that it was accidentally unearthed on the eastern part of Memphis, at Kôm el-Nawa in the late 1970s or early 1980s (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982: 257–258 and pl. XXX). However, the mention of the god Sobek in the inscription provides another interesting piece of evidence of a cult dedicated to this crocodile deity in the Memphite area (el-Sharkawy 2010: 193 and 203). Offering tables are attested from the Old Kingdom on in various contexts, from houses to temples and tombs. These served as convenient substitutes for the act of presenting actual food offerings to gods or the deceased. Through ritual performance and pouring libation water over depictions of food and offering formulae, the magic of the table was activated so that those to whom it was dedicated could be virtually supplied with offerings. T-shaped tables like MOS8 were in use from the Middle Kingdom through the Late Period.
مائدة قرابين لامني سونب

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: MO58
مادة الصنع: بازلت
أرقام الحفاظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 8, سجل الحفائر 17
مكان العثور عليه: منف, كوم النوة (بدون كود)

التأريخ: عصر الدولة الوسطى, الأسرة الثانية عشرة

ولا يوجد معلومات دقيقة عن السياق الأثري الأصلي لهذه القطعة، وكلما ما تعرف أنه قد عُثر عليها بالصدفة بالجزء الشرقي من منف في Kôm El-Naafa. ثم بعد ذلك، في كوم النوة، وكم إحدى هذه اللوحات معروض في أذار المعبود سوبك بعد دليل على عمليته في منف (el-Sharkawy 2010: 193 and pl. XXX).

مائه قرابين ضخمة منحوتة من كتلة واحدة من البازلت، وبغض النظر عن الكسر الموجود بأحد الأركان، فإن المائدة بحالة جيدة جداً من الحفظ. وهي تأخذ شكل حرف T، وتمييز يوجود مذراب لتصريف السوائل خارجها. يحل سطح المائدة أشكال قرابين منفذة بالنقوش البازر، ممثلة فوق شكل قتال، وكذلك تكون شكل العلامة الهيروغليفية "حتب" والتي تعني "قرابين"، وهذه القرابين عبارة عن أشكال مختلفة من أرغفة الخبز (اثنان على شكل دائرة، وثالث يأخذ شكل قالب الخبز)، بالإضافة إلى ما يرجح أنهما اثنين أواني الجعة ذات السدادة المدببة من الطمي. على الحواف، يوجد نقش لصيغة تقدمة قرابين مقدمة للمعبود سوبك الذي يتخذه التساح رمزلاً له، ومذكور بالنص أحد ألقاب سوبك وهو "سوبك الشبكة". 

في إشارة إلى ما يذكر عن سوبك في الديانة المصرية القديمة أنه قد أمضى أبناء حورس الأربعة داخل شبكة، كما يذكر النص أن هذه القرابين مكرسة لأحد الموظفين وهو المشرف على الأملاك، القائم على تعداد حيوانات العوائل إمني سونب المولود من السيدة إت. على الرغم من عدم ذكر أية اسماء ملكية يمكن من خلالها تأريخ اللوح، إلا أنه يرجح تاريخها إلى الأسرة الثانية عشرة، وذلك من خلال دراسة أسماء الأفراد حيث تعتبر أسماء إمني سونب، وايتأت من الأسماء المفضلة والتي شاع استخدامها خلال تلك الفترة.
This statue group, of which only the lower part is preserved, is carved from quartzite. Despite the very fragmentary condition of this statue, it can be inferred from the few elements preserved that this portrayed a larger-than-life-sized seated god, presumably Amun or Atum, of whom only the legs and part of the throne are visible. Most likely, the god was originally depicted crowning a life-sized effigy of King Horemheb kneeling before the god, as evidenced by the pair of flexed feet identifiable between the legs of Amun/Atum. Such coronation groups are well attested in New Kingdom royal statuary (Simpson 1955: 112–114; Pasquali 2011: 59). Horemheb is identified by his names and titles inscribed on either side of the statue in an engraved line of text running around the base. Remnants of the throne are adorned with a decorative dado and side panels bearing the intertwined plants of the sema-tawy symbol of Egypt reunified.

We know very little about the provenance and archaeological context of this statue group, other than that it was accidentally exposed in 1949 during road construction near Kôm Arba’în (PM III²: 852; Simpson 1956: 118–119).
FRAGMENT OF A LOTUS COLUMN OF RAMESSES II

Museum Object Number: MO39
Material: red granite
Other numbers: Mus. 47, Exc. 39
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Nawa, eastern area (NAE)?
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

This sawn fragment once belonged to a lotus column shaft carved from red granite. Lotus columns (Arnold 2003: 54) are recognizable by both their ribbed shafts, intended to represent a bundle of lotus flower stems, and their characteristic circular cross-sections (Arnold 2003: 54). They are unlike papyrus columns, whose stems show a triangular cross-section. The current fragment shows a portion of two of these stems. Their surfaces are adorned with hieroglyphic inscriptions in sunken relief mentioning the names and titles of Ramesses II and the patron-god of Memphis, Ptah.

This fragment may correspond to one of the sawn fragments of red granite columns bearing the names of Ramesses II that was reported in the 1980s by D. G. Jeffreys as lying loose on the eastern edge of Kôm el-Nawa (Jeffreys and Smith 1985: 6; Jeffreys 1985: 39, and fig. 10 [NAE] and 55). These may have been exposed by W. M. F. Petrie in 1908 (Petrie 1909a: 10 [§ 31]) when he excavated an east-west avenue made of reused granite blocks (NAC) leading to a Late Period structure that may have been either a gate or a temple (NAB).

This sawn fragment once belonged to a lotus column shaft carved from red granite. Lotus columns (Arnold 2003: 54) are recognizable by both their ribbed shafts, intended to represent a bundle of lotus flower stems, and their characteristic circular cross-sections (Arnold 2003: 54). They are unlike papyrus columns, whose stems show a triangular cross-section. The current fragment shows a portion of two of these stems. Their surfaces are adorned with hieroglyphic inscriptions in sunken relief mentioning the names and titles of Ramesses II and the patron-god of Memphis, Ptah.

This fragment may correspond to one of the sawn fragments of red granite columns bearing the names of Ramesses II that was reported in the 1980s by D. G. Jeffreys as lying loose on the eastern edge of Kôm el-Nawa (Jeffreys and Smith 1985: 6; Jeffreys 1985: 39, and fig. 10 [NAE] and 55). These may have been exposed by W. M. F. Petrie in 1908 (Petrie 1909a: 10 [§ 31]) when he excavated an east-west avenue made of reused granite blocks (NAC) leading to a Late Period structure that may have been either a gate or a temple (NAB).

يتميز الأعمدة التي تأخذ شكل زهرة اللوتس (Arnold 2003: 54) ببدنها المضلّع لأخذ شكل حزمة من سيقان نبات اللوتس، ويأخذ المقطع العرضي منها شكل دائري مميز (وذلك على العكس من أعمدة البردي، والتي تأخذ القطاع العرضي منها شكل المثلث). هذه القطعة عبارة عن جزء من اثنين من السيقان، يزين سطحها كتابات هيروغيليفية بالنقش الغائر تسجل أسماء وألقاب الملك رمسيس الثاني، ويتحة منف الرئيسي.

يُعتقد أن هذه القطعة تتطابق مع واحدة من أجزاء الأعمدة الجرانيتية التي حملت أسماء رمسيس الثاني، والتي ذكر وجودها D. G. Jeffreys خلال الثمانينات في الحد الشرقي من كوم النوة (Jeffreys and Smith 1985: 6; Jeffreys 1985: 39, and fig.) واحصل على هذه الكتل عام 1908 (Petrie 1909a: 10 [§ 31]) أثناء حفره بالخضير على أحد الطرق التي تتجه من الشرق للغرب المبني من كتل أحجار الجرانيت المعاد استخدامها (NAC) والذي كان يؤدي إلى مبنى يُعرف بالقصر المتأخر والذي يُعتقد أنه كان إما بؤرة أو معبد (NAB).

جزء من عمود على شكل زهرة اللوتس، يحمل اسم رمسيس الثاني

مuseum Object Number: MO39
رقم الحفاظ بالمتحف: 39
مادة الصنع: جرانيت أحمر
أرقام الحفاظ الأخرى: متحف 47، سجل الحفائر 39
مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم النوة، المنطقة الشرقية (NAE)?
التاريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، الملك
رمسيس الثاني
OCTAGONAL PILLAR OF RAMESSES II

Museum Object Number: MO66
Material: limestone
Other numbers: Mus. 28, Exc. 40
Provenance: Memphis?
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

This limestone fragment from an octagonal pillar (Arnold 2003: 176 [d]) bears the names and titles of Ramesses II on one of its faces. Its provenance and archaeological context are unknown, but it seems credible that this pillar once adorned a Memphite chapel or temple of Ramesses II.

FRAGMENTS OF COLUMNS OF RAMESSES II

Museum Object Number: MO40; MO41
Material: Egyptian alabaster
Other numbers: Mus. 48, Exc. 57 (MO40); Mus. 49, Exc. 56 (MO41)
Provenance: Memphis?
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

The museum displays two fragments of circular columns carved from Egyptian alabaster. Their provenance and archaeological context remains unknown, though a Memphite findspot is credible. These column fragments seem to be similar in style and design to each other, arguing in favor of the same origin and date for both pieces.

Now partially defaced, the surface of the column shaft MO40 was originally embellished with columns of texts delimiting mirrored depictions in sunken relief of King Ramesses II attired with royal regalia and worshipping Memphite deities. Though fragmentary, the columns of inscriptions allow us to identify most of the depicted personages. On one side, Ramesses II, wearing a royal shendyt-kilt, a large necklace, and a khepresh-crown,* clutches what appears to be a life (ankh) glyph in his left hand while presenting an offering (now destroyed) with his right hand to the lion-headed goddess Sekhmet, here identified by her name and portrayed with a sun-disk on top of her head and an undetermined divine scepter in her right hand. On the other side, Ramesses II, identically dressed, censes an almost entirely defaced deity (perhaps Sekhmet again) whose head is surmounted by a sun-disk and whose left hand holds a was-scepter.*

Now mostly defaced and half-broken, the surface of the column fragment MO41 was originally embellished with inscriptions and depictions of (mirrored?) cult scenes carved in sunken relief. Of this, only the faded silhouette of a goddess, perhaps the lion-headed goddess Sekhmet, is preserved. An undetermined divine scepter in her left hand, she stands before an offering stand topped by a lotus flower. A figure of a king, of whom only the defaced royal cartouches are visible (likely Ramesses II again), may have initially stood opposite of the goddess.

---

*ānkh
*khepresh
*was-scepter
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The museum holds a series of limestone column drums of varied type whose provenance and archaeological context remain unknown. Their simple designs also make their dates particularly difficult to assess (ranging from Pharaonic to Late Antique). Two of these, MO75 and MO81, consist of simple circular drums left undecorated, while another pair, MO79 and MO83, have a surface adorned with alternating double lines engraved vertically, creating facets (17 facets for MO79; 20 facets for MO83) that may have been intended to evoke, though roughly, a “fluting” design. These latter two drums respectively show a flat vertical back that may correspond to a later re-cut (MO79, unless the drum once belonged to a semi-detached column) and a square hole on one side (MO83). Both reworkings indicate that these were not found in their primary context.

عُدِّلَت المحفزات ضمن مقتنياته بعض القطع، عبارة عن أجزاء من أعمدة متنوعة الطراز، غير معروف أصلها أو السياق الأثري لها، كما يصعب تأريخها بشكل دقيق (من عصر الأسرات الفرعونية وحتى أواخر العصور القديمة). تتسم هذه القطع بالبساطة في التصميم، حيث نجد في MO75 وMO81، بدن اسطواني غير مزخرف، بينما في MO79 وMO83، سطح مزخرف، يتكون من العناصر المبردة بخطوط طويلة مثل الحزوز (عددها 17 في القطرة 79، و20 في القطرة 83). وكما يُقصَد به التصميم الأولي للعمود هو “الذيل المزخرف”， أما الجزء الخلفي للعمود في镰ناسب مع عملية إعادة قطع لاحقة (إلا إذا كانت القطرة رقم 79 جزء من عمود شبه متصل). كما يوجد ثقب مربع الشكل أعلى الجوانب (بالقطرة 83، MO83) وهذا يوضح أنه لم يتم العثور عليهم في سياقهم الأثري الأصلي، وإذا أثناء إعادة استخدامهم لاحقاً.
This large quartzite fragment may have been sawn away from either a piece of statuary or from an architectural element. It is embellished with decorations and inscriptions beautifully carved in sunken relief. Its smaller face still bears remnants of the upper part of two columns of inscriptions mentioning the names of Ramesses II, while its larger face portrays the god Ptah standing in his shrine and dressed with his characteristic outfit of a skullcap, royal beard, cloak, and a large necklace with a back pendant.

Very little can be said about the use or the provenance of this stone element. It has been re-cut, indicating that this piece may have once belonged to the decoration or architecture of a Memphite temple, before being looted and sawn into pieces for transport and re-use. An undated archival photograph (perhaps to be dated from the 1920s-1930s see fig. 43 in introduction) shows this piece embedded in the foundations of a modern traditional house, located somewhere in the area corresponding to the temenos of Ptah, together with other ancient stone pieces, including the drum of a Late Antique column of the same design as our columns MO12 and MO13. These were found re-used at Kôm el-Nawa.
CORNER BLOCK OF A TEMPLE

Museum Object Number: MO36

Material: Egyptian alabaster

Other numbers: Mus. 44, Exc. 47

Provenance: Memphis?

Period: New Kingdom, Ramesside period?

This large, decorated corner block is carved from Egyptian alabaster. Though badly damaged and eroded, this block still bears on two of its faces fragments of decoration and inscription in sunken relief, as well as the trace of a now-missing torus molding. Its larger face depicts a probable Ramesside king; recognizable by his outfit, he wears a royal shendyt-kilt, a large necklace, and a khepresh-crown* of which only the back ribbons are visible. His overall attitude indicates that he is performing one of the stages of the divine cult, probably the offering of Maât (see for comparison MO34). On the block's narrower face the king is shown attired in the same royal regalia (khepresh-crown* and shendyt-kilt), but considering the position of his right arm, here he may have been depicted in the position of adoration. Though nothing is known about its provenance and archaeological context, it seems probable that this decorated block originally comes from the wall decoration and masonry of a Memphite chapel or temple.

MO36

حجر زاوية من إحدى المعابد

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: MO36

مادة الصنع: ألباستر مصر

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 44, سجل الحفائر 47

مكان العثور عليه: منف؟

التاريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، فترة الرعاسة؟

حجر زاوية من الألباستر المصري، ورغم حالته المدمرة والمتآكلة، فإنه لا يزال يحمل زخارف وكتابات على الوجهين منفذة بالنقش الغائر، بالإضافة إلى آثار نتوء على شكل نتوء (نصف دائري) لكنه مفقود الآن. يظهر على الجزء الأكبر من القطعة أحد ملوك الرعاسة الذي يمكن تعيينه من خلال شكله الخارجي مرتدياً نقبة الشنديد الملكية، فلادة كبيرة، نقوش الخرش* الذي لا يبق منه إلا الشراط الخلفية. يمثل المنظر المعناوي للملك أثناء تأديته لأحد طقوس التعبد ربما تقدمه المائع (للمقارنة انظر القطعة MO34). أما على الوجه الأصغر للكلمة يظهر الملك بالهيكل الرسمية (مرتدياً ناقش الخرش* وقبة الشنيد)، ونظرًا لوضع الأيدي الأمين، ربما يمثل الملك في وضع التعبد. على الرغم من عدم وجود أي معلومات عن أصل هذه القطعة أو السياق الأثري لها، فإنه يحمل أن هذه القطعة جاءت أساسًا من أحد البناء أو الكتلة الحجرية المأخوذة لأحد المعابد أو المقابر الدينية منف.
This large block, which has been partially re-cut, is carved from red granite. Though fragmentary and heavily eroded, its larger face still bears a portion of an inscribed scene carved in sunken relief. This depicts a man, presumably a king (we can still distinguish the faded outline of an uraeus-cobra on his forehead), dressed with a kilt, a large necklace, and a semi-long bag wig or headcloth. He seems to hold in front of him what may have been a standard surmounted by royal cartouches. Nothing is known about the provenance or archaeological context of this decorated block (the Ramesside date is tentative).
This very large frieze,* carved from a large block of limestone that has since broken into two pieces, consists of a row of monumental protective cobra-goddesses (or uraei) whose heads are topped by sun-disks and whose bodies are raised up with their hoods expanded into a fighting position. Feared for their venom, which was thought to burn like the fire of the sun-god, these female cobras represented re-doubtable guardian deities. Such a cobra-goddess, or uraeus, often stands on the forehead of the king as a protector of royalty; likewise, this same goddess entwines the sun-disk of the god Ra (for more on the meaning and iconography of cobras in Pharaonic Egypt, see Vernus and Yoyotte 2005:321–334). Since the early dynasties, and particularly from the New Kingdom onwards (the date proposed for this piece is tentative), this motif was used as a decorative pattern for friezes that bordered parapets and walls in religious architecture, as seen locally in the southern court of Djoser’s Step Pyramid at Saqqara.

Though the provenance and archaeological context of the present frieze are unknown, we can infer from its large size and iconography that this originally belonged to the architecture of a Memphite temple. At the same time, evidence of re-cutting on the upper portion of the sun-disks and the presence of a square hole indicates that this element of frieze was reused at some point and that it was not found in its primary position. Besides, we know from archive pictures that this piece has been exposed and moved to be displayed inside the shelter of the Abu’l-hol colossus as early as 1949 (see fig. 13 in introduction).

FRIEZE OF URAEI-COBRAS
Museum Object Number: MO73
Material: limestone
Other numbers: no number
Provenance: Memphis?
Period: New Kingdom?

إفريز من حيّات الكوبرا
رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: MO73
مادة الصنع: حجر جيري
أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: بدون رقم
مكان العثور عليه: منف؟
التاريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة؟

منذ الأسرات المبكرة، استخدم هذا العنصر الجمالي لزخرفة الأفريز التي تزين بعض المعالم الدينية بالمباني الملكية على سبيل المثال الفناء الجنوبي لمجموعة الهرم المدرج للملك زوسر في ميت رهينة. وقد استمر استخدامه وإزداد بشكل خاص خلال عصر الدولة الحديثة وصاعداً (تم تأريخ هذه القطعة بشكل مبدئي على هذا الأساس).

على الرغم من عدم معرفة أصل هذا الإفريز والسياق الأثري له حتى الآن، لكن يمكن استنتاج أنه كان جزءاً من أحد المعابد في منف، ولكن في نفس الوقت شير علامة إعادة القطع الجزء العلوي عند قرص الشمس، كذلك وجود ثقب مربع الشكل إلى إعادة استخدام هذا الإفريز في مرحلة لاحقة، لذا فلم يتم العثور عليه في سياق الأولي. كما نعرف من خلال إحدى الصور الأرشيفية القديمة أنه تم اكتشاف هذه القطعة وفقًا للعرض داخل المأوى المغني الخاص بالتمثال الضخم لرمسيس الثاني عام 1949 (انظر شكل 13 بالمقدمة).
UNINSCRIBED CAVETTO CORNICE

Museum Object Number: MO67
Material: limestone
Other numbers: Exc. 51?
Provenance: Memphis?
Period: Pharaonic period

The surface of this large piece of limestone cornice* is finely carved but was left undecorated (perhaps unfinished). It clearly constitutes the corner element of a cavetto cornice, a common decorative pattern in Pharaonic stone architecture (Arnold 2003: 46–47). Despite the absence of any data related to its provenance or archaeological context, it seems credible to assert, considering the large size of this piece, that this cornice fragment once belonged to the architecture of a Memphite temple. However, it remains difficult to determine the sort of architectural element that this piece originally adorned (for instance, the top of a wall or of a gate).

The museum displays two large pedestals of similar size and design, but of unknown provenance. Together, these very likely constituted a pair. Carved from red granite, both are massive quadrangular blocks with the top surfaces hollowed out in the shape of a shallow rectangle to receive the base of a statue. The four faces of each pedestal were adorned with the same series of mirrored inscriptions carved in sunk relief. These consist of a running line of text surmounting columns of inscriptions which, though much defaced by erosion, still bear the names and titles of Ramesses II.

Nothing is known about the archaeological context of these two pedestals, but it should be noted that such statue pedestals have been exposed throughout Memphis, including several belonging to statues of Ramesses II, and that they were usually placed in front of temples and chapels in order to support portraits of the king. Nothing indicates, however, that the two statues currently displayed on these pedestals (MO22 and MO23) were actually part of an original assemblage. All that we can say is that this pair of pedestals and the two statues currently standing on them have been displayed together for some considerable time (as early as 1956, as evidenced by fig. 12 in introduction).
This standard-bearing statue of Ramesses II, of quite heavy-handed style, is carved from red granite. The lower part of the statue is water-damaged. The king is portrayed striding, his left foot forward. He clutches two standards surmounted by miniature heads of Memphite gods identified by their names and outfits: Ptah on the left, with his headdress consisting of a long wig with a pair of ram's horns surmounted by a sun-disk and two tall feathers (here mostly destroyed), and Thoth on the right, whose long wig is surmounted by a lunar crescent and a full-moon-disk.

Ramesses II is identified by his names, which are mentioned in the inscriptions at the back of the plinth above the shoulders of the statue. In these inscriptions, the statue itself is named as "object-of-love-like-Ptah-Thoth-he-who-is-under-his-moringa-tree," meaning this statue was a deified form of the king that could be worshipped by a passerby (Manouvrier 1996: 477).

The king’s outfit testifies to the fashion worn by the elite of the time. He wears a long, finely pleated dress with large sleeves, which splays out and is bordered with fringe, a beaded necklace, and a pair of pointed sandals. His headdress, which consists of a ceremonial khepresh-crown* adorned with a royal uraeus-cobra, emphasized his royal status.

Very little is known about the provenance and archaeological context of this statue, except that it was accidentally exposed in 1940 when a well was drilled in Hôd el-Wissâda in the cultivated fields located southwest of Kôm el-Rabî’a (PM III²: 863; el-Amir 1943: 359–363 and pl. XXI-XXII; Les fouilles 1946: 55–56; Jeffreys 1985: 27 and fig. 8 [RAN]; Jeffreys 2010: 126). Such standard-bearing statues are known to have been particularly in favor during the reign of Ramesses II (about the function and evolution of royal standard-bearing statues under Ramesses II, see Manouvrier 1996: 534–541; see also MO21). These were usually adorning processional pathways and temple entrances. With this statue, Ramesses II is depicted as an officiant honoring two major deities of the Memphite area: Ptah said as "he-who-is-under-his-moringa-tree," referring to a former Memphite tree-god gradually associated with Ptah and of which a specimen may have been tended in the god's temple precinct (about this epithet and the god[s] to whom it refers, see Sandman-Holmberg 1946: 147–150), and Thoth, the lunar god of norm and knowledge who incarnates in the Memphite theology the divine verb by means of which the demiurge Ptah created the universe. The Memphite temple of Thoth still remains to be uncovered, but a sacred animal necropolis dedicated to this god has been unearthed near Memphis, in North Saqqara (PM III²: 825–826).
تمثال ضخم للملك رمسيس الثاني حاملًا ألوية أحد المعبودات

MO51

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: 51

مادة الصنع: جرانيت أحمر

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 17، سجل الحفائر 4 أو 12

مكان العثور عليه: منف، في الحقول الزراعية الواقعة جنوب غرب كوم الربيعة، الحوض الوسطاني (RAN)

التاريخ: عصر الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، الملك رمسيس الثاني


وكان عدد تماثيل ظهره على هذه الصفة بالمرتفع ومن الداخل المعابد. يظهر رمسيس الثاني في هذا التمثال كنابض بالطمغ يحمل ألوية في أيديه. وقد ذكرت نصب التمثال على الألوية الجزء الأدنى من الألوية، وفي إحدى الألوية، يحمل الملك نصبًا 아직 لا يزال غير مصنوعًا.

يظهر على التمثال أسماء رمسيس الثاني، منقوشة على رأس الملك، وتذكير بعمر الملك. يظهر رمسيس الثاني كقائم على البشرية، حيث يقوم بتكريم اثنين من المعبودات الرئيسية في المنطقة المنفية. وقد ذكر أن الملك "الذي أسفل شجرة المورينجا خاصته"، وهما يشير إلى أن هذا التمثال هو "أسفل شجرة المورينجا خاصة". وتعيد منغزلي (Manouvrier 1996: 477) مسألة مزج الباروكات والعبير، والعبير والتكريم. إن هذه الصفة، والآلهة التي ارتبطت بها، مثال على أزياء الملك خلال عصره.

يعتبر التمثال مثالًا على تقفية الملك على ساحات النخبة خلال هذا العصر، حيث يصور الملك مرتديًا سروال طويل، ذو طيات ناعمة وبأكمام كبيرة تتدفق للخارج، ومكده بالأهداب، كما يرتدي قبعة ذات خرز، ورجل من الصادي، المدببة. أما رأسه في kèون من ناج الخرس، المزين بالصل الملكي، وذلك تأكيده لإظهار التمثال للملك.
This life-sized statue of Ramesses II, of which only a fragment of the bottom portion is preserved, is carved from a block of alabaster. The rectangular base of the statue is adorned at the front with columns of inscriptions mentioning the names and titles of Ramesses II; what is preserved of the side face is also inscribed and embellished with a herringbone pattern. This decorative pattern may have been intended to accentuate the veins of alabaster in which the royal statue is actually carved, a material regarded as particularly precious and pure by ancient Egyptians (Aufrère 1991: 696–698). The back of the statue, which may have consisted of a throne and/or a back pillar, is missing. Ramesses II is wearing an outfit which testifies to the fashion worn by the elite of the time. He wears a pair of pointed sandals and a long, finely pleated dress or kilt bordered with fringe, the front of which splays out and bears a column of text. The position of the feet of the statue and the curvature of the kilt seem to argue in favor of a seated position.

The exact provenance and archaeological context of this statue are not known, but a Memphite origin is highly probable. There is no evidence, though, to suggest with any certainty that the red granite pedestal (MO87, of unknown provenance) upon which this statue is currently displayed was part of the original assemblage. However, we know that the two pieces were long displayed together, as early as 1956 as evidenced by a set of archival pictures that show this fragment of alabaster statue already standing on top of pedestal MO87, along the old shelter of the Abu‘l-hol colossus, before the museum was created (see, for instance, fig. 12 in the introduction).
This life-sized seated statue of King Pedubast, carved from a block of black granite, is unfinished, apart from the back pillar, which has been fully polished and inscribed. Though the details of his body (muscles, fingers, and toes) and outfit were not carved, the king appears dressed in a royal shendyt-kilt and is clearly portrayed seated on a throne, with his hands placed flat on his thighs. Pedubast is identified by his names (Sehetepibre Pedubast; about the coexistence of several Pedubasts and the criteria for their respective identifications, see Aston and Jeffreys 2007: 63) mentioned in the columns of inscriptions engraved on the three faces of the back pillar. These also mention the main local god, Ptah, and two of his well-known hybrid forms that were also worshipped in Memphis: Ptah-Tatenen—literally Ptah “he-of-the-risen-ground,” a specific form of Ptah referring to his role as a demiurge (for more details, see MO21)—and Ptah-Sokar, Sokar being the patron-deity of the Memphite necropolis, who tended to be assimilated with Ptah and Osiris from the New Kingdom onwards.

Very little is known about the provenance and archaeological context of this unfinished seated statue, except that it was accidentally exposed in 1949 at Kôm el-Fakhry, when local people removed earth from the mound to fill a nearby swamp (PM III²: 852; Habachi 1966: 69–70, figs. 1–3 and pl. V [b, c]). The king Pedubast is known as being the founder of the 23rd Dynasty, a dynasty of kings of Libyan origin who ruled part of the eastern Delta from the city of Leontopolis during the Third Intermediate Period, while the Egyptian territory was split between several authorities.

مَقَال عَدَل مكتمل للملك بادي باست

MO30:
رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: 30
مادة الصنع: جرانيت أسود
أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل الحفاظ 40، سجل الحفائر 38/431
مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم الفخري (بدون كود)
التاريخ: عصر الإنتقال الثالث، الأسرة الثالثة والعشرون.

الملك بادي باست

SEATED STATUE OF A GOD

Museum Object Number: MO29
Material: diorite
Other numbers: Mus. 41, Exc. 3734/37
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Nawa (NAL)
Period: Late Period, 26th Dynasty, Psamtik I

This life-sized seated statue carved from diorite, of which only the lower portion is preserved, can be dated to the reign of Psamtik I based on the inscription engraved on the front of the statue's seat. However, the identity of the portrayed figure remains uncertain. Although the inscription mentions the god Ptah-Tatenen, the position and outfit of the seated figure, originally wrapped in a cloak with his arms crossed over his chest, holding what may have been a hq-a-scepter* (of which the bottom part can still be identified on the thighs of the statue), may also argue in favor of the god Osiris (see, for comparison, a statue of Osiris of the 26th Dynasty found in Saqqara and displayed at the Cairo Museum: PM III²: 670 [JE38928]).

This piece was accidentally uncovered in 1981 while the army was excavating at Kôm el-Nawa (Moussa 1983: 210 and pl. II [a-b]; Leclant 1984: 361; Jeffreys 1985: 40 and fig. 10 [site NAL]). Nothing more is known about its archaeological context, but this statue testifies to the contribution made by Psamtik I to the temples of Memphis, as reported by Classical authors (Málek 1986: 111–112).

تمثال جالس لأحد المعبودات
مuseum object number: MO29
مادة الصنع: دوريت
أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 41، سجل الحفائر 3734/37
مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم النوة (NAL)
التأريخ: العصر المتأخر، الأسرة السادسة والعشرون، الملك بسماتيك الأول

تمثال جالس بالحجم الطبيعي من الديوريت، لم يبق منه سوى الجزء السفلي. تم تأريخه لعصر الملك بسماتيك الأول بناءً على النقوش الموجودة على الجزء الأمامي لمقعد التمثال. هوية التمثال غير واضحة، رغم ذكر النص لبناحِ تانن، كما أن وضع وهيئة الجزء السفلي المتبقي منه يوضح أنه كان ملفوفاً في عباءة حابكة، وتقاطع ذراعيه حول صدره، بينما يقبض بيديه على ما يمكن أن يكون صولجان الحقا* (والتي يمكن ملاحظة الجزء السفلي منه على فخذ التمثال)، وربما يصور أيضاً هذا التمثال أوزير (المقارنة مع تمثال أوزير الذي عُثر عليه في سقارة ويرجع لعصر الأسرة السادسة والعشرين، والمحفوظ حالياً بالمتحف المصري انظر: PM III²، 670 [JE 38928]).

غُثر الجيش على هذه القطعة بالصدفة عام 1981 خلال قيامه بالحفر في كوم النوة (Moussa 1983: 210 and pl. II [a-b]; Le- [clant 1984: 361; Jeffreys 1985: 40 and fig. 10 [site NAL]
ولا توجد معلومات عن السياق الأثري المحيط لهذه القطعة، ولكن يشهد هذا التمثال على صحة ما وصل إلينا من الكتاب الكلاسيكيين من إسهام الملك بسماتيك الأول في بناء معابد منف (Málek 1986: 111–112).
STATUE OF A SQUATTING BABOON

Museum Object Number: MO68
Material: limestone
Other numbers: Exc. 1030/43
Provenance: Memphis or Saqqara?
Period: New Kingdom?

This large statue of a hamadryas baboon, beautifully carved from a block of limestone, is of unknown date (the New Kingdom date is tentative). Although the feet and genitals of the baboon are missing and part of its muzzle is broken, its overall attitude is still recognizable. This baboon is portrayed squatting, its two hands resting on his knees and its back against a dorsal pillar or plinth. Its anatomy is realistically rendered, even though we note a tendency toward stylization, especially for depicting the monkey’s thick fur. This statue is un-inscribed, and its provenance and archaeological context are unknown. This only allows for conjecture regarding the religious tenets to which this baboon’s statue may have referred (about baboons in Pharaonic iconography and theologies, see Vernus and Yoyotte 2005: 615–627).

Considering a possible local origin for this statue (either Memphis or Saqqara), the range of options remains quite wide (as is exemplified in Desroches-Noblecourt 1958: 83–85). One possibility is that this statue could refer to the lunar god of standard measures and knowledge, Thoth, sometimes portrayed as a baboon, whose sacred animal necropolis has been uncovered in North Saqqara (the excavation of the baboon “galleries” provided a series of statues depicting this animal: see PM III²: 826 [“statues”]). The absence of a lunar disk on top of the head of the statue (or at least of a mortise for affixing one) does not allow us to confirm this first assumption with any certainty.

A second possibility is that this statue may allude to the sacred baboons that were known to have been housed during the Late Period in a Memphite temple devoted to a hybrid form of Ptah named “he-who-is-under-his-moringa-tree” (from the name of an ancient Memphite deity, see Sandman-Holmberg 1946: 147–150), and where one of these sacred animals was worshipped as an intercessor to the god (mainly for oracles). Once dead, this baboon was mumified—thus turning it into a new entity named Osiris-the-baboon—and buried with other baboon mummies dedicated to Thoth in the sacred animal necropolis in North Saqqara.

A third possibility is that this baboon may have been part of an assemblage referring to the worship of the sun. In Pharaonic times, baboons were thought to praise the solar god every morning, based on the fact that these animals often become very active when the first rays of sunlight appear (Thomas 1979: 91–94). For this reason they are commonly depicted next to sun-related cult elements such as obelisks. From what is known about Memphite theologies, the solar deities of Heliopolis, such as Ré-Horakhty, were also worshipped in the city of Memphis (Eaton 2012: 109–131), further arguing for a Memphite provenance for this statue.
تمثال بابون

العنوان: مجسم بابون

الدولة: مصر

العصر: الدولة الحديثة

الموقع: منف

التفاصيل المحسوبة: هيكل من الحجر الجيري غير معروف تاريخه. تم تمثيل القرد بوضعه القرفصاء، يسند ظهره على عمود، يمتنع عن الرفع، ويتم تمثيل الصفات التشريحية للقرد بشكل واقعي. لا يحمل هذا التمثال أي نقوش أو كتابات، كذلك، تاريخه وسياقه الأثري غير معروف. فلا يمكننا التعرف على السياق الديني الذي استخدم فيه (للمزيد عن قرود البابون ودلالتها ورمزيتها خلال العصور الفرعونية، انظر Vernus and Yoyotte 2005: 615–627).

ومن الناحية الأثرية، فإن التمثال ربما يشير إلى القرود المقدسة، على سبيل المثال، فالقرود المقدسة كانت تُصلي الصبح للإله الشمس، واستخدمت كوسيلة للإله (فيما يخص بالنبي). عند موت أحد القرود، يتم تحنيطها وتتحول إلى كينونة أخرى تسمى أوزير- القرد، ويُدفن مع مومياوات القرود الأخرى المكرسة لعصر القمر. فيما يتعلق بوجود قرص القمر، لا يوجد قرص القمر أعلى رأس التمثال (أو على الأقل، وجود ثقب لتهيئة القرص) يسمح بتأكيد هذا الإفتراض.


عليه، أنه من الضروري البحث عن مزيد من الأدلة لتفحص هذا الإفتراض، ومن الناحية الأثرية، فإن التمثال ربما يشير إلى القرود المقدسة، على سبيل المثال، فالقرود المقدسة كانت تُصلي الصبح للإله الشمس، واستخدمت كوسيلة للإله (فيما يخص بالنبي). عند موت أحد القرود، يتم تحنيطها وتتحول إلى كينونة أخرى تسمى أوزير- القرد، ويُدفن مع مومياوات القرود الأخرى المكرسة لعصر القمر. فيما يتعلق بوجود قرص القمر، لا يوجد قرص القمر أعلى رأس التمثال (أو على الأقل، وجود ثقب لتهيئة القرص) يسمح بتأكيد هذا الإفتراض.
This large statue of the dwarf god Bes carved from a single piece of limestone is of unknown date, but a late date (Late–Greco-Roman Periods) is credible. Broken into pieces, this statue has been restored. Though the upper part of the statue is missing from the breast upward, as well as his left arm and genitals (the latter may have been intentionally mutilated), Bes is perfectly recognizable. Standing on a broken base and against what may have been a back pillar or a plinth, he is depicted with his arms resting on his thighs. Bes wears a lion skin with muzzle and forelegs visible on his torso, and the two back legs hanging along his thighs; it should be noticed that the lion's tail was intentionally doubled at the back so as to be visible on either side of the back plinth. The lion skin is kept in place on the god's back by a cord tied up under his navel.

As an apotropaic deity, Bes is frequently involved in the protection of the acts of procreation and birth, ranging from secular contexts (private life) to more sacred contexts (the sun god's daily rebirth, the deceased's rebirth); see, for instance, Bosse-Griffiths 1977: 98–106; Volokhine 1994: 81–95; Meeks 1992: 423–436; Manniche 2015: 209–232. From the Late Period on, Bes gradually gains importance within the temple realm, both for his ability to divine oracles (through dreams) and for his supposed healing power; several monumental effigies of Bes dating to the 30th Dynasty-Hellenistic period have been uncovered near the Serapeum in Saqqara, testifying to the existence in the Memphite area of religious installations where Bes played an important role (see the structures known as the "Bes chambers:" PM III²: 777, 779; Manniche 2015: 226–229). Images of Bes are common from a wide range of contexts throughout Egyptian history, from houses to temples and tombs. Though the provenance and archaeological context of the present statue are unknown, its large size and fine workmanship argue in favor of an official or religious context.
A CHRISTIAN LAND
Fewer in number than the pieces coming from the Pharaonic temples, a set of architectural elements of Greco-Roman and Coptic style recalls the presence in Memphis of Christian churches, likely as early as Late Antiquity. Regrettably, the provenance of these stone objects could not be traced back, either because this is not documented (MO80 and MO84; MO76) or very poorly documented (MO12 and MO13; and perhaps MO72, MO74, MO77 and MO78). However, stylistic comparisons show that the pieces without provenance (MO80 and MO84; MO76) find exact parallels in better-contextualized buildings both at Memphis and other sites, like what may have been a Memphite church at Kôm el-Qal’a (undated, most likely not earlier than the 5th century AD; in Egypt, very few churches date back to the 4th century AD, see Grossmann 2007: 103–136), and the better-known Monastery of Apa Jeremias at Saqqara (5th–9th century AD). These museum’s pieces, though few in number, give a glimpse of the creativity and hybridity of Coptic art, which not only combines, but also renews a range of Greco-Roman and Pharaonic decorative motifs.
ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS OF CORINTHIAN DESIGN

Museum Object Number: MO74; MO78; MO72; MO77

Material: limestone

Other numbers: Mus. 15, Exc. 13 (MO74; MO78); no number (MO72); Mus. 15, Exc. 68 (MO77)

Provenance: Memphis, Kôm Dafbâby, southern area (DAA)?

Period: Late Antiquity

The museum displays several architectural elements clearly inspired by classical Corinthian style. All carved from limestone, they likely date from Late Antiquity and consist of two column capitals, a large fragment of a cornice, and a column drum.

The two column capitals (MO74 and MO78) are of similar design and dimension. Typically Corinthian, their capital bells consist of stylized acanthus leaves carved in relief, from which emerging helices turn inwards to meet each other and emerging volutes* turn outwards to form the four protruded angles of the capital that support a concave abacus* adorned with a central blossom (the abacus is the slab intended to bear the weight of a building’s architrave* or arc).

The large piece of cornice (MO72) may also have once belonged to an entablature* of Corinthian design. In Greco-Roman architecture of Classical age, the Corinthian cornice constituted the upper part of the entablature, projecting outwards under the roof, above the frieze* and architrave that were supported by the columns. The underside of the Corinthian cornice is recognizable from its series of ornamental dentils,* or squared-block protrusions.

The column drum (MO77) illustrates a design motif known as “fluting;” its surface adorned by a series of 19 shallow grooves running vertically. Fluted columns are common in Greco-Roman architecture of the Classical age, and are commonly used in the Corinthian style.

The provenance and archaeological context of these architectural elements are unknown, but it should be noted that they may correspond to a series of Corinthian-styled elements known to have been accidentally exposed during army trenching undertaken at Kôm Dafbâby in the 1970s (Jeffreys and Smith 1985: 8–10 and fig. 1 [9]; Jeffreys 1985: 43 and fig. 10 [DAA]). These architectural elements may have belonged either to a temple of Mithras (though the identification of such a temple remains very conjectural and is mainly based on the discovery of statues related to the mysteries of Mithras in the same area) or to a Coptic church built later over the same spot. Whatever they once adorned (be it a church or a pagan temple), these capitals testify to the cosmopolitan flair of the city of Memphis, which since Pharaonic times housed many diverse foreign communities that left remnants of both their art and religious worship.
This piece is MO74. We need to insert also a picture for MO78, see Amel's picture 704119.
عناصر معمارية على الطراز الكورنثي

MO74; MO78; MO72; MO77:

الحفظ بالمتحف: حجر جيري

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 15، سجل الحفائر 13 (MO74: بدون رقم (MO72): سجل الحفائر 68 (MO77)

مكان العثور عليها: منف، كوم دفبابي، المنطقة الجنوبية (DAA)

التاريخ: أواخر العصور القديمة

أما جزء العمود الأسطواني (MO77) فيأخذ تصميم زخرفي يسمى "المحزز" الذي يزين سطحه مجموعة من الحزوز غير العميق يبلغ عددها 19 ممّطةً رأسياً. كان هذا النمط من الزخرفة شائعاً في العمارة اليونانية الرومانية في العصر الكلاسيكي، كما كانت شائعة في الطراز الكورنثي.

بالنسبة لأصل هذه الأجزاء المعمارية والسياق الآثري لها فهو غير معروف. ولكن، يلاحظ أن هذا قد يتطلق مع مجموعة من العناصر المعمارية ذات الطراز الكورنثي التي تشكلت بالصدفة أثناء قيام الجيش بالحفر في كوم دفبابي في السبعينات (Jeffreys and Smith 1985: 8-10 and fig. 1 [9]; Jeffreys 1985: 43 and fig. 10).

هذا يعني أن بداية هذا العصر المعماري إذ لا يعود للأسرار اليونانية (التي تعرف على معبد كهذا محتمل جداً). ويرتكز أساساً على اكتشاف مئات مرتبطية بالأسرار الليبرتانية في نفس المنطقة) أو كنيسة قبطية تمت بنائها لاحقاً في نفس المنطقة. وسواء كان معبد أو كنيسة، فإنه يوجد من تلك العناصر المعمارية يشهد على كون منف حارس عالي استمرت منذ العصور الفرعونية، ومعايست فيها مجموعات أجنبية عديدة تركة وتراثها الفنية والدينية.

يحتمل أن القطعة الأكبر حجماً من الإفريز (MO72) كانت تتميي للمئات العلوي لأحد العناصر المعمارية على الطراز الكورنثي أيضاً. ففي العمارة اليونانية الرومانية في العصر الكلاسيكي، كانبدع الكورنثي يكون الجزء العلوي للمئات يحتوي مقيم للخارج أسلب السقف وأعلى كل من الإفريز والعمود الأعمدة. ويمكن تقييم الجزء السفلي من الإفريز الكورنثي من خلال مجموعة من الأعشاب أو التوابع المزخرنة على الكتلة المربعة.
COLUMN SHAFTS WITH A DRAPERY DESIGN

Museum Object Number: MO12; MO13
Material: limestone
Other numbers: Mus. 28, Exc. 6 (MO12; MO13)
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Nawa (no site code)
Period: Late Antiquity

This pair of Late Antique cylindrical column shafts, carved out of limestone, bear a unique elaborate design that testifies to the creativity of Coptic architecture. The surface of the shafts has been engraved in raised relief to imitate the shape of two pillars, adorned with three shallow grooves running vertically (fluting), in between which hang curtains. The drapery of the curtains shows a pattern evoking feathers or fish scales, and their bottom braid is embellished with tassels. The capitals are missing, but the tops of the shafts still bear the bottom portion of what could be either vegetal elements or vases.

Two square recesses indicate that these fragments were reused at some point, suggesting that they were not found in their primary context. Nothing is known about the building to which they belonged, but they may have once adorned a Coptic church. These two column shafts were found loose in an unexcavated area located in the eastern part of Memphis at Kôm el-Nawa in the late 1970s or early 1980s (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and pl. XXXII). It is worth noting that a smaller fragment of a column that is identical to MO12 and MO13 appears in an archival picture of unknown date (presumably of the 1920s-1930s, see fig. 43 in introduction), testifying to the existence in Memphis of other architectural pieces that belonged to the same building. This photograph shows the other fragment embedded on the foundations of a modern traditional house, located somewhere in the area corresponding to the temenos of Ptah, together with other ancient stone pieces (including our MO57).
أجزاء من أعمدة مزخرفة

MO13: MO12

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: 12

مادة الصنع: حجر جيري

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: صهل المتحف 28، سجل الحفائر 6

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم النوة (بدون كود)

التأريخ: أواخر العصور القديمة

توضح هذه القطع على اثنين من الثقوب المربعة، وهي إشارة لإعادة استخدامهما خلال إحدى الفترات الزمنية اللاحقة، مما يقترح أنه لم يُعثر عليهم في سياقهم الأثري الأصلي. لا توجد أي معلومات عن المبنى الذي كانت تلك العناصر جزءاً منه، ولكن يُشتبه أنها كانت تزين كنيسة قبطية. ثم جزء هذه القطع في إحدى المناطق الواقعة في الجزء الشرقي لمبنى في كوم النوة أواخر السبعينات أو أواخر الثمانينات (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) و (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) وأوائل الثمانينات)

مصدر الصورة: MO12

المواد: حجر جيري

أرقام الحفائر الأخرى: سجل المتحف 28، سجل الحفائر 6

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم النوة (بدون كود)

التأريخ: أواخر العصور القديمة

توضح هذه القطع على اثنين من الثقوب المربعة، وهي إشارة لإعادة استخدامهما خلال إحدى الفترات الزمنية اللاحقة، مما يقترح أنه لم يُعثر عليهم في سياقهم الأثري الأصلي. لا توجد أي معلومات عن المبنى الذي كانت تلك العناصر جزءاً منه، ولكن يُشتبه أنها كانت تزين كنيسة قبطية. ثم جزء هذه القطع في إحدى المناطق الواقعة في الجزء الشرقي لمبنى في كوم النوة أواخر السبعينات أو أواخر الثمانينات (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) و (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) وأوائل الثمانينات)

مصدر الصورة: MO12

المواد: حجر جيري

أرقام الحفائر الأخرى: سجل المتحف 28، سجل الحفائر 6

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم النوة (بدون كود)

التأريخ: أواخر العصور القديمة

توضح هذه القطع على اثنين من الثقوب المربعة، وهي إشارة لإعادة استخدامهما خلال إحدى الفترات الزمنية اللاحقة، مما يقترح أنه لم يُعثر عليهم في سياقهم الأثري الأصلي. لا توجد أي معلومات عن المبنى الذي كانت تلك العناصر جزءاً منه، ولكن يُشتبه أنها كانت تزين كنيسة قبطية. ثم جزء هذه القطع في إحدى المناطق الواقعة في الجزء الشرقي لمبنى في كوم النوة أواخر السبعينات أو أواخر الثمانينات (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) و (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) وأوائل الثمانينات)

مصدر الصورة: MO12

المواد: حجر جيري

أرقام الحفائر الأخرى: سجل المتحف 28، سجل الحفائر 6

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم النوة (بدون كود)

التأريخ: أواخر العصور القديمة

توضح هذه القطع على اثنين من الثقوب المربعة، وهي إشارة لإعادة استخدامهما خلال إحدى الفترات الزمنية اللاحقة، مما يقترح أنه لم يُعثر عليهم في سياقهم الأثري الأصلي. لا توجد أي معلومات عن المبنى الذي كانت تلك العناصر جزءاً منه، ولكن يُشتبه أنها كانت تزين كنيسة قبطية. ثم جزء هذه القطع في إحدى المناطق الواقعة في الجزء الشرقي لمبنى في كوم النوة أواخر السبعينات أو أواخر الثمانينات (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) و (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) وأوائل الثمانينات)

مصدر الصورة: MO12

المواد: حجر جيري

أرقام الحفائر الأخرى: سجل المتحف 28، سجل الحفائر 6

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم النوة (بدون كود)

التأريخ: أواخر العصور القديمة

توضح هذه القطع على اثنين من الثقوب المربعة، وهي إشارة لإعادة استخدامهما خلال إحدى الفترات الزمنية اللاحقة، مما يقترح أنه لم يُعثر عليهم في سياقهم الأثري الأصلي. لا توجد أي معلومات عن المبنى الذي كانت تلك العناصر جزءاً منه، ولكن يُشتبه أنها كانت تزين كنيسة قبطية. ثم جزء هذه القطع في إحدى المناطق الواقعة في الجزء الشرقي لمبنى في كوم النوة أواخر السبعينات أو أواخر الثمانينات (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) و (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) وأوائل الثمانينات)

مصدر الصورة: MO12

المواد: حجر جيري

أرقام الحفائر الأخرى: سجل المتحف 28، سجل الحفائر 6

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم النوة (بدون كود)

التأريخ: أواخر العصور القديمة

توضح هذه القطع على اثنين من الثقوب المربعة، وهي إشارة لإعادة استخدامهما خلال إحدى الفترات الزمنية اللاحقة، مما يقترح أنه لم يُعثر عليهم في سياقهم الأثري الأصلي. لا توجد أي معلومات عن المبنى الذي كانت تلك العناصر جزءاً منه، ولكن يُشتبه أنها كانت تزين كنيسة قبطية. ثم جزء هذه القطع في إحدى المناطق الواقعة في الجزء الشرقي لمبنى في كوم النوة أواخر السبعينات أو أواخر الثمانينات (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) و (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) وأوائل الثمانينات)

مصدر الصورة: MO12

المواد: حجر جيري

أرقام الحفائر الأخرى: سجل المتحف 28، سجل الحفائر 6

مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم النوة (بدون كود)

التأريخ: أواخر العصور القديمة

توضح هذه القطع على اثنين من الثقوب المربعة، وهي إشارة لإعادة استخدامهما خلال إحدى الفترات الزمنية اللاحقة، مما يقترح أنه لم يُعثر عليهم في سياقهم الأثري الأصلي. لا توجد أي معلومات عن المبنى الذي كانت تلك العناصر جزءاً منه، ولكن يُشتبه أنها كانت تزين كنيسة قبطية. ثم جزء هذه القطع في إحدى المناطق الواقعة في الجزء الشرقي لمبنى في كوم النوة أواخر السبعينات أو أواخر الثمانينات (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) و (Leclant 1982: 62; Moussa 1982d: 390 and (أوائل الثمانينات) وأوائل الثمانينات)
This pair of limestone column capitals likely date from Late Antiquity (perhaps from the turn of the 4th and 5th centuries AD; about difficulties in providing an accurate date, see Török 1990: 437–484). Of comparable design, though we note variations in the position and number of leaves, their capital bells consist of two bunches of acanthus leaves carved in relief that splay out from the bottom up to form an abacus,* an oblong rectangular flat surface intended to bear the weight of a building’s architrave* or arc. On both sides of these capitals a vertical band is left undecorated; this may have served to engage with an intercolumnar wooden screen (as suggested by Petrie 1915: 34 [§ 80] and pl. LXII [52]).

Though nothing is known about the provenance and archaeological context of these two capitals, we may infer that they came from a Memphite church, since this design for a capital is well attested elsewhere in the area, such as in a Christian building exposed at Kôm el-Qal’a (Petrie 1915: pl. LXII [55]; Jeffreys 1985: 20 [QAN]) and also in the Monastery of Apa Jeremias located on the southern part of Saqqara (Quibell 1912: pl. XXXIV [3]). Such vegetal patterns, derived from Corinthian design (see MO74 and MO78), were particularly favored during Late Antiquity for decorating Coptic religious buildings.

---

A pair of column capitals, likely from Late Antiquity (perhaps from the turn of the 4th and 5th centuries AD; about difficulties in providing an accurate date, see Török 1990: 437–484). Their capital bells consist of two bunches of acanthus leaves carved in relief that spread out from the bottom up to form an abacus,* an oblong rectangular flat surface intended to bear the weight of a building’s architrave* or arc. On both sides of these capitals a vertical band is left undecorated; this may have served to engage with an intercolumnar wooden screen (as suggested by Petrie 1915: 34 [§ 80] and pl. LXII [52]).

Though nothing is known about the provenance and archaeological context of these two capitals, we may infer that they came from a Memphite church, since this design for a capital is well attested elsewhere in the area, such as in a Christian building exposed at Kôm el-Qal’a (Petrie 1915: pl. LXII [55]; Jeffreys 1985: 20 [QAN]) and also in the Monastery of Apa Jeremias located on the southern part of Saqqara (Quibell 1912: pl. XXXIV [3]). Such vegetal patterns, derived from Corinthian design (see MO74 and MO78), were particularly favored during Late Antiquity for decorating Coptic religious buildings.

---

Crear un par de columnas de caliza que probablemente daten del Tiempo de los Judíos (quizás al comienzo del siglo IV o V d.C.; sobre dificultades en proporcionar una data precisa, véase Török 1990: 437–484). De diseño comparable, aunque notamos variaciones en la posición y número de hojas, sus campanas constituyen dos ramas de acanto cortadas en relieve que se extienden de abajo hacia arriba para formar un abacús,* una superficie rectangular y plana destinada a soportar el peso de un arquitrabe* o arco. En ambos lados de estas columnas, un borde vertical queda desnudo; esto podría haber servido para conectarse con una pantalla de madera intercolumnar; esto fue sugerido por Petrie 1915: 34 [§ 80] y pl. LXII [52]).

Aunque se ignora el origen y el contexto arqueológico de estas dos columnas, es posible inferir que provinieron de una iglesia memfita, ya que este diseño para una columna es bien conocido en otras partes de la región, como en una edificación cristiana expuesta en Kôm el-Qal’a (Petrie 1915: pl. LXII [55]; Jeffreys 1985: 20 [QAN]), y también en el Monasterio de Apa Jeremías localizado en la parte sur de Saqqara (Quibell 1912: pl. XXXIV [3]). Tales patrones vegetales, derivados del diseño corintio (ver MO74 y MO78), fueron particularmente favorables durante el Tiempo de los Judíos en la decoración de edificios religiosos coptos.

Aunque se ignora el origen y el contexto arqueológico de estas dos columnas, es posible inferir que provinieron de una iglesia memfita, ya que este diseño para una columna es bien conocido en otras partes de la región, como en una edificación cristiana expuesta en Kôm el-Qal’a (Petrie 1915: pl. LXII [55]; Jeffreys 1985: 20 [QAN]), y también en el Monasterio de Apa Jeremías localizado en la parte sur de Saqqara (Quibell 1912: pl. XXXIV [3]). Tales patrones vegetales, derivados del diseño corintio (ver MO74 y MO78), fueron particularmente favorables durante el Tiempo de los Judíos en la decoración de edificios religiosos coptos.
COLUMN CAPITAL OF “EGYPTIANIZING” DESIGN

Museum Object Number: MO76
Material: limestone
Other numbers: Mus. 15, Exc. 13
Provenance: Memphis?
Period: Late Antiquity

This limestone column capital of “Egyptianizing” design likely dates from Late Antiquity. Though nothing is known about its provenance and archaeological context, it seems probable that it once adorned a Memphite church. The bell of this capital consists of four stylized corner acanthus leaves, carved in relief, and surmounted by low relief volutes* that both refer to Corinthian models (see MO74 and MO78) and evoke the look of the Pharaonic “lotus” of Upper Egypt (a variety of water lily that still remains to be identified). The volutes of these lily flowers form the protruded angles of the capital that support the Corinthian abacus.* This particular design is attested elsewhere in the Memphite area; a similar column capital was exposed in a Christian building excavated by W. M. F. Petrie at Kôm el-Qal’a (Petrie 1915, pl. LXII [56]; Jeffreys 1985, 20 [QAN]). It is more widely attested throughout Christian Egypt and Nubia (Ryl-Preibisz 1990: 393, figs. 1–6). Such a design is not surprising, as Coptic architecture is known for having incorporated and simplified decorative patterns borrowed from Pharaonic and Greco-Roman architecture (see for instance: Badawi 1949: 15–16, fig. 5; Ryl-Preibisz 1990: 403 [4: lotus flowers], pl. II, 5, fig. 19).

This is an ancient limestone column capital with an “Egyptianizing” design, likely dating from Late Antiquity. Although the provenance and archaeological context are unknown, it is probable that it once adorned a Christian church in Memphis. The capital features stylized acanthus leaves and low relief volutes that resemble Corinthian models and the Pharaonic “lotus” of Upper Egypt. This design is uncommon but has been found elsewhere in the Memphite area. Similarly styled columns have been discovered in Christian buildings excavated by W. M. F. Petrie, such as at Kôm el-Qal’a (Petrie 1915, pl. LXII [56]; Jeffreys 1985, 20 [QAN]). This design is more widely attested throughout Christian Egypt and Nubia (Ryl-Preibisz 1990: 393, figs. 1–6). It is not surprising as Coptic architecture assimilated and simplified decorative elements from Pharaonic and Greco-Roman styles (Badawi 1949: 15–16, fig. 5; Ryl-Preibisz 1990: 403 [4: lotus flowers], pl. II, 5, fig. 19).

تاج عمود "يجاهي" التصميم المصري القديم

رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: MO76
مادة الصنع: حجر جيري
أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 15 ، سجل الحفائر 13
مكان العثور عليه: منف؟
التأريخ: أواخر العصور القديمة

تاج عمود من الحجر الجيري، يحاكي التصميم المصري القديم، يرجح تأريخه لأواخر العصور القديمة. على الرغم من عدم توافر أية معلومات عن مصدر هذه القطعة ولا السياق الأثري لها، فيحتمل أنها كانت تزين كنيسة قبطية. تتكون قمة هذا التاج من أربعة أركان عبارة عن أوراق الأكانثوس منفذة بالنحت يعلوها أشكال مموجة بارزة* وهذا يشير إلى الطراز الكورنثي (انظر القطع أرقام MO74, MO78). كما تحاكي مظهر "لوتس" مصر العليا (لم يتم التعرف على العديد من أزهار الزنابق المائية التي عرفت في مصر القديمة حتى الآن) ، وتكون الأشكال المموجة لهذه الأزهار زوايا تاج العمود الذي يقوم بحمل العتب الكورنثي (عabacus).* ظهر هذا التصميم في إحدى المواقع بمنف حيث قام و.م.ف. بتي بالكشف Petrie 1915, pl. LXII [56]; [QAN]). وهو ما يشهد على مدى انتشار الآثار المسيحية في مصر والنوبة (Ryl-Preibisz 1990: 393 and figs. 1–6).

يعتبر وجود مثل هذا الطراز ليس بالأمر المفاجئ، فمن المعروف قيم العمارة القبطية بتبسيط العناصر الزخرفية الرومانية واليونانية Badawi 1949: 15–16 and (لمزيد انظر: fig. 5; Ryl-Preibisz 1990: 403 [4: lotus flowers], pl. II, 5 .(and fig. 19)
LIVING AND DYING IN MEMPHIS
TESTIMONIES OF EVERYDAY LIFE
The objects in the following pages present Memphis as a living place where a wide range of people dwelt and carried out their daily activities. Several pieces displayed at the museum exemplify what domestic architecture, and more generally secular architecture, looked like in the city of Memphis (Snape 2014). While temples—meant to last—were usually constructed with enduring materials like stone, secular buildings, such as workshops, storerooms, stables, administrative buildings, houses, and even palaces, were mostly built in mudbrick, with only a few elements carved from wood and limestone (usually the door and window frames, the columns, and ceiling beams).

Firstly, a pair of imposing limestone column bases (MO4 and MO9) belonging to a palace built by Merneptah, reminds us that Memphis was a city that historically housed a royal residence for the king. To date, only two such Memphite palatial complexes have been identified and excavated in the ruin field: the palace of Merneptah of the 19th Dynasty at Kôm el-Qal’a (from which MO4 and MO9 come; O’Connor 1991: 167–191) and the palace of Apries of the 26th Dynasty at Kôm Tumân, which archaeologists assume may have been erected over a former palace (Jeffreys 1985: 41). But it goes without saying that more structures of this sort once stood at Memphis and are yet to be uncovered. During Pharaonic times, the royal palace was designed and viewed not only as a residence but also as a ceremonial place where the divine nature of Egyptian kingship could be displayed and revered (about royal residences and their manifold implications, see Gundlach and Taylor 2009).

The Memphite palace of Merneptah is a perfect example of the symbolic and ceremonial dimension of the royal residence, with its many display spaces (including a window of appearance, hypostyle halls, and a throne room), and its elaborate architecture and decoration, intended to emphasize the king’s divine function and his dominion over the Egyptian territory and beyond. The two limestone column bases on display at the museum (MO4 and MO9) testify to the monumentality and magnificence of the throne room of the palace, where they initially flanked an elaborately carved throne dais where the sovereign sat in majesty (about the symbolism of the king’s throne, see Kuhlmann 2011). The decoration of these two column bases, whose inscriptions were originally inlaid with blue faience, also illustrates the sophistication and bright-colored design of Ramesside palaces, which integrated into their mudbrick structures a wide range of glazing decorative elements and tiles of high quality and complex elaboration (the glass and vitreous materials industries, already a royal monopoly during the late 18th Dynas-
ty, developed considerably under the Ramesside kings, see Shortland 2009; Nicholson 2009; and for comparison, Hayes 1937).

A fragmentary door lintel of painted limestone (MO31, dated to the 21st Dynasty) and two small palm column capitals also carved from limestone (MO52 and MO82, undated) give an idea of some of the most common decorative patterns used for embellishing the architecture of secular buildings, notably private dwellings. The palm design, which was also employed in temple architecture (but for larger-sized columns), was frequently used for adorning architectural supports in administrative buildings and houses. Likewise, from the New Kingdom onwards, stone doorframes were convenient places where the dweller could display his prestige, through decoration that would state his identity and social status, his family and professional lineage, as well as his devotion to a specific god or king (reigning or deified; see for instance Budka 2001).

A range of stone vessels of varying quality (MO3, MO6, MO7, MO10, MO15, MO16, MO46, and MO49), which probably served as mortars, evoke a particularly crucial aspect of the household's and greater estates' daily life: food production (see, for instance, Kemp 2006: 171–179, 326–335). Whether it be for family sustenance or a wider household (with servants), for breeding livestock/animals, or for supplying institutionalized groups of people (workers, priests, etc.), as well as the table of the kings and the altars of the gods and the deceased, food production was a constant matter of concern, and probably kept a large part of the population of Memphis busy everyday.
PAIR OF COLUMN BASES FROM THE THRONE ROOM OF MERNEPTAH

Museum Object Number: MO4; MO9
Material: limestone, originally inlaid
Other numbers: Mus. 31, Exc. 5 (MO4); Mus. 31, Exc. 21 (MO9)
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Qal’a, palace of Merneptah (QAB)
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Merneptah

This pair of large limestone column bases once adorned the hypostyle throne room of the palace of Merneptah in Memphis. This royal palace was located in a separate enclosure at Kôm el-Qal’a within the ancient urban area that developed to the southeast of the vast sacred precinct of Ptah (Jeffreys 1985: 20 [QAB]; O’Connor 1991: 167–191). These are particularly interesting because they provide a glimpse of the architecture and decoration of royal residences during the Ramesside period. When C. S. Fisher excavated the remarkably well-preserved palace of Merneptah in 1917 on behalf of the University of Pennsylvania Museum in Philadelphia, he found this pair of column bases in situ, from a set attached to the two sides of a royal dais, made of limestone slabs and accessible through a front ramp and two side stairs (see figs. 24–25 in the introduction). This dais is one of the best, if not the best, preserved throne daises excavated to date (for more on New Kingdom throne daises and their decoration, see Hayes 1937: 11–21 and Kuhlmann 1977: 77–80). At the time of the discovery, this dais was complete and still beautifully adorned in painted low relief showing a series of bound foreign captives and bows with a frame of rekhut-birds upon neb-glyphs, a symbol of dominion over all nations (Fischer 1917: 216–218, fig. 79 [room 7, dais] and 80–83; Fischer 1921: 30–34; Jeffreys, Malek, and Smith 1986: 10–13 and fig. 6).

This pair of column bases, while suggesting only a hint of the magnificence of this lost assemblage, still shows traces of the original structure and decoration of the throne dais (now dismantled and kept in an MoA storehouse in Mit Rahina). The backs of these bases have been left rough where they engaged with both the dais and each of the side stairs (the rough surface makes a slope on one side). Likewise, the tops of the column bases show a section of the decorative dado that framed the top edges of the throne dais. The portion of the bases meant to be viewed is smoothly polished and adorned with a running line of inscription bearing the names and titles of Merneptah (Gohary 1978: 193–194). The deep recesses in the carving of the hieroglyphs were originally inlaid with blue faience, as were many of the other stone architectural elements (columns and door/window frames) that embellished the palace, whose sun-dried brick structure was further covered with brightly painted and gilded decoration. The top surfaces of these bases were worked so that a limestone column shaft of palm design with open umbel would fit on top of them.
اثنين من قواعد الأعمدة من غرفة العرش لمرنبتاح

MO9: MO4
رقم الحفظ بالمتحف: 21
مادة الصنع: الحجر الجيري، كان مطعماً في الأصل
أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: متحف منف، سجل الحفائر 31 (MO9: 21)؛ متحف منف، سجل الحفائر 31 (MO4: 21)؛ متحف منف، سجل الحفائر 5 (MO4: 21)
مكان العثور عليه: منف، كوم القلعة، قصر مرنبتاح (QAB)
التأريخ: الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشر، الملك مرنبتاح

زوج من قواعد الأعمدة التي كانت تزين قاعة العرش في قصر مرنبتاح في منف، الذي كان يقع في مجمع منفصل بكوم القلعة بالقرب شرق مقاطعة منف الحالية. يعتبر هذا الزوج من الأعمدة مثيرة للإهتمام بشكل خاص لأنها تعطي لنا فكرة عن عمارة وزخرفة القصور الملكية خلال عصر الدولة الحديثة. عثر س. اس. فيشر على تلك القطع خلال حفائره في عام 1917، حيث عثر عليها بحالة جيدة من الحفاظ. وقد عثر عليها في مكانها الأصلي ضمن مجموعة من الأعمدة التي كانت مثبتة على المنصة الملكية المنحوتة من كل الحجر الجيري، وكان يمكن الوصول إلى المنصة عبر مرمر ما مثاث على المنصة (أشار أشكال 24، 25 بالمقدمة). تعتبر هذه المنصة من أكثر منصات العرش حكماً – إن لم تكون الأكثر حكماً على الإطلاق - التي عثر عليها في مصر، وتظهر أنها كانت مثبتة على المنصة الملكية، وهي من نوعها الوحيد في monde.

في حين أن هذا الزوج من الأعمدة بطيء معنى عن مدى أهمية هذا المجمع المفقود، فإنه لا يزال يوجد بعض الشواهد الأخرى على النشاط الأصلي لمدينة العرش وزخرفتها (وهي الآن محفوظة في متحف وزارة الآثار بدمياط). وقد ظهر الجزء الحلي من تلك القواعد خشن غير متعنوم حيث كانت تصل مع كل من منصة العرش وكل سلم من السلم الجانبي (ترك على السطح غير المنتمي ملحوظاً على أحد الجوانب). في حين يظهر الجزء العلوي من القواعد جزءًا من إطار زخرفي يحيط بالحواف العليا لمدينة العرش، حيث تم تصميم الجزء الظاهر للعيان، وصقله جيداً ويزينه بشريحة من الكتابات تحمل أسماء وألقاب مرنبتاح (Gohary 1978: 194–193). يلاحظ من طريقة الحفر العميق للحروف الهيروغليفية أنها كانت مطعمة بالفيانس الأزرق شأنها شأن الكثير من العناصر المعمارية الأخرى (الأعمدة، وإطارات الأبواب والنوافذ) التي كانت موجودة بالقصر الملكي الذي كان مبنياً من الطوب المجفف في الشمس، وزين بزخارف ملونة راهبة ومذهبة. يشير السطح العلوي للمنصة إلى إحكام وجود عمود من الحجر الجيري من طراز النخيل كان مثبتًا أعلاها.

التعليمات: 
- اسم: MO9, MO4
- رقم الحفاظ: 21
- المادة: حجر جيري
- الأسرة: التاسعة عشر
- الملك: مرنبتاح
- الموقع: منف، كوم القلعة
- التأريخ: الدولة الحديثة

المراجعات:

في حين أن هذا الزوج من الأعمدة بطيء معنى عن مدى أهمية هذا المجمع المفقود، فإنه لا يزال يوجد بعض الشواهد الأخرى على النشاط الأصلي لمدينة العرش وزخرفتها (وهي الآن محفوظة في متحف وزارة الآثار بدمياط). وقد ظهر الجزء الحلي من تلك القواعد خشن غير متعنوم حيث كانت تصل مع كل من منصة العرش وكل سلم من السلم الجانبي (ترك على السطح غير المنتمي ملحوظاً على أحد الجوانب). في حين يظهر الجزء العلوي من القواعد جزءًا من إطار زخرفي يحيط بالحواف العليا لمدينة العرش، حيث تم تصميم الجزء الظاهر للعيان، وصقله جيداً ويزينه بشريحة من الكتابات تحمل أسماء وألقاب مرنبتاح (Gohary 1978: 194–193). يلاحظ من طريقة الحفر العميق للحروف الهيروغليفية أنها كانت مطعمة بالفيانس الأزرق شأنها شأن الكثير من العناصر المعمارية الأخرى (الأعمدة، وإطارات الأبواب والنوافذ) التي كانت موجودة بالقصر الملكي الذي كان مبنياً من الطوب المجفف في الشمس، وزين بزخارف ملونة راهبة ومذهبة. يشير السطح العلوي للمنصة إلى إحكام وجود عمود من الحجر الجيري من طراز النخيل كان مثبتًا أعلاها.
This door lintel fragment, of which only the left half is preserved, is inscribed with the name of an official named Ptah-kha and his father Ashaut-ikhut, who both served under the reign of Psusennes I. It consists of a horizontal slab of limestone decorated with sunken relief embellished with painting and surmounted with a torus and a cavetto cornice.* The back has been left rough to attach to the brickwork structure of a building. The stone doorframe to which this fragment once belonged was uncovered, broken but complete, by the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia in 1956 when a test trench was dug at Kôm el-Rabi’a to the west of the Small Temple of Ramesses II in order to find the temple’s enclosure wall. At the time of the discovery, this fragment of lintel was exposed together with its other half and doorjambs (present location unknown) close to an in situ stone threshold (PM III²: 845; Anthes 1957: 13–14; Anthes 1965: 28–29, 92–95 [26] and fig. 12, and pl. 31 [a]; Budka 2001: 219–220 [213]). At this time, the doorframe was still bearing most of its original color: the lintel cornice was still adorned with alternating white and red stripes, while its inscriptions were embellished with blue hieroglyphs on a yellow background, and the skin of the figures was reddish in color. Though partially faded, traces of these colors are still visible today.

Considering the narrowness of the excavation trench, almost nothing is known about the type of structure to which this doorway once belonged. The excavation conducted in the immediate vicinity of the Small Temple of Ramesses II by the University of Pennsylvania Museum showed that this temple and its surroundings were reused during the 20th–21st Dynasties as a burial ground. This led some authors to envisage at first that this fragment of lintel belonged to a funerary or religious structure that has yet to be uncovered (Kitchen 1996: 268–269; Jeffreys 1985: 71). However, more recently, it has been assumed that this may have been part of a domestic structure, perhaps a priestly house of the type of the contemporary priests’ houses exposed in the sacred precinct of Amun in Karnak (Aston and Jeffreys 2007: 68–69).

The flat surface of this lintel depicts the left portion of a scene showing the Fan-bearer and Father-of-the-god Ptah-kha (on the left) and his father Asha-ikhut (on the right, fragment now lost) kneeling on both sides of the royal cartouches of King Psusennes I (of which only the bottom left angle is visible), initially resting on a gold sign and topped with a sun-disk and two ostrich feathers as a reference to the divine nature of Pharaonic kingship. The scene is framed, at the top, by an elongated depiction of the hieroglyphic sign of the sky, and on its sides, by a column of inscriptions. On the present fragment, Ptah-kha is shown with his left hand in a position of adoration and his right hand clutching a khu-fan as a symbol of his status. This type of fan, consisting of an elaborated papyrus-umbel handle topped by a single ostrich feather, was only held by high dignitaries, in particular, officials who had been favored by the king and authorized to stand at his right side. The high status of this personage is also confirmed by his rich outfit that testifies to the fashion worn by the elite of the time. He wears a long elaborate kilt, a large necklace, and a pair of refined pointed sandals. His shaved head indicates that he was a member of the priesthood, as is confirmed by the inscription that identifies him as both priest of Ptah and as a priest in the estate of Osiris.

Lintels bearing depictions of private individuals worshipping the names or a figure of the king (living or deified) are not uncommon. Such lintels have been found dating from the New Kingdom onwards throughout Egypt, where they adorned the doorways of various types of buildings, from houses to chapels and tombs (see Budka 2001).
عنب باب من بيت أحد الكهنة

MO31

مادة الصنف: حجر جيري ملون

أرقام الحفاظ الأخرى: سجل الحفائر 39، سجل الحفائر 2894/36

مكاني العثور عليه: منف، كوم الربيعة، بأحد مجسات الحفر غرب معبد رمسيس الثاني الصغير

التاريخ: عصر الإنتقال الثالث، الأسرة الحادية والعشرون، بسونيس الأول

تظهر هذه الأعتاب التي تحمل مناظر تعبدية للأفراد سواء أمام الملك (حي أو مؤله) أو أمام أسماه. وقد عثر على مثل هذه القطع توزع لحفر الدولة الحديثة ولاحقاً عبر أرجاء مصر. وكانت تزين مداخل الأبواب في مختلف المباني سواء المنازل أو المقاصر أو حتى المقابر (انظر: Budka 2001).

وعندما يُمكن التعرف على النصف الأيسر منه، تبدو عليه اسم أحد الموظفين ويعود يحتفظ – خا وأبيه وكلاهما خدم خلال عصر الملك بسونيس الأول، يتكون العتب من كتلة أفقية من الحجر الجيري مزينة بزخارف منفذة بالحفر الغائر ولونها، ويعود chica إفريز ربع دائري. تُرك الجزء الخلفي من العتب خشن غير متماثل حيث إضافة إCHandleاء المبدع. أما إطار الباب الحجري الذي تنتمي له هذه القطعة فقد عثر عليه بعثة متحف جامعة بنسليانا في بالي، عام 1956 مكتملاً لكنه كان مكسوراً داخل أحد مجسات الحفر الإختبارية بكوم الربيعة غرب المعبد الصغير لرمسيس الثاني، وكان الغرض من هذا المجس هو العثور على السور المحيط بالباب. وخلال الاكتشاف، تم العثور على تلك القطعة بصحة الجزء الأيسر، لكونها المحاولة إلى إضافة إلى صفحتي الباب (موقعها الحالي غير معروف) بالقرب من عتبة حجرية كانت في مكانها.


ويساقي الأثري الأصلي. (14-13) Anthes 1957: 85; Anthes 1965: 28-29, 92-95 [26] and fig. 12, and pl. 31

وكان إطار الباب ليرمال ملوناً باللون الأحمر. وعندما كان هناك إلقاء مفرقع أو اتصالات، كان الإطار الأحمر معقوف. وبناءً على ذلك، بان أكثر من هذا المجس هو حفر الصغير لرمسيس الثاني، كان الغرض من هذا المجس هو العثور على السور المحيط بالباب. وخلال الاكتشاف، تم العثور على تلك القطعة بصحة الجزء الأيسر، لكونها المحاولة إلى إضافة إلى صفحتي الباب (موقعها الحالي غير معروف) بالقرب من عتبة حجرية كانت في مكانها.

وكان إطار الباب ليرمال ملوناً باللون الأحمر. وعندما كان هناك إلقاء مفرقع أو اتصالات، كان الإطار الأحمر معقوف. وبناءً على ذلك، بان أكثر من هذا المجس هو حفر الصغير لرمسيس الثاني، كان الغرض من هذا المجس هو العثور على السور المحيط بالباب. وخلال الاكتشاف، تم العثور على تلك القطعة بصحة الجزء الأيسر، لكونها المحاولة إلى إضافة إلى صفحتي الباب (موقعها الحالي غير معروف) بالقرب من عتبة حجرية كانت في مكانها.

وقابل هذه الأعتاب، كاهن بتاح، وكاهن بمقاطعة أوزير. تمت هذه الأعتاب التي تحمل مناظر تعبدية للأفراد سواء أمام الملك (حي أو مؤله) أو أمام أسماه. وقد عثر على مثل هذه القطع توزع لحفر الدولة الحديثة ولاحقاً عبر أرجاء مصر. وكانت تزين مداخل الأبواب في مختلف المباني سواء المنازل أو المقاصر أو حتى المقابر (انظر: Budka 2001).

وكان إطار الباب ليرمال ملوناً باللون الأحمر. وعندما كان هناك إلقاء مفرقع أو اتصالات، كان الإطار الأحمر معقوف. وبناءً على ذلك، بان أكثر من هذا المجس هو حفر الصغير لرمسيس الثاني، كان الغرض من هذا المجس هو العثور على السور المحيط بالباب. وخلال الاكتشاف، تم العثور على تلك القطعة بصحة الجزء الأيسر، لكونها المحاولة إلى إضافة إلى صفحتي الباب (موقعها الحالي غير معروف) بالقرب من عتبة حجرية كانت في مكانها.

وكان إطار الباب ليرمال ملوناً باللون الأحمر. وعندما كان هناك إلقاء مفرقع أو اتصالات، كان الإطار الأحمر معقوف. وبناءً على ذلك، بان أكثر من هذا المجس هو حفر الصغير لرمسيس الثاني، كان الغرض من هذا المجس هو العثور على السور المحيط بالباب. وخلال الاكتشاف، تم العثور على تلك القطعة بصحة الجزء الأيسر، لكونها المحاولة إلى إضافة إلى صفحتي الباب (موقعها الحالي غير معروف) بالقرب من عتبة حجرية كانت في مكانها.

وقابل هذه الأعتاب، كاهن بتاح، وكاهن بمقاطعة أوزير.
The museum displays two limestone column capitals of palm type (Arnold 2003: 53–54). Their capital bells both consist of nine palm tree fronds bunched together and splaying out in order to support an abacus* (an architectural element intended to bear the weight of an architrave* or ceiling beam). Capital MO52 still bears its abacus, a circular slab pierced with a circular hole in the top. The top of capital MO82 is pierced by a square hole, or mortise, meant to receive the tenon peg of its now-missing (but likely cubical) abacus.

We know nothing about the provenance and archaeological context of these two palm capitals. However, we do know that palm columns were in use in a wide range of buildings—from temples to houses—from the Old Kingdom onwards up to the Greco-Roman period. The overall small dimensions of those two capitals (in particular MO52) may argue in favor of a more secular origin than a temple, possibly a house or an administrative building.

The museum displays a series of large vessels (height ca. 40–50 cm) hewn out of stone in the shape of truncated cones. Their rough exterior surfaces suggest that they were sunk three-quarters into the ground to be used. Their inside surfaces appear comparatively smooth with their bottom enlarged, most likely due to use (one is even pierced). The provenance and archaeological context of these vessels are either unknown or very poorly documented. Only two of these vessels have been located with certainty as coming from Memphis. Based on the information provided by archival pictures of the Inspectorate of Saqqara, we can tell that MO3 was found somewhere in the ruin field of Memphis in 1967, and that MO15 was unearthed within the structures exposed on the southern approach of Ptah’s sacred precinct in 1962.

Likewise, the functions of these vessels, which may have been diverse, can only be guessed. The simplest ones, all carved from limestone, may come from household assemblages (see vessels MO6, MO7, MO10, MO15, MO16, and MO49). Such utilitarian vessels were most likely used as mortars for food preparation. We can mention for comparison numerous Memphite specimens found in the settlement excavated at Kôm el-Rabi’a (Giddy 1999: 281–289), and well-preserved vessels found in situ in the Ramesside town of the royal workers at Deir el-Medina (Bruyère 1939: 74, fig. 22, 256, fig. 132). They are sometimes re-cut and hollowed out from older column drums, which provided a convenient ready-made shape.

Vessel MO46 is of a more elaborate style and carved of red granite, with two lug handles opposite one another on the outer edge of the rim. It may have come from a religious context, as a similar vessel was found in situ in a building located to the west of the Apis House, inside the sacred precinct of the god Ptah (Jones 1983: 38 [red granite basin 59] and plan 1). The exact purpose of such vessels found in religious contexts is unclear, though their inner smooth surface may argue in favor of their use as mortars as well.
يعرض المتحف ضمن مقتنياته مجموعة من الأواني كبيرة الحجم (ارتفاعها حوالي 40 - 50 سم) مقتطعة من الحجر على شكل مخروطية، يفترض أنها كانت تستخدم وهى مدفونة في الأرض حتى ثلاث أرباع ارتفاعها بسبب سطحها الخارجي الخشن. أما السطح الداخلي لتلك الأواني فهو ناعم وأملس نسبياً مع إتساع جزءها السفلي، ويعزى ذلك غالباً لاستخدامهم (إحدى هذه الأواني مثقوبة). أما أصل تلك الأواني والسياق الأثري لها فهو إما غير معلوم أو أن التوثيق غير دقيق. اثنين فقط من تلك الأواني يتأكد أصلهم من منف، بناء على المعلومات التي أمدتنا بها إحدى الصور الأرشيفية القديمة (Giddy 1999: 281–289) بالإضافة إلى الأواني التي عُثر عليها في حالة جيدة من الحفظ وفي مكانها الأصلي بدير المدينة في مدينة العمال الملكيين التي ترجع لفترة الرعامسة (Bruyère 1939: fig. 22, 256, fig. 132). فبالنسبة للأواني البسيطة المنحوتة من الحجر الجيري، ربما كان مصدرها هو أحد المجمعات السكنية (انظر الأواني أرقام MO49، MO46، MO15، MO16، MO10، MO07، MO06) أو مكان العثور عليه: منف?

التاريخ: عمر الأسرات الفرعونية

يمكن تميز بعض أجزاء الأعمدة الإسطوانية القديمة وإعادة استخدامها كأواني حجرية. أما الآلية رقم MO46 فهي منحوتة من الجرانيت الأحمر بأسلوب دقيق، ولها مقربين يقابل أحدهما الآخر على الحافة الخارجية للإناء التي يحتمل أنها ذات سياق ديني، حيث عُثر على أواني مماثلة في مكانها الأصلي داخل بناء يقع غرب بيت أبيس داخل حرم مقاطعة بناح المقدسة (Jones 1983: 38 [red granite basin 59 and plan 1])، والعثور على تلك الأواني غير واضح، لكن سجلها الداخلي الاسم رجا ليشير استخدامها كوعاء لدق الحبوب أيضاً.

يعرض المتحف ضمن مقتنياته مجموعة من الأواني كبيرة الحجم (ارتفاعها حوالي 40 - 50 سم) مقتطعة من الحجر على شكل مخروطية، يفترض أنها كانت تستخدم وهى مدفونة في الأرض حتى ثلاث أرباع ارتفاعها بسبب سطحها الخارجي الخشن. أما السطح الداخلي لتلك الأواني فهو ناعم وأملس نسبياً مع إتساع جزءها السفلي، ويعزى ذلك غالباً لاستخدامهم (إحدى هذه الأواني مثقوبة). أما أصل تلك الأواني والسياق الأثري لها فهو إما غير معلوم أو أن التوثيق غير دقيق. اثنين فقط من تلك الأواني يتأكد أصلهم من منف، بناء على المعلومات التي أمدتنا بها إحدى الصور الأرشيفية القديمة (Giddy 1999: 281–289) بالإضافة إلى الأواني التي عُثر عليها في حالة جيدة من الحفظ وفي مكانها الأصلي بدير المدينة في مدينة العمال الملكيين التي ترجع لفترة الرعامسة (Bruyère 1939: fig. 22, 256, fig. 132). فبالنسبة للأواني البسيطة المنحوتة من الحجر الجيري، ربما كان مصدرها هو أحد المجمعات السكنية (انظر الأواني أرقام MO49، MO46، MO15، MO16، MO10، MO07، MO06) أو مكان العثور عليه: منف?

التاريخ: عمر الأسرات الفرعونية

يمكن تميز بعض أجزاء الأعمدة الإسطوانية القديمة وإعادة استخدامها كأواني حجرية. أما الآلية رقم MO46 فهي منحوتة من الجرانيت الأحمر بأسلوب دقيق، ولها مقربين يقابل أحدهما الآخر على الحافة الخارجية للإناء التي يحتمل أنها ذات سياق ديني، حيث عُثر على أواني مماثلة في مكانها الأصلي داخل بناء يقع غرب بيت أبيس داخل حرم مقاطعة بناح المقدسة (Jones 1983: 38 [red granite basin 59 and plan 1])، والعثور على تلك الأواني غير واضح، لكن سجلها الداخلي الأقدم رجا ليشير استخدامها كوعاء لدق الحبوب أيضاً.

يعرض المتحف ضمن مقتنياته مجموعة من الأواني كبيرة الحجم (ارتفاعها حوالي 40 - 50 سم) مقتطعة من الحجر على شكل مخروطية، يفترض أنها كانت تستخدم وهى مدفونة في الأرض حتى ثلاث أرباع ارتفاعها بسبب سطحها الخارجي الخشن. أما السطح الداخلي لتلك الأواني فهو ناعم وأملس نسبياً مع إتساع جزءها السفلي، ويعزى ذلك غالباً لاستخدامهم (إحدى هذه الأواني مثقوبة). أما أصل تلك الأواني والسياق الأثري لها فهو إما غير معلوم أو أن التوثيق غير دقيق. اثنين فقط من تلك الأواني يتأكد أصلهم من منف، بناء على المعلومات التي أمدتنا بها إحدى الصور الأرشيفية القديمة (Giddy 1999: 281–289) بالإضافة إلى الأواني التي عُثر عليها في حالة جيدة من الحفظ وفي مكانها الأصلي بدير المدينة في مدينة العمال الملكيين التي ترجع لفترة الرعامسة (Bruyère 1939: fig. 22, 256, fig. 132). فبالنسبة للأواني البسيطة المنحوتة من الحجر الجيري، ربما كان مصدرها هو أحد المجمعات السكنية (انظر الأواني أرقام MO49، MO46، MO15، MO16، MO10، MO07، MO06) أو مكان العثور عليه: منف?

التاريخ: عمر الأسرات الفرعونية

يمكن تميز بعض أجزاء الأعمدة الإسطوانية القديمة وإعادة استخدامها كأواني حجرية. أما الآلية رقم MO46 فهي منحوتة من الجرانيت الأحمر بأسلوب دقيق، ولها مقربين يقابل أحدهما الآخر على الحافة الخارجية للإناء التي يحتمل أنها ذات سياق ديني، حيث عُثر على أواني مماثلة في مكانها الأصلي داخل بناء يقع غرب بيت أبيس داخل حرم مقاطعة بناح المقدسة (Jones 1983: 38 [red granite basin 59 and plan 1])، والعثور على تلك الأواني غير واضح، لكن سجلها الداخلي الأقدم رجا ليشير استخدامها كوعاء لدق الحبوب أيضاً.
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PREPARING FOR THE AFTERLIFE
PREPARING FOR THE AFTERLIFE

Death and rebirth in the afterlife were important matters of concern to the people of Memphis, as they were to all ancient Egyptians of the Pharaonic Period (Grajetzki 2003). A few objects displayed at the museum testify to the means by which people attempted to overcome death. Above all, this was concerned with the long-term preservation and ritual preparation of the deceased's body, which was an absolute prerequisite to fulfilling this goal (Hays 2010; Ikram 2010). A fragmentary embalming table (MO27) made for a Memphite official of the 18th Dynasty—one of the rare examples discovered to date—illustrates explicitly the actual process of mummification, with drains used for collecting and evacuating fluids associated with the preparation and purification of the deceased's body.

Concomitantly, a range of objects of varying origins and dates illustrates pieces of burial equipment, meant to ensure the magical transformation of the deceased so that he could rejuvenate himself in a more enduring form and become an “Osiris.” Two stone sarcophagi dated to the New Kingdom (the lid and bottom MO5 and MO8, and the bottom MO20), in which the transformation of the deceased's body supposedly took place, are covered with protective deities and extracts from the funerary books necessary for the rebirthing process to happen effectively. Two (unfinished?) stone chests (MO17 and MO48) may have been intended for storing the canopic jars in which the deceased's mummified organs were kept.

The fact that most of these objects were found at Memphis is of particular interest. Take the embalming table (MO27), for instance. Although we know it was found outside its original context, it reminds us that embalming houses were probably located somewhere at the edge of the city, and burial took place in the nearby cemeteries of Saqqara. Likewise, the two unfinished canopic chests (MO17 and MO48) may indirectly testify to the existence of local workshops where burial equipment was produced, sometimes from large blocks of high-quality stone (one of these is carved from a massive block of quartzite). The choice of carving this or that element of burial/embalming equipment from a specific stone was probably intended to meet specific needs (see above about the symbolic meaning of stones in the temple, p. 84). Last but not least, the re-use of a stone sarcophagus (MO5 and MO8), originating from a Ramesside cemetery at Saqqara in a later tomb built for a high priest in the heart of the city, shows how expensive and valuable such objects were, given that even high-ranking people did not hesitate to appropriate such a piece, preferring to transport one from a remote place rather than funding the manufacture of a new one.
This funerary purification (or embalming?) table, carved from Egyptian alabaster and of which only the upper part is partially preserved, can be dated to the reign of Amenhotep III. Though fragmentary and badly damaged, it still bears the shape of a trapezoidal table whose upper surface has been slightly hollowed out in order to form a shallow tank. This upper receptacle slopes slightly towards the middle and is perforated at one end with a gutter to drain off liquids through one of its side faces. The two preserved corners of the rim are pierced with circular holes that may have held items such as protective amulets or even ritual torches, as suggested by the line of inscriptions engraved on the sides of the table.

Though simple in design, the table is finely worked and bears protective funerary formulae invoking Isis, as well as offering formulae addressed to Anubis and Osiris, to benefit the deceased, Amenhotep, also called Huy, who was governor and estate overseer in Memphis under Amenhotep III (he is not to be confused with a different Amenhotep-Huy, who was governor of Memphis under Ramesses II, see MO5 and MO8). Amenhotep is well known from his tomb, exposed in the nearby necropolis of Saqqara, and through a number of monuments now kept abroad in various European museums (PM III²: 702–703; Hayes 1938: 10–12). This rich material teaches us that Amenhotep was a prominent official of the time, and that he was involved not only in the administration of the Memphite area, but also in the building activities undertaken by Amenhotep III in Memphis, as well as in the cult of the Memphite patron-gods Ptah and Sekhmet.

Very little is known about the provenance and archaeological context of this alabaster table other than that it may have been accidentally exposed by sebbakhin at Kôm Tumân in the early 1920s, in an area located somewhere to the south of the Palace of Apries (26th Dynasty), potentially with other finds dated from the 18th Dynasty (PM III²: 831; Habachi 1967: 42–47 and pl. X–XI, fig. 1–2; Jeffreys 1985: 43). These finds (including the alabaster table) may correspond to fill or leveling material that may have been removed or reused from earlier installations (dating to the New Kingdom) prior to the construction of this later palace.

However, it can be inferred from the shape, size, material, and decoration of this table that it may have been used for funerary purification and/or embalming purposes. This is further suggested by the discovery of a collection of similar stone tables of Egyptian alabaster or limestone elsewhere at Memphis. These were found in the southwest corner of the Ptah temenos (northeast of Kôm el-Fakhry), in a 30th Dynasty building identified as belonging to a set of structures devoted to the keeping, worship, and embalming of the sacred Apis bulls (these are currently known as the “Apis House”). These stone tables, which are still displayed on site today, belonged to the Apis’s “pure place” (wâbet)—its embalming house—where, after the bull’s death, its corpse was ritually washed before being embalmed (el-Amir 1948: 51–52 and pl. XV–XVII; Jones 1982: 53–54; Jones 1990; regarding the stages of the Apis embalming ritual as described in texts, see also Vos 1993: 31–32). Like the present table, several of the tables found in the Apis’s wâbet were similarly carved of Egyptian alabaster, a stone thought to be highly precious and pure, and favored for use in places where purity was required (Aufrère 1991: 696–698). The comparatively small size of our purification table clearly shows that it was used for washing or embalming a corpse much smaller than that of a dead bull, most likely a human body—perhaps that of Amenhotep-Huy. Very few embalming tables intended for the preparation of human mummies have been excavated thus far (Habachi 1967: 44–46 and pl. XII), which makes Amenhotep’s embalming table a particularly unique object.

EMBALMING TABLE OF AMENHOTEP-HUY

Museum Object Number: MO27
Material: Egyptian alabaster
Other numbers: Mus. 43, Exc. 2923/35
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm Tumân, area south of Apries Palace (TAP)
Period: New Kingdom, 18th Dynasty, Amenhotep III
مايدة تطهير جنائزي (أو سرير تحنيط؟)، من الألباستر المصري، لم يتبق منها سوى الجزء العلوي، ويمكن تأريخها إلى عصر الملكأمنحتب الثالث، وهي بحالة متأكلة ومدمرة بشدة، تأخذ شكلشبه منحرف، ومبطنة الطوالي مفرغ قليلاً للإحتفاظ بالسوائل، وهو ينحدر قليلاً نحو الوسط، كما يوجد بأحد أطرافه ثقب مزودبمزراب لتصريف السوائل، توجد بعض الثقوب دائرية الشكل علىحافة المائدة عند اثنين من الأركان، ربما كانت لتعليق بعض الأشياء، كالملاكمة الحالية أو حتى مشاحل الإضاءة المستخدمة في الطقوس، ووجه هذا الرأي بناء على النقش المحفور على جوانب المائدة.

تتميز هذه المائدة بجودة صنعها رغم بساطة التصميم، تحمل المائدة صيغة جنائزية حامية لإيزيس، بالإضافة إلى صيغة تقدمة قرابين لكل من أنوبيس وأوزير لصالح المتوفي المدعو أمنحتب، المعين أيضاً حوي الذي كان حاكماً ومشرفاً على الأملاك بمنف خلال عصر الملك أمنحتب الثالث (والذي كان حاكماً لأمنحتب حوي أول، الذي كان حاكماً لأمنحتب حوي الثاني، انظر القطعMO5، MO8، المحفوظة ب расположен باري إنيز، بالإضافة إلى صيغة تقدمة قرابين كل من أمنحتب وأوزير لصالح الموتى المدعو أمنحتب، المعين أيضاً حوي الذي كان حاكماً لأمنحتب حوي الثاني، انظر القطعMO5، MO8) حاليًاً متواجد في المتحف المصري، والذي يعتبر من أهم المعينين في عصر الأسرة الثامنة، وكانت تحتوي على جسم شرقي كبير يحتوي على الأركان من الألباستر الذي كان يستخدمه المصريون القدماء في الخزف.

مع ذلك، فالنظر إلى شكل وحجم المائدة وموادها، ورائحتها، فإنه يشتبه أنها كانت تستخدم في التطور الجنائزي، و/o أغراض التحنيط. ويدعم هذا الرأي اكتشاف مجموعة من المواد الحجرية المصنوعة من الألباستر المصري أو الحجر الجيري في أماكن أخرى، مما يشير إلى استخدامها في السور الجوفي الغربي لحرم معبد بنايا (شمال شرق كوم الفخري) داخل المبنى الذي يزخر لأسرة الثلاثين.

الذي يعتبر جزءاً من مجموعة مباني كان الغرض منها هو رعاية وتوحيد وتحليب النحل كأس النحل إضافياً "بيت أبيض". تلك المواد الحجرية، التي لا تزال معروضة بالمكان الحالي، تخضع "م(can تطور" (وبعث) الخاص بالنحل أبيض - أي بيت التحنيط - حيث يتم تطور جدول النحل قرب موته لإعداده لعملية el-Amir 1948: 51–52 and pl. XV–XVI; Jones 1982: 53–54; Jones 1990)


لا توفر معلومات عنا قمت هذه القطاعات في السياق أو السياق الذي لها بحاف، وينبغي أنها كانت تحتوي على جميع المناطق المحيطة في كوم طومان في أوقات الخروجات من القرن الماضي، في المنطقة الواقعة جنوب قصر إبريس (الأسرة السادسة والعشرون) على بعض الآثار الأخرى التي تحارجه إلى حضور الأسرة الثامنة عشرة (MO3: 831; Habachi 1967: 42–44 and pl. X–XI, figs. 1–2).

وهذه الآثار (وها فيها هذه المائدة المحبوطة (Jeereys 1985: 43)
**SARCOPHAGUS OF AMENHOTEP-HUY**

Museum Object Number: MO5 (lid); MO8 (bottom)

Material: red granite

Other numbers: Mus. 30, Exc. 25 (MO5); Mus. 29, Exc. 11 (MO8)

Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Rabî’a, 22nd Dynasty cemetery, tombs of Petiese (RAB)

Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

This lid and bottom of the sarcophagus of Amenhotep, also called Huy, are beautifully carved from two massive blocks of red granite.

The lid (MO5) 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 the hieroglyph for gold, 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 additional columns of texts and funerary deities, 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 Nephtys, and on the foot side, the goddess Isis. Both goddesses are flanked by deities of the necropolis.

The bottom part of the sarcophagus (MO8) 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, 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-Huy, who was estate overseer in Memphis under Amenhotep III, see MO27). He also served as director of a temple of Ramesses II located in the Memphite estate of the goddess Hathor. This temple is now lost, but was presumably in the vicinity of another temple of Hathor also built by Ramesses II and 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 very likely (see evidence provided by Pasquali 2012: 141–149). However, we can argue that it was looted in antiquity, as evidenced by the discovery of several elements of his tomb and burial equipment in a secondary burial context. Such is the case with the present sarcophagus lid and bottom. They were exposed by A. Badawi and M. M. el-Amir in 1942 when they 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; Jeffreys 1985: 22, 70–71 and fig. 26; Aston and Jeffreys 2007: 74). This sarcophagus was found reused in the upper room of the tomb of the High Priest Petiese, while an anthropoid sarcophagus also belonging to Amenhotep-Huy and carved from granite (now housed in the Cairo Museum [JE 59128]: Hamada 1935: 122–131) was found reused in the nearby tomb of Harsiiese.
غلاء وتابوت أمنحتب المعروف أيضاً باسم حوي، دقيق الصنعة، منحوت من كتلتين ضخمتين من الجرانيت الأحمر المفرغة. وقد كسر الغطاء (القطعة رقم MO5) إلى نصفين، لكن تم ترميمه. وهو غطاء قد اتخاذه ملك حوي لتوت أمنحتب حوي، الذي يتم توثيقه في النقوش. مع ذلك، يمكن أن يكون قد نهبت خلال العصور القديمة، كما هو واضح من أكشاف العديد من آثار تلك الفترة والأنثروبولوجيين معد استخدامهم في غير مكانهم الأصلي. وهو ما ينطبق على هذا التابوت (بجزئيه)، الذي عثر عليه ك.م.ب. في عام 1942 أثناء عمليات تغطية كتار الكهنة المؤرخة بعصر الأسرة الثانية والعشرين، الواقعة بشمال غرب مقبرة الملك رمسيس الثاني الصغير بكوم الربيعة (Badawi 1944: 181–206 and pl. XVI–XX). 

أما الجزء السفلي من التابوت (القطعة رقم MO8) فهو أيضاً غطاء عادة مستطيلة الذات جوانب مستمرة من ناحية الرأس. وهو متصلب، لكن يitung بسلسة عبارات مبتكرة، يحتوي على نقوش جنائزية متعددة على السطح الخارجي للتابوت، وأيضاً أمنتحب حوي (محفوظ بالمتحف JE 59128: 12–131) [Hamada 1935: 122–131]، ويعتبر تابوت أمنتحب حوي هو واحد من النقوش الجنائزية المدرجة بالنقش الغائر، يحتوي على نقوش جنائزية وأيضاً أمنتحب حوي. وهو تم إعداده أثناء عملية التخدير، وبالتالي كان مصنوعاً في بداية عصر الرمسيس الثاني.}

أما الجزء الداخلي للتابوت (القطعة رقم MO5) فهو غطاء عادة مستطيلة الذات جوانب مستمرة من ناحية الرأس. وهو متصلب، لكن يحتوي على عبارات مبتكرة بسلسة عبارات مبتكرة، يحتوي على نقوش جنائزي متعددة على السطح الخارجي للتابوت، وأيضاً أمنتحب حوي (محفوظ بالمتحف JE 59128: 12–131) [Hamada 1935: 122–131]، ويعتبر تابوت أمنتحب حوي هو واحد من النقوش الجنائزية المدرجة بالنقش الغائر، يحتوي على نقوش جنائزية وأيضاً أمنتحب حوي. وهو تم إعداده أثناء عملية التخدير، وبالتالي كان مصنوعاً في بداية عصر الرمسيس الثاني.
This bottom part of a sarcophagus is hollowed out from a single large block of red granite. It is of unknown date, but a New Kingdom date seems credible considering the style of its decoration. This sarcophagus, whose owner remains unknown, is rectangular with a rounded head. Its exterior and interior surfaces are both badly eroded, most likely from water damage. However, elements of its decoration are still visible, especially at the head of the sarcophagus, where a kneeling goddess—probably Nephthys—with her arms raised in a gesture of protection and a hieroglyphic djed-sign of stability are carved in sunken relief. Found broken in several pieces, this sarcophagus was restored in modern times, but it also shows traces of what may correspond to ancient restorations, especially seven dovetail holes at the top and on the sides of the rim for installing joints. Nothing is known about the provenance and archaeological context of this sarcophagus, nor about its owner. This sarcophagus bottom may originally come from a tomb located either in Saqqara or Memphis, and may even have been reused in a secondary burial context like the sarcophagus of Amenhotep-Huy (see MO5 and MO8).
The museum houses two examples of large stone chests of unknown date and origin, although they are thought to have been taken and brought to the museum from an area located immediately south of the Open Air Museum's fence (personal communication of the museum staff). They both were carved from massive blocks of stone: quartzite in one case (MO17), limestone in another (MO48). Both were found uninscribed with their outer surfaces left roughly hewn (perhaps unfinished), but they appear to be well crafted. The inner container of box MO17 was neatly hollowed out in the shape of a cube, and the bottom surface of its lid was carefully hewn in the shape of a flat square to fit snugly with the equally square rim of the box. The inner container of box MO48 was likewise hollowed out in the shape of a cube; its rim was neatly carved to engage with a square lid (now lost) that was lifted and removed via levers that slipped into four slanting notches, one on each side of the box. In the absence of any inscriptions or any more data related to the provenance and archaeological context of these large stone chests, we can only speculate about their purpose. However, it seems likely that these stone chests were originally used (or intended) for a funerary purpose and may have served as canopic installations for storing the viscera of a deceased person. Such “canopic chests” of stone were in use for royal burials since the Old Kingdom onwards (Dodson 1994).
نداء إلى الموتى

CALLING ON THE DEAD
According to ancient Egyptians’ beliefs, death was not the cessation of existence on earth. Once transfigured and turned into an Osiris, the dead could still interact with the world of the living, albeit under specific circumstances (Harrington 2013). The creation of virtual, magical paths through which the deceased could travel between the world of the dead and the world of the living (e.g., by means of a decorated tomb chapel, a statue, a stela, a false-door, or domestic cultic installations), provided a medium of communication between families and their dead. From what we understand, this interaction between the living and the dead was conceived as a two-way mutually beneficial exchange: the surviving family members were meant to sustain the dead, maintain their tomb and memory, and appease them when they were upset, and in exchange the deceased would grant them his/her protection, support, and help, notably by interceding with gods and by fighting the family’s enemies (be they living people or supernatural beings).

Two Middle Kingdom false-door stelae (MO32 and MO33) found in recesses against the wall of an earlier cemetery at Kôm el-Fakhry, together with a row of offering tables, illustrate the constant preoccupation of the people of Memphis with keeping in touch with their dead (additional discoveries in the nearby settlement also revealed the existence of a sort of ancestor cult, see Tavares and Kamel 2011). A naophorous statue (MO2) found in Saqqara shows that people who were distinguished or influential figures in society during their lifetime could become, once dead, preferred intermediaries to the gods for a wide range of people, even exceeding the immediate family circle; such monuments were usually set in places accessible to the passerby, so that anybody could call upon the deceased and glorify their memory (see for comparison the purpose of “block statues” installed in temples’ entrance spaces, Schultz 2011).
FUNERARY FALSE-DOOR STELAE OF IMEPY-ÂNKH AND (ISU-SA-)IMEPY

Museum Object Number: MO32 (Imepy-ânkh); MO33 (Isu-sa-Imepy)
Material: limestone, painted
Other numbers: Mus. 38, Exc. 41 (MO32); Mus. 37, Exc. 42 (MO33)
Provenance: Memphis, Kôm el-Fakhry, First Intermediate Period cemetery, eastern street (FAC)
Period: First Intermediate Period, 9th–10th Dynasties

This pair of limestone funerary false-door stelae are likely to date to the 9th or 10th Dynasty. They were found together in situ by M. Abd el-Tawwab el-Hitta at Kôm el-Fakhry in 1954 (PM III²: 852; Leclant 1956: 256 [b]; Lilyquist 1974: 27–30; Jeffreys 1985: 29 and 68, and fig. 19). At the time of the discovery, these two stelae were still embedded in the wall that borders the eastern edge of a First Intermediate Period cemetery.

They show a comparable design, and both were initially painted, as is evidenced by paint remnants on MO33. Both consist of a rectangular stela that supports a small-format false door in low relief—the typical structure of false doors dated from the mid-6th Dynasty onwards up to the 12th Dynasty (Arnold 2003: 89 [b]). The false door consists of a central niche representing the doorway, framed by two doorjambs surmounted by a lintel adorned with two prophylactic eyes, and from which hangs a drum representing a rolled-up mat curtain. This inner doorframe is surmounted by a panel flanked by two rectangular recesses and adorned with an offering scene featuring the deceased to whom these stelae are dedicated: in one case (MO32), inscriptions identify the lady Imepy-ânkh, a priestess of Hathor, seated before a table topped with a pile of food offerings; in the other case (MO33), a man called (Isu-sa-)Imepy is seated before a table surmounted by a line of reed-shaped elements representing sliced bread loaves and a beef foreleg. As evidenced by archaeological finds, these two personages were likely buried in the adjacent cemetery.

This inner doorframe is bound by a second outer doorframe that is in turn surrounded by a semicircular torus molding (MO32’s torus is carved in imitation of a ligatured bundle of reeds), such that the overall appearance is that of two doorjambs supporting a lintel topped by a cavetto cornice.* Every element of these two false doors has been engraved with hieroglyphic inscriptions running either vertically or horizontally. Depictions of the deceased appear on the bottom portions of the four doorjambs; they are all facing the aperture of the door. The sides and top of the stelae are bordered by a raised frame covered with inscriptions.

False doors are attested since the first dynasties onwards in various contexts, from private houses to tombs and temples, where they served as virtual contact points between the world of the living and the hereafter (conceived as the world of the gods and the dead). Recent re-excavations (publication in preparation) conducted in 2011 by AERA in an area previously exposed by M. Ashery for the Egyptian Antiquities Organization in the early 1980s (unpublished results) have shown that an access to our two stelae had been maintained through time, even when a settlement developed during the Middle Kingdom next to the aforementioned cemetery (see fig. 31 in the introduction). This indicates that the stelae MO32 and MO33 were meant to remain accessible to the passerby, providing an actual communication medium for private people of the adjacent settlement to interact with their relatives buried in the cemetery.
بابان وهميان لكل من إمبي عنخ، (إسو-سا) إمبي

رقم الحفاظ بالتحف: 32–MO (إمبي-عنخ)؛ 33–MO (إسو-سا-إمبي)

مادة الصناع: الحجر الجيري، ملون

أرقام الحفاظ الأخرى: سجل الحفائر 38، سجل الحفائر 41 (MO32)؛ سجل الحفائر 37، سجل الحفائر 42 (MO33)

موقع العثور عليه: منف، كوم الفخري، جبانة عصر الانتقال الأول، الطريق الشرقي (FAC)

التاريخ: عصر الانتقال الأول، الأسرات التاسعة والعاشرة

تقدمة قراين يستفيد منها المتوحش، الممثل بالأشياء السفلية لعجائبباب الأبواب العربية: نظراً تجاه فتحة الباب، أما جوانب وقمة اللوحات فهي محاطة إطاراً بارزاً مغطى بكتاباتٍ جنائزية.

ظهرت الأبواب الوهمية منذ الأسرات المبكرة وصعداً في أكثر من سياق، سواء المنازل الخاصة أو المدارس أو المعابد حيث كانت تعتبر نقطاً تواصل إطارياً بين عالم الأحياء، والعالم الآخر (الذي اعتقد أنه عالم الآلهة والأموات). أظهرت أعمال الحفائر الحديثة (التقنيات قدب النشر) التي أجريت عام 2011 من خلال جمعية أبحاث مصر AERA القديمة في المنطقة التي سبق الكشف عنها. العثور على Mob32 من مصلحة الآثار المصرية في أوقات الثمانينيات (نتائج غير مشروعة)، أن اللوحات كانت يتم الوصول إليها لفترة من الزمن استمرت بعد بناء إحدى المستوطنة السكنية خلال الدولة الوسطى بجاور الجبانة المشتر إليها (النقطة 31 بالقدمية). ولهما ما يشير إلى أن اللوحات أرقام 32 و33 كانت متاحة للعابرين، وكوسيلة تواصل فعلية بين سكان المستوطنة المجاورة، وذويهم المدافون بالجانب.


كانا هذه اللوحات لا تزال تزين الجدار الذي يحد بالحافة الشرقية لجبانة عصر الانتقال الأول خلال وقت الاكتشاف.

تتشكل اللوحات في تصميمها، وكلاً في الأصل ملونة حيث لا تزال بقايا بعض الألوان ظاهرة في القطع رقم MO32، وMO33 (Jeffreys 1985: 29 and 68, and fig. 19). تتكون كل منهما من لوحة مستطيلة الشكل تدعم باب وهمي أصغر حجماً مرتبط برسومات نحتية - وهو التصميم النمطي المعتاد للأبواب الوهمية التي ترجع لعصر الأسرة السادسة وصاعدًا. هيصفة أن الأسرة الثانية عشرة.

يحيط بال إطار الداخلي لهذه الأبواب الوهمية إطار آخر خارجي محاط هو الآخر بإفريز على شكل نصف دائري (الإفريز بالقطع رقم MO32) منحوت ليحاكي حزامية مربوطة من الخيزران (MO33). لتكون معتادًا بالجانب لتغطي عقب إفريز بوقع دائري. وقد زين كل عصر لهذه الأبواب الوهمية بالكتابات الهيروغليفية المقوية سواء رأسياً أو أفقياً. وهذه الكتابات عبارة عن صيغة باللغة السمهانية في الأسرات المبكرة وصعداً.

ينتشرزاب مبتلاً البابين يظهران على ألوانها في القطرة رقم MO33. تتكون كل منها من لوحة مستطيلة الشكل تدعم باب وهمي كبير. مندف بمقدار منفصل بالنحت (الإفريز) - وهو التصميم النمطي المعتاد للأبواب الوهمية التي ترجع لعصر الأسرة السادسة وصاعدًا (الإفريز منصوب على شكل حزمة من الخيزران) (Arnold 2003: 89 [b]). يتكون الباب الوهمي من نيشة وسطية يتسع دخول الباب، محاطة بحضيضي باب يعلوه عبدين من الفنون الحالية، يمد منه تدخل إلى الروح من جهة من جهة من جهة ميدان العشرين. يعلم إطار الباب الداخلي لوحة محاطة باثنين من الخيايا مستطيلة الشكل مزينة بكتابات جنائزية مربوطة (الإفريز منصوب على شكل حزمة من الخيزران) (MO32) تجاور الباب الأربعة; ناظراً تجاه فتحة الباب. أما جوانب وقمة اللوحات فهى محاطة إطاراً بارزاً مغطى بكتابات جنائزية. إمبي عنخ كاهنة حتحور (القطعة رقم MO33): أمام إمام مادعة تعلوها كوم من قرابين الطعام. بينما في القطعة الأخرى (إمبي-عنخ) إمام جالساً أمام مادعة بعلوها صفين من أشكال الخيزران مزينة برسومات نحتية أرفغة الخبز بالإضافة إلى الساق الأمامية ثور. من خلال الأدلة الأثرية، نجد أن كل من إمبي-عنخ، إمبي-سا تم دفنهما بالجبانة المجاورة.

يحيط بال إطار الداخلي لهذه الأبواب الوهمية إطار آخر خارجي محاط هو الآخر بإفريز على شكل نصف دائري (الإفريز بالقطع رقم MO32) منحوت ليحاكي حزامية مربوطة من الخيزران (MO33). لتكون معتادًا بالجانب لتغطي عقب إفريز بوق دائر. وقد تزين كل عصر لهذه الأبواب الوهمية بالكتابات الهيروغليفية المقوية سواء رأسياً أو أفقياً. وهذه الكتابات عبارة عن صيغة
NAOPHOROUS STATUE OF (PA)-RAHOTEP

Museum Object Number: MO2
Material: red granite
Other numbers: Mus. 33, Exc. 2
Provenance: Saqqara, Southern Necropolis, area southwest of the Monastery of Apa Jeremias
Period: New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, Ramesses II

This kneeling life-sized statue of the mayor, Vizier and High Priest of Ptah in Memphis, (Pa-)Rahotep, bears a naos containing an effigy of the god Ptah. This now-eroded “naophorous” statue was carved from a single piece of red granite. Though found headless, (Pa-)Rahotep can be identified both by his name and titles, and by his outfit, consisting of the long dress of the Vizier, as well as a typical Ramesside wig and a pair of refined pointed sandals worn as status symbols. His statue is resting upon a base engraved with a line of text that runs around its four sides and against a back pillar that is also inscribed. These inscriptions consist in offering formulae addressed to the gods Ptah and Osiris-Wennefer to the benefit of the deceased (Pa-)Rahotep.

In the naos carried by (Pa-)Rahotep, Ptah of Memphis is portrayed standing, wrapped in his classic cloak and clutching his composite scepter. The naos features the shape of the typical Lower Egyptian sanctuary (per–nu, see Arnold 2003: 173), with its vaulted ceiling. Its façade and sides are covered with inscriptions, and the top of its door is adorned with an engraved figure of Anubis, god of the necropolis, depicted as a recumbent canine with a ribbon around his neck, a flagellum standing next to his flank, and a kherep-scepter before him. The preserved inscriptions mainly consist of funerary offering formulae for the benefit of (Pa-)Rahotep; these mention funerary deities present in the Memphite area, such as Osiris and the hybrid form of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris. The inscription located at the bottom of the naos consists of a prayer addressed to the God Ptah, again to the benefit of (Pa-)Rahotep.

(Pa-)Rahotep came from one of the highest families of the early Ramesside period. Under the reign of Seti I and Ramesses II, he served for decades as Northern Vizier, the highest government position under the king’s, before being named High Priest of Ptah in Memphis at the end of his career. The position of High Priest of Ptah was among the most prestigious of the time. Depending upon royal favor, this position was held during the Ramesside period by royal sons and members of important families. By becoming High Priest of Ptah like his father before him, (Pa-)Rahotep also inscribed himself in a long family tradition related to Memphis priesthood (Raedler 2011: 135–154). As High Priest, (Pa-)Rahotep was authorized to dedicate monuments in sacred precincts, such as a now-lost ruined chapel erected in the southern necropolis of Saqqara (the area located southwest of the remains of the Monastery of Apa Jeremias) where the present naophorous statue was found by Z. Goneim in 1955 (PM III²: 665; Leclant 1956: 256 [B,a]; Lauer 1956: 62–63; Altenmüller and Moussa 1974: 1–9 and pl. I). Nothing is known about the purpose of that small chapel, of which only a few limestone blocks remain; we do not know whether this monument was a chapel dedicated to the god Ptah or to the Vizier himself, or whether this was the tomb-chapel of the Vizier. Besides commemorating his memory, this statue of (Pa-)Rahotep presumably acted as a mediator to the god Ptah of Memphis for people passing by. In 1972, a decision was made by the Egyptian Antiquities Organization to remove this block-statue from Saqqara and to transport it to the Open Air Museum in Mit Rahina where it is still displayed today (regarding the journey of statue MO2, see figs. 47–48 in the introduction).
تمثال حامل للناووس (با-) رع حتب

MO2

رقم الحفظ بالتحف: 2

مادة الصنف: الجرانيت الأحمر

أرقام الحفظ الأخرى: سجل المتحف 33, سجل الحفائر 2

مكان العثور عليه: سقارة، الجبانة الجنوبية، المنطقة الواقعة إلى الجنوب الغربي لدير الأنبى أرميا

التاريخ: الدولة الحديثة، الأسرة التاسعة عشرة، الملك رمسيس الثاني

استُخدم هذا التمثال خلال فترة الرعامسة للأمراء الملكيين والأعضاء العائلات الهامة المقربة من السلطة الملكية. وقد تولى (با-) رع حتب منصب الكاهن الأكبر لبتاح في منف (با-) رع حتب حامل للناووس تمثال للإله بناح. هذا التمثال "الحامل للناووس" منحوت من كتلة واحدة من الجرانيت الأحمر، وهو متأكد بحدة. وعلى الرغم من الأثر عليه فاقدا للرأس، فإنه تم نسب هذا التمثال إلى (با-) رع حتب من خلال اسمه وألقابه المسجلة على التمثال، بالإضافة إلى مظهره الخارجي الذي يعكس مكانته الاجتماعية المميزة حيث يظهر برداء الوزير الطويل إلى جانب باروكة مميزة لفترة الرعامسة، كما يرتدي زوجاً مميزاً من الصنادل المدببة.  

يظهر داخل الناووس الذي يحمله (با-) رع حتب، بتاح إله منف ممثل واقفاً ملفوفاً في عبائته الحابكة المميزة قابضاً بيديه على صناديقه المركب. الناوس الشكل النمطي لمقصورة مصرية، ذات السقف المنقوش (per-nu, see Arnold 2003: 173) ويتزين وجهة المصورة بالنقش، كما يزين أعلى الباب نقش، وهو مكتبته الجيولوجية رابطاً بينهما يوجد شريط ملون مع مساحة نقوشية، و أفراح الألوية جانبية، و صناديق الخرب أمامه. يوجد بعض النقوش الباقية على الناووس والفنون بحالة جيدة من الحفظ وهو عبارة عن صيغة تقديرية مكرسة للإله بناح، وأوزير ونفر ليس倭د منها المتوفى (با-).  

يظهر داخل الناوس الذي يحمله (با-) رع حتب، نقل التمثال من سقارة إلى المتحف بسري بالمفتوح بميت رهينة حيث يعرض حالياً (عن رحلة التمثال رقم 271، نشرت في القرد 1972، ووصوله للمتحف، انظر أشكال رقم MO2 1–9 and pl. I) والغرض من هذه المصورة الصغيرة غير معروف.

يندر أن تُخُذل المقتنيات لتمثال الأثر المصري 1972، نقل التمثال من سقارة إلى المتحف ووصلة المقتنيات، أن تُخُذل التمثال رقم 48 بالمقدم. MO2
Common ancient Egyptian crowns mentioned in the text.
Common scepters mentioned in the text.
Common architectural entablature and column terms of Corinthian design mentioned in the text.