

# EHNASYA

## INTRODUCTION.

1. WHEN last year the continuance of my researches in the early history was closed, by the refusal of the Egyptian Archaeological Committee to allow English work at Saqqara, I was obliged to turn to a site at which we had only intended that Mr. Currelly should do some minor work. Dr. Naville had spent a season at Ehnasya (or Ahnas) in 1891, and stated "We thus cleared what I believe to be all that is still extant of the great temple of Arsaphes." I had therefore no wish to embark for another season's work in that site; but, as being all that we could have, it was necessary to make the best of it.

I had in 1897 suspected that the region already cleared was only a part of the temple. And we proved it this year, by clearing not only a space as large again as Dr. Naville's hall, behind that; but also discovering a great court, much larger than the hall, in front of it. The history of a great temple of several successive ages of building is always an interesting subject; and as we found in it what is perhaps the finest gold statuette, and the finest granite triad, yet known, the work was well worth doing, though we could not recover more of the early history, as I had hoped would be permitted.

2. Our party consisted of my Wife, Mr. Currelly and Mr. Ayrton. But very soon Mr. Currelly left with Mr. Loat to search the desert

for the cemetery, gradually moving down to my old quarters at Gurob. Afterwards Mr. Currelly went to Buto, where my wife and I joined him for a week after leaving our own work. At Ahnas, as it has been called, or Ehnasya, as the people really name it, we were living in the midst of the cultivated plains. Our mud-brick huts did not dry for weeks, our clothes were wet every morning with the damp air, and a great rain-storm flooded all our premises with some inches of water. It was not till late in the season that the land began to feel like Egypt. We had continual trouble with the contractor who annually purchases from the Antiquity Department the right to destroy the Roman buildings for bricks. The whole of the walls of Roman age are mined out by long underground burrows; and the large piles of red bricks thrown up for sale to distant places, show the sites of churches and mansions of which no one will ever know more. This contractor claimed to destroy immediately all the walls we uncovered, and incessant feuds, alarms, and nightly plunderings went on. At last I confiscated all the tools of any men caught in our workings. After getting half a dozen picks and baskets, and facing out a long discussion with a prevaricating assembly of parties interested, my work was left in comparative peace. The *omdeh* of Ehnasya behaved in a reasonable and friendly manner throughout; and we had

pleasant greetings with the country people in the villages, apart from the brick question.

3. The accurate survey of the ruins of the temple was a necessary work. In order to have a good basis for that I measured a long line on the top of the facade wall of the temple; and then set off an axis square with that by a great equilateral triangle of one tape length. Then every point was referred to its distances in co-ordinates from the base, or from the axis at right angles to that. There were thus no measurements dependent upon others, but every point was independently fixed.

Our work at the temple was greatly encumbered by the mounds thrown out in Dr. Naville's partial clearance, nearly all of which overlay other parts of the temple, and needed to be moved again, sometimes to a depth of 40 feet. We not only cleared the temple, but we searched some way behind it for any other buildings; also we made considerable trenching and clearance to the south-east, where a piece

of a limestone column, part of a basalt shrine of Hakor, and banks of stone chips, seemed to promise another temple. Beside this, to the north of the Kom ed Dinar, where two granite blocks of a temple remain, we sought deep and wide for more. These trials occupied much of our men and time, but if any buildings had existed they seem to have been entirely removed. We also cleared out various houses of Roman age that had been destroyed by fire, as such are most likely to contain objects left in the burning. In this way we secured a large quantity of pottery figures, lamps, and tools, dated by the coins found in the houses; and Mrs. Milne while with us marked the pottery and cleaned the coins. The results for dating appear in the supplementary volume of Roman remains.

Of the plates in this volume nearly half have been done by my wife, and the others by Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Currelly, and myself.

## CHAPTER I.

### THE SITE BEFORE THE BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE. PL. IV.

4. ALTHOUGH there can be no doubt that at least one temple had existed at Henen-suten from the 1st Dynasty, if not earlier, yet the site of that is unknown. The large temple described in this volume does not contain any remains of temples older than the XIIth Dynasty; and it was found to overlie irregular buildings, and burials which cannot be earlier than the XIth Dynasty.

These earlier buildings could not be thoroughly examined, owing to the stone work of the temples which partly overlaid them. Also it was not possible to reach them until March, owing to the water level of the inundation. On pl. iv. is shown the outlines of the temple walls in dot and dash lines, in relation to the brick walls which lie below them, so far as Mr. Ayrton could trace them at the close of our work. It will be seen that the brick walls have no connexion with the temple walls, and are only approximately in the same direction. None of the walls are thick, like those of the early brick temples at Abydos; hardly any parts are more than one brick through. And the presence of granaries points also to these being ordinary houses. Still farther marking the private character of the ground, were about a dozen burials scattered in different parts; apparently these had been placed parallel to the walls, owing to the graves being dug among deserted buildings. It is remarkable how, both at Abydos and here, the Egyptians seem to have had no objection to mixing cemetery and town together. At Abydos the desert was close at hand, and yet pit graves were dug, lined, and

vaulted, amid the deserted houses of the outskirts of the town, much as they seem to have been here. All this shows very different ideals of burial to what we usually associate with Egypt. But often in a modern Egyptian town the cemetery may be on a mound of ruin not more than two or three centuries old, if no more clear and suitable spot can be had; and there seems to have been still less objection anciently to such a mixture.

5. That the temple of the XIXth Dynasty was only a refurbishing of that of the XVIIIth is almost certain from the history. No wholesale clearance of temples between Tahutmes III and Ramessu II is known otherwise, and therefore we cannot assume that the XVIIIth Dynasty temple was eradicated before the XIXth Dynasty temple was built. But the foundations of a temple of different plan underlie the walls of the XVIIIth Dynasty. The courtyard wall was continued north of its present line, before it was turned to meet the wing of the portico. There is a line of wall foundation underlying a row of columns of the hypostyle hall. And there are in several parts foundations, shown in pl. v., much deeper than the rest of the temple. Moreover on these deepest foundations (XIIth Dyn.?) is a sand-bed of rebuilding; a second foundation upon that (XVIIIth Dyn.?) ; another sand-bed of a second rebuilding, and then the XIXth Dynasty threshold. All of this is strong evidence that a great temple existed here, not only before the XIXth Dynasty, but before the XVIIIth as well. There is then no ground for supposing

that the temple of Senusert (Useratesen) II, Senusert III, and Amenemhat III, of which so many inscriptions were found here, was not built on this ground; and we may accept the obvious conclusion that these stones are the ruins of the temple whose deep foundations are older than the XVIIIth Dynasty.

6. The burials preceded the temple building, as they were laid along the sides of the earlier brick walls; and there is no ground for supposing that Egyptians ever buried in or under a temple. We must therefore date these burials before Senusert II; and by their style they cannot be earlier than the XIth Dynasty. They prove a good deal concerning the dates of styles of scarabs, hitherto uncertain.

They show that symmetrical designs in scarabs were fully used, as in pl. ixA, Nos. 4, 19, 20; that the "King of the Aamu" scarabs (15) go back to this age; that the high-backed scarabs (20), with various deeply cut, bold, groups embodying the name of Nubkheper-ra, are before the XIIth Dynasty, and therefore that Antef V was of the XIth, and not of a later age; and that the curl patterns (as 14) start as early as this, and must not be all put to the XVIIIth Dynasty. These are points which we cannot have more satisfactorily proved than by the superposition of a XIIth Dynasty temple on the top of a cemetery. The details of the burials are recorded by Mr. Ayrton as follow, most of them being shown on pl. iv.

No. 10. Skeleton, head west, between the facade wall and the eastern granite bases; a polished red pottery bowl (fig. 1, pl. ixA) at the head.

No. 11. Skeleton, on back, head north, left hand on stomach, right at side; man (?); no ornaments; broken pot on chest.

No. 12. Body only, without legs, head north, face east; woman. On neck, large glazed ball beads, notched beads (fig. 3), pendant (fig. 2), and scaraboid (fig. 4).

No. 13. Upper half of skeleton, on back, head turned to left; back bent, and mouth open. No ornaments.

No. 14. Skeleton, legs deformed, too short for body, on back, head south; right hand on pelvis, feet crossed. By pelvis, alabaster kohl pot (fig. 6), small diorite bowl (fig. 10), green glazed bowl (fig. 9) and two ivory pins (figs. 11, 12): by feet, alabaster cup (fig. 5); on left hand, glazed scarab (fig. 7), and plain amethyst scarab (fig. 8).

No. 15. Skeleton, on back, head east, feet crossed, left hand on pelvis; above the right lung a red jar (fig. 13).

No. 16. Skeleton. Silver ring on left hand.

No. 17. Skeleton, on back, head west; left hand on pelvis, legs crossed, a child. On left hand two ovoids (figs. 14, 15) glazed steatite. Wrongly numbered on pl. iv; this is the body 2 inches east of figures 17.

No. 18. Skeleton, on back, head erect, legs distorted, infant. In small brick coffin. No objects.

No. 19. Skeleton A. Head north, face east; no objects, therefore probably an attendant on the other.

Skeleton B, same position, in front of A. On left hand scarab set in gold (fig. 20); large scarab with "union of south and north," glazed (fig. 19); and carnelian scarab with spirals (fig. 18). Among bones of pelvis two gold beads (fig. 17), with small red tube beads and white drum beads. At foot scarab (fig. 21). At back of pelvis glazed figure of Taurt (fig. 16). In front of body a small bowl of buff pottery.

## CHAPTER II.

THE TEMPLE OF THE XII<sup>TH</sup> DYNASTY. PL. V.

7. BEFORE dealing with the several buildings which stood on this site it will be best to give a classification of the various levels of construction that appear.

In the first place the foundation level of a building is almost as important as its pavement level. The bottoms of the various parts of the building were noted therefore as well as the top levels. In the plan, pl. vi, the top levels are stated upon the stones, in inches above an arbitrary datum, the Ramesside sill being called 200. These serve to show the various course levels. On the ground at the side of the stones is the level of the bottoms of the stones marked B; and in some places a section gives the bottoms and tops of several stones, with S put between where a sand bed occurs. We must remember that there are varying depths of foundations, one, two or three courses thick; but where a sand bed occurs between stones it is of capital importance as marking a new foundation of a rebuilding, for no builder would put a thick sand bed between his courses.

The oldest building of all, shown on pl. v, has its course levels at:—

181, 181, 186, pavement.

(177 temenos walls founded).

160, 164, 167, 167, joints.

132, 141, 141, 145, 147, joints.

120, 125, 126, 126, base of stones.

This is apparently of the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, as none of these stones were re-used ones of that age, and one re-used stone (pl. xi, 1) is apparently of the Old Kingdom.

8. The next level of building must be after

the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, as it includes many re-used blocks of that age. This rebuilding bears the drawn lines marking the position of the walls on the foundations. Between the stones of this period, at the back of wall, were scarabs and glazed pieces of Tahutmes III. The levels are:—

194, 196, 197, 200, pavement.

(193 temenos wall rebuilt).

179, 182, 184, 186, joints.

153, 158, 159, 162, 163, 166, 168, joints

135, 141, 142, 142, 142, base of stones, sand below.

The hard mud walls of earlier constructions of the temple, are cut down to 147 level, to clear the ground for this rebuilding.

9. The next level is certainly that of Ramessu II, and the sill at 200 is his actual pavement level, as the door pivot hole is just lower than that, so that there cannot have been a whole course over it.

200, sill.

186, 188, 188, joints, columns.

170, 172, 174, 175, 175, base of stones, sand below.

The pavement then was that of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty; but the rebuilding had only one course of foundation, and not three courses as in the earlier temples. The wretched foundations of Ramessu II are obvious in the case of the great quartzite blocks of the facade, which rest in many instances on one or two small blocks of limestone and loose earth. They cannot be safely bared without falling over for lack of support; while just below this rottenness are three splendid courses of large limestone

blocks, contrasting with the miserable supports of the XIXth Dynasty stones.

10. After the XIXth Dynasty a higher level is shown by the granite column bases of the portico, which are quite rough and irregular in form, and not intended to be seen : their surfaces are at a level of 214 to 220 in. Also the same level appears on the substructures of the hypostyle columns. This level was probably determined by the base line of the facade inscription at 214, which it was not desired to encroach upon when raising the pavement.

215, pavement in hall.

213, 214, 215, column basements.

214-220, granite basements.

(220, outer temenos cut down).

190, 190, 193, base of stones.

The last rebuilding had its pavement yet higher, shown by mortar on the sculptures at 237, tops of drums put to raise the columns at 236, 237, and the latest temenos wall founded 234.

11. The structures of the lowest level are shown on pl. v. Of the COURT the base of the east wall remains. But the stones of the lowest course can only be seen in a group at the north end of this wall where they were left without being covered by any later rebuilding. This group of stones is shaded from top left, whereas the rest of the wall is shaded from top right, to show that they are a higher course ; they may be of XIIth or of XVIIIth Dynasty, but as the lower course can only be seen at the edges, the upper course is drawn to show the character of the foundations. The front of the court seems to have been entirely removed, at least at its junction with the side. The west side is also entirely gone.

In the court are two brick walls, thicker than those due to houses, which stand in relation to some stone work. They may be the retaining walls of the foundations, as it is not likely that a brick building would exist within a stone court. Large blocks of stone abut on the walls, and seem to have probably been the bases of a

doorway. The tops of these are at 158 to 160, and are not therefore decisively of the XIIth Dynasty temple ; but their position would be still harder to account for in the XVIIIth Dynasty, when the type of temple was more fixed and on a larger scale.

The blocks at the north side of the court are also difficult to understand. At first sight they seem to be for the basements of columns ; but one is too near the axis of the building for a column. The only explanation would seem to be that the axis had been shifted 45 inches east in the XVIIIth Dynasty, and therefore the brick wall and foundation in the midst of the court must belong to that later period. But this is unlikely, as we have already observed. If the axis were further west originally, it would imply that the court was 90 in. wider, and therefore that the whole of the west side was shifted in later rebuilding. There are great difficulties in each view of these changes ; and we have hardly enough evidence to show what the plans were.

The back wall of the court which forms the facade of the HYPOSTYLE HALL is a fine piece of foundation. The lowest courses at 120-132, 132-147, belong to the first temple (XIIth Dynasty) ; a sand bed of 10 in. was laid over these, and the second temple (XVIIIth Dynasty) was founded with a course at 157-170. Over this are some small blocks, a very insufficient support for the XIXth Dynasty quartzite facade and wall above it. Behind this the only early work is a foundation wall below a row of columns, which would only leave room for chambers 14 or 15 feet long. This would imply that there was no hypostyle hall in the XIIth Dynasty, but only a sanctuary for the sacred bark, and store chambers at the side of it.

The idea that we thus get of the XIIth Dynasty temple is very different from that of later temples. There would be merely a small block of very substantial building of a sanctuary and store-rooms flanking it ; and a large court in front of that. This would fairly agree with

the outlines of the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty temple at Abydos; and in the absence of any better plans of this age it at least gives some idea of the type then followed. It appears to be a continuation of the primitive shrine and courtyard as shown on the tablet of Mena. (*Royal Tombs*, ii. pl. x. 2.)

12. Of the construction of the temple we can learn something from the blocks that remain. Beneath the northern blocks of quartzite on the west side of the portico was a red granite foundation; and this was now bare, owing to the quartzite block having fallen over since it was exposed by Dr. Naville. On the granite were traces of inscription, which I carefully washed and examined; my wife's copy is given in pl. xiii. From this it is evident that the block is a lintel with symmetrical groups: a column of *ka* name at each end, in the midst a cartouche, and a deity seated at each side. The *ka* name is that of Senusert III.

Besides this a large block of Senusert II has been re-used for an architrave of Ramessu II; it bears part of the vulture and uraeus name of Senusert, and evidently formed part of a jamb of a gateway. This block shows the proportion which the strip of inscription and *ka* name bore to the jamb; and the lintel shows the proportion which it bore to the whole gateway. The dimensions measured and reduced are as follows, in in. :—

	Jamb.	Lintel.
Breadth of <i>ka</i> name .	8·2	4·7
Breadth of jamb .	25·9	∴ 14·8
Edge of jamb to door .	7·8	∴ 4·5
Between <i>ka</i> names .	∴ 107	61·5
Width of door .	∴ 91	∴ 52·5
Length of lintel .	∴ 164	94
Width over jambs .	∴ 143	∴ 82·1

The length of lintel for the great jamb was then at least 143, and probably 164 in. There was probably an even greater lintel here, as some bars of red granite in a Coptic Church, which have been cloven from older lintels, are 97, 157 and 190 in. long. Very possibly that of 157 in. length comes from the lintel of this doorway of Senusert. In proportion the great Coptic lintel of 190 long would imply a doorway of 106 wide, and jambs 30 broad; probably the door was really wider, as the lintel would be less in proportion on the greatest doorways. So we may say that probably the great doorways of Senusert's temple were about 110 and 90 in. wide, and the lesser door of which we have the lintel was 52 in. wide. The largest gateway would be that of the pylon leading into the court. The second door might be that on the foundations in the court; the lintel is 157 long, and the foundations are 163 wide, which well agrees to this length. Lastly the lintel which we found is probably that of the sanctuary itself. And the Coptic lintel of 97 in. is very likely the back beam of the same lintel, as what we have is 94 long. It is interesting to see that the three Coptic beams of granite agree to (1) the existing lintel, (2) the lintel reduced from the great jambs, and the foundations in the court, and (3) what must have been the largest gate of all in the pylon.

The granite palm columns of the portico have been recognized as probably of the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty since they were found, see pls. viii and x, 4. The inscriptions upon them were added by Ramessu II and Merenptah, and the columns will be considered further on.

## CHAPTER III.

THE TEMPLE OF THE XVIII<sup>TH</sup> DYNASTY. PL. VI.

13. It seems certain that there was a temple of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, before a considerable rebuilding by Ramessu II, on the former lines, when we consider the foundations of the facade, as already noted in describing the various levels. And, as the blocks of the back wall, which had objects of Tahutmes III between them, overlies the level at which the drawn lines for the walls are cut (see the lines in pl. x, 2, 3), the outlining of the temple plan must be that of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty. It cannot be earlier, as the blocks under the lines are re-used ones of the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty.

This outlining certainly represented the intended wall faces, as a few blocks of the walls remain with faces in this alignment, within an inch or so. We can therefore recover the exact dimensions of the temple. These drawn lines are shown as dotted lines on the stones in pl. vi.

14. Measuring from the front of the facade, the walls across the axis are 0-103 (?), 764-818, 1076-1117, 1368-1431 inches. Hence the thickness of the walls was 103, 54, 41, 63, or 5, 2½, 2, 3 cubits. The chamber lengths were 661, or 32 cubits of 20·66; 258, or 12½ cubits of 20·64; and 251, which may be an error for the previous amount. The average difference between parts of the same line is less than half an inch, and never exceeds 2 inches.

The breadths of the temple depend on parallelism of the side walls. These walls show a divergence from squareness with the facade of *nil* on west (variations of 2 inches on inner and outer sides balancing), and an average of 1 on 240, or ¼° contraction towards the back, in the east wall. The breadth at the facade is 884 out 755 in; at the small inner hall it is 878 out, and 753 in; at the back it cannot be

taken, as the N.E. corner line is lost. This breadth is divided at the small hall into 189 and 190 for side chamber and one wall (the thickness of which is not marked) and 374 for the small hall. This is 18 cubits of 20·78; and it is divided by columns into spaces of 5½, 7, and 5½ cubits. The back portion of the temple is divided into spaces of 209, 41, 248 (41 ?) (215 ?) inches; evidently 10, 2, 12 (2, 10 ?) cubits.

The court in front had a wall 83 inches, 4 cubits, thick. The east wall is at 667 to 584 from the axis, giving the width of the court 1334 out and 1168 in. The east wall of the court diverges from the temple axis 1 in 100, in the same direction as the east wall of the temple.

15. As the XVIII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty court turned inward to meet the portico, and did not cover the end of the east wall of the XII<sup>th</sup> Dynasty, the portico plan must belong to this age, and have only been rebuilt by Ramessu II. Hence the positions of the granite columns probably belong to this temple, although they have been raised later on. This opens the interesting question of the roofing of the portico. The architraves could not be thicker than the columns, and from them to the facade is a span of 191 inches, or 16 feet. This is far more than any other span in the place, the largest elsewhere being only half of this. It is true this width is exceeded by the roof of the axial way at Karnak; but the size of such a unique roof as that is not likely to have been rivalled merely for the portico of a local temple. The probable conclusion is that there was an intermediate row of columns between those of granite and the facade; and that these being of limestone have been entirely destroyed with their bases.



## CHAPTER IV.

## THE TEMPLE OF THE NINETEENTH DYNASTY. PL. VI.

16. THE form of this temple seems to have exactly followed the lines of the XVIIIth Dynasty. How much of that had been injured can hardly be traced; certainly the whole facade had to be rebuilt, and the basements of the columns in the hypostyle hall show sand beds of this age (level 166 to 175). But the rest of the temple may well have remained mainly intact. There were, however, large additions due to Ramessu II; the colossi along both sides of the court, and large scenes of the *sedheb* festival, were the work of this reign.

In the COURT the bases of colossi were built opposite to each of the columns along the sides of the court. They do not seem to have been placed backing against a square pillar, as at the Ramesseum or Medinet Habu; but rather as free-standing figures, like those placed between the columns at Luqsor. From the fragments found, we know that they were standing figures, with one leg advanced, wearing a ribbed loin-cloth, and with bare feet. They were certainly neither seated nor Osiride figures. The dimensions across the toes are,—

	Ehnasya.	Tanis colossi.	Great colossus.	Modern foot.
Great toe ...	4.1	5.0	14.7	1.2
space ...	1.8	—	—	—
2nd ...	3.1	3.0	12.5	0.8
3rd ...	2.7	2.0	10.4	0.7
4th ...	2.4	5.9	11.2	0.7
5th ...	3.1			
Foot ...	17.2	15.9	57.2	4.0
Figure ...	∴ 235 or 293	221	—	69.5

The comparison with the colossi of Tanis would give 235 for the figure without a crown, or 293 if of modern proportions.

The bases are very irregular. In the midst

of each is a raised mass, shaded in the plan, apparently the core on which the colossus was placed, before being built around with a masonry pedestal. The mass of each base is distinguished here by two diagonals being drawn from corner to corner; but these are only lines for distinction, and do not represent any marks on the stones. The distances of the centres of the bases apart are very variable. The column centres are at  $2 \times 116$ ,  $119\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $2 \times 118$ ,  $114\frac{1}{2}$  apart, or 117 with an average error of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches. But the bases of the colossi average  $115\frac{1}{2}$  apart, with an average error of  $6\frac{1}{2}$  inches. So it is clear that the columns were set out with fair accuracy, and the pedestals of the colossi were added afterwards, probably merely by eye or rough measurement.

On the west side only four bases remain and part of a fifth. The wavy diagonal line across part of the bases marks the size of a single block of stone; and part of this is cut to a higher level, here shaded. Only one column base remains on this side, and no trace of an outer wall. The bases are not opposite one to another, by an average of nearly a foot difference; and not varying in one direction only.

17. Near the front of the court stood two triads of red granite. The western one is perfect, and was found lying face down. The figures are those of Ramessu between Ptah and Hershef. On the back are nine columns of inscription, each containing a different *ka* name of the king, followed by his cartouches. At the lower ends of the columns the king is said to be loved by—

1. Ptah, lord of truth, king of both lands.
2. Horus the great god.
3. Hershef, king of south and north.

4. Ptah, great of eyes.
5. Bastet, loved of Ptah.
6. Atmu, lord of both lands of Heliopolis.
7. Asar-*anaaref*.
8. Ptah-tunen.
9. Amen ra, lord of heaven.

This triad is 95 inches wide and 136 high. The figure of Ptah was painted blue. The figure of Hershef formerly had inlaid eyes. It has been annexed by the Cairo Museum, in addition to the half-share of other things that were found, and will therefore, as in similar cases, stand against some future discovery.

On the east is the lower half of a lesser triad of seated figures of the same gods, 86 wide. The upper half of it was found in a very much weathered state about half-way up the court. The block of granite lying near this triad is 60 by 87 inches and 36 inches high, without any inscription. It may be a portion of the granite pylon.

Part of the court still retains a pavement of limestone, which doubtless extended over the whole of it anciently. This pavement, the southern end of the eastern side of the court, and the positions of the triads, were all planned by Mr. Ayrton after I had left. Towards the north of the court there is a mass of low blocks at 158 to 160, and upon them a sloping ascent up to 174 level, evidently leading up to the temple portico at 200 level.

18. The granite columns of the PORTICO were doubtless placed here by Ramessu, but their positions from which they were overthrown were those of the latest rebuilding, with which we shall notice them and the bases. The problem, however, which faces us in the Ramesside temple is that of the spacing. The columns cannot have then been farther apart than in the plan, because the blocks of architrave would not then fit on them; and those blocks are inscribed on each side and below by Ramessu. Yet we see here a wide gap in the row of columns; and not a trace of any more

columns or bases has been found. In view of the six bases and six columns remaining all complete, it seems strange that other bases and columns should have entirely disappeared. Yet the architraves must have continued across the front, as the inscriptions require this to complete them (see pl. xviii). Now the intervals of the columns (centre to centre) average 76 inches; and the space in the middle (centre to centre) is 313 inches. This is, therefore, about four column intervals; yet filling in the three columns to produce an even series would place one in the axis. This seems impossible; and so we are driven to suppose two more columns, and a double interval in the axis, leaving an opening 132 wide between the columns, and requiring an architrave of 161 to span centre to centre. Now we have already noted that the Coptic granite lintel of 157 would agree to the length of about 164 required for the great jambs, and 163 width of foundation in the court. It seems as if the old lintel of which we have the jamb, and apparently the foundations also, was used by Ramessu to span the middle of his colonnade, as he used the jamb for another of the architraves; and these were ultimately carried off and split lengthways for the Coptic church.

The seated quartzite figure of a king of the XIIth Dynasty, usurped by Ramessu, was found still upright in the N.-E. corner of the portico, by Dr. Naville. The fellow figure stood in the opposite corner, where we found the throne split and overturned. This is kept at Cairo.

The facade has been entirely removed to the foundations, excepting the carved blocks of brown quartzite, which formed the lowest course (see pl. xvii). The inscriptions extend from each side of the axial doorway along the back and sides of the portico, and end in a group of cartouches on the south faces of the two side walls. The blocks are deeply cut, and several of the signs are filled with detail in the hollows. But the hawk has been carelessly cut too high on the west of the door, running up into the