

## W. M. Flinders Petrie's 1907/08 Dig Season Near Sūhāġ

Re-considering the records and relocating the finds from the BSAE excavations at the sites of al-Haġārīsa, Athribis-Atrīpe, and the Shenute Monastery (ad-Dayr al-Abyaḍ)

### Part I: The photographic record: Views of sites, monuments, and artefacts

By Rafed El-Sayed

This is the first in a series of planned articles on the BSAE expedition directed by Flinders Petrie in 1907/08 at three separate Upper Egyptian sites, located within three kilometres of each other on the west bank of the Nile in the Sūhāġ district. Petrie used the name 'Athribis' for all three in published and unpublished accounts of his work. The following attempted reexamination of Petrie's published reports and unpublished records was undertaken in the context of the author's field work and current research on the archaeology and topography of the region, based primarily on work conducted in museums and archives. One aim has been the localisation and identification of finds made in the vicinity of Sūhāġ published by Petrie only cursorily in his reports of 1908 and 1909. Shortly after arrival in London, the objects were distributed among several collections in the United Kingdom and continental Europe. In 2012 the author and his team began locating and recording the objects for renewed documentation and reprocessing. This contribution focuses on publication and analysis of photographs, for the most part unpublished, made during the 1907/08 season near Sūhāġ and today in the Petrie Museum Archive, London.

## I Introduction

### 1.0 Preliminary remarks

Until today much remains unclear concerning the work conducted and the results achieved during Petrie's investigation of the sites subsumed under his use of the term Athribis. This is true concerning the published reports as well as the unpublished photographic record. Despite some remaining uncertainties, the photographs provide unique documentation of the region in 1907/08. Furthermore, they supplement our knowledge of the early twentieth century landscapes of the Sūhāġ area and document Petrie's interest in landscape photography.<sup>1</sup>

The ancient and modern history of archaeological sites within the borders of the historical ninth nome of Upper Egypt that includes the sites at the foot of the western mountain chain near Sūhāġ (**pl. I**), is a focus of the author's continuing research.<sup>2</sup> One of its aims is the reconstruction of the sacred landscapes here – their topography, toponymy, and archaeology. The approach involves not just the geography of the area and the archaeology of the monumental sites but also the material culture recovered. The artefacts, now dispersed in collections world wide, were once embedded in the sacred landscape; thus very often their iconography makes reference to the topography with which they were originally associated.

Since Petrie did not return to the sites near Sūhāġ for further clarification, his investigations in the area remained provisional.<sup>3</sup> The results were published in 1908 and 1909 and most of the artefacts Petrie was allotted at the

1 On the importance of the documentation for the author's approach see R. El-Sayed, *Die Archäologie des religiösen Wandels. Kulturlandschaft und materielle Kultur des Raumes von Ahmīm-Panopolis von der Spätantike bis in das frühe Mittelalter [3.-9. Jh.]* (in preparation).

2 For the author's habilitation project on *'The Archaeology of Religious Change'* (s. note 1) cf. the website of the Mīn-Panos project <[www.min-panos.uni-goettingen.de](http://www.min-panos.uni-goettingen.de)>

3 Before leaving for Memphis in January 1908 Petrie still considered returning to the Sūhāġ sites, cf. M. S. Drower, *Letters from the Desert: The Correspondence of Flinders and Hilda Petrie* (Oxford, 2004), 184.

division were distributed among the supporters of his work shortly after the end of the season in 1908. Since then very little attention was paid to the objects and records. It would be the early 1980s before exploration of the sites was resumed by foreign and Egyptian missions. One among them was initiated by the author in 1998 and directed jointly with Yahia El-Masry, then director of the local Sūhāḡ Inspectorate for Antiquities from 2003 until 2011.<sup>4</sup> The reconsideration of the unpublished records and traceable finds related to the 1907/08 Sūhāḡ mission began in 2010<sup>5</sup> and continues, since 2012, in the framework of the Göttingen Mīn-Panos project. A central goal of this project is the creation of an archaeological information system for the ninth nome of Upper Egypt.<sup>6</sup> The AIS comprises primary data including maps, photographs, drawings, etc. as well as archival material, along with secondary data such as excavation reports, both published and unpublished, travellogues and so forth. It will in future serve as a web-based tool for interdisciplinary research on the area.

One of the first archaeological excavations on the west bank of the Panopolite Nome was Petrie's venture of 1907/08. The focus of the following pages is the excavated sites and monuments as recorded in Petrie's publications, unpublished records, and his on-site photographs which are currently among the archival material in the Petrie Museum, London. Sections 1.1 to 1.3 reconsider the 1907/08 season and the problem of identifying the sites, monuments, and artefacts pictured in the photographs. Part II is an annotated catalogue of the Petrie Museum Archive negatives (PMAN), not presented in numerical order, but arranged according to the sites and monuments identified in the photographs. To introduce each site a short bibliography and a brief general description is provided. Preliminary conclusions and appendices – a list of negative numbers, a set of thumbnail images, and plates with additional illustrations – are provided.

### 1.1 Petrie's dig season near Sūhāḡ: duration, team, work assignments and objectives

Petrie's final excavation report is rather uninformative as far as the precise length of the season, the staff involved, and their responsibilities:<sup>7</sup>

*We accordingly camped there [scil. at Athribis], while some of the party were two miles further north, at the Deir Amba Shenudeh, or White Monastery, and our work extended to copying tombs two miles to the south, near Hagarseh. [...] meanwhile, we have done in a month or two as much as a temporary excavation will allow. 3. The party at Athribis fluctuated in number, owing to work elsewhere. Mr. Ernest Mackay<sup>[8]</sup> was there for ten weeks, from the beginning to the end of the work. I was there for seven weeks, arranging the work and copying. Herr Schuler of Munich was occupied in copying for a month, mainly on the zodiac tomb. Mr. Wainwright<sup>[9]</sup> was copying for three weeks. Mr. E. Ward<sup>[10]</sup>, Mr. Ivo Gregg, and Mr. Humphry Hill were at the place for a fortnight, but mostly concerned with finishing the plan of the Coenobium, which they had excavated during a fortnight before. Mr. Gregory Wyatt stayed for ten days, and did some of the copying. The net amount of work in excavating and copying at Athribis was about six weeks to two months for three people.*

Additional information concerning the duration of the season and the work accomplished is given by Petrie in his autobiography:<sup>11</sup>

- 
- 4 R. El-Sayed and Y. El-Masry (eds), *Athribis I: General Site Survey 2003 – 2007. Archaeological & Conservation Studies. The Gate of Ptolemy IX. Architecture and Inscriptions* (Le Caire, 2012). For the history of research in the area, see 1.2, below. A comprehensive review covering the 17th to the 21st century will be included in the author's habilitation (see n. 1).
  - 5 El-Sayed, in El-Sayed and El-Masry (eds), *Athribis I*, 77 and 77 n. 28–30.
  - 6 See R. El-Sayed, C. Häuber and F. X. Schütz, 'AIS Mīn-Panos': *Developing an Archaeological Information System for the Panopolite Nome (Akhmīm) in Upper Egypt* (Studia Panopolitana, Occasional Paper 1; Göttingen, 2016) <webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/pub/mon/2016/1-el-sayed.pdf>.
  - 7 W. M. Fl. Petrie, *Athribis* (BSAE 14; London, 1908), 1–2. Author's remarks and numbers of footnotes in [].
  - 8 On Mackay see M. L. Bierbrier, *Who Was Who in Egyptology* (4th rev. edn; London, 2012), 348.
  - 9 On G. A. Wainwright, see Bierbrier, *Who Was Who*, 562.
  - 10 On Ward see A. Stephenson, 'Artefacts of Excavation', *EA* 46 (2015), 29. To date it has not been possible to locate information about other members of Petrie's team.
  - 11 W. M. Fl. Petrie, *Seventy Years in Archaeology* (London, 1930), 209–210.

*On November 14, 1907, I started, the students being Mackay and Ward as last year, also Gregg and Hill, and Schuler, a German architect sent by von Bissing. We began by settling at Deir el Abyad, December 2nd, in order to find the meaning of ruins near the monastery. [...] After a week I moved to Athribis, and a week later our party settled there. The temple proved to be entirely Ptolemaic, and to have the peculiar feature of a peristyle court surrounding the whole, probably to Greek influence. I copied much of the sculpture, [...] We copied the very rare examples of zodiac horoscopes of Roman age, painted on tomb ceilings. Some rock tombs of the IVth or Vth century at Hagarseh were also fully copied and published. On January 1, Ward and Schuler went to Memphis to begin building our house; but German ideas did not fit with Egyptian conditions, and there was hardly a habitable room by the 27th when I moved there.*

More precise information can be found in the pocket diary concerning the years 1907–08.<sup>12</sup> The respective entries read as follows [pl. II]: 30<sup>th</sup> of November 1907: “Up to Sohag with Schuler”,<sup>13</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> of December 1907: “Over to Deir Abyad. [?] Athribis”,<sup>14</sup> 25<sup>th</sup> January 1908: “Corniche found to be reused in floor, 1<sup>st</sup> temple destroyed”, 26<sup>th</sup> January 1908: “packing”, 27<sup>th</sup> January 1908: “Down to Bedreshen – 3 rooms built, all soaking wet”. Thus the field work at the Sūhāḡ sites commenced on December 2, 1907 and continued until January 25<sup>th</sup> 1908.<sup>15</sup>

Petrie explained his motives for excavating the sites near Sūhāḡ and outlined the main objectives he pursued as follows:<sup>16</sup>

*To work Memphis the season should be as late as possible, for the subsidence of the water. Hence it was necessary to fill the earlier part of the season by short work further south. A ruined temple was known at Athribis near Sohag, so I applied for that region, and also to work Memphis.*

The same motivation for working the sites is given in the introduction to the excavation report:<sup>17</sup>

*Before beginning work at Memphis, two or three months can only be spent on excavation in drier sites, for the inundation covers the area of the great temple of Ptah till the middle of February, and the surrounding mounds are so damp below, and so miry with continual rain, that work on them is not desirable in December and January. In view of this, the work of the British School was resumed in Upper Egypt, in the same region as last year,<sup>[18]</sup> for the beginning of the season.*

Petrie might have considered working at the Sūhāḡ sites as early as 1901, when he first visited the area during a return trip from Abydos (see below).<sup>19</sup> Already during his first short visit to the region that year, he had copied some inscriptions at Athribis-Atrīpe.<sup>20</sup> On the peculiarities of the site Petrie stated:<sup>21</sup>

*Seven years ago I had noticed, near Sohag, the site known as Athribis; here there appeared to be the ruins of a temple, covered by sand, on the desert edge. It is so seldom that temple ruins are on the desert, and not swallowed in the growth of Nile deposits in the plain, that it seemed desirable to examine this.*

12 On the pocket diaries see P. Del Vesco, ‘Day after day with Flinders Petrie. Pocket diaries from the archive of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, University College London’, in M. Betrò and G. Miniaci (eds), *Talking along the Nile: Ippolito Rossellini, travellers and scholars of the 19th century in Egypt. Proceedings of the international conference held on the occasion of the presentation of progetto Rosellini. Pisa, June 14–16, 2012*, (Pisa, 2013). A digital copy of the diaries was kindly provided to the author by the Petrie Museum.

13 Page 109, see pl. II.

14 Page 110, see pl. II.

15 In W. M. Fl. Petrie, *Memphis I*, (BSAE 14; London, 1909), 1 January 26 is the date cited for Petrie’s arrival at Memphis. Pace El-Sayed and El-Masry, *Athribis I*, 57.

16 Petrie, *Seventy Years*, 209.

17 Petrie, *Athribis*, 1. See also, British School of Archaeology in Egypt, *Catalogue of Egyptian Antiquities, found by Prof. Flinders Petrie and Students at Memphis and Athribis. 1908. Exhibited at University College, Gower St., London, W.C., June 29th to July 25th* (London, 1908), 3.

18 During the season 1906/07 Petrie had worked at Abydos, 50 kilometres south of Sūhāḡ.

19 M. S. Drower, *Flinders Petrie: A Life in Archaeology* (London, 1985), 263, 308. Drower, *Letters from the Desert*, 165.

20 Drower, *Flinders Petrie*, 263. This copying most probably took place in the ‘zodiac tomb’, which was presumably accessible on Petrie’s first visit; see Petrie, *Athribis*, 12: ‘For many years a tomb has stood open, [...]’

21 Petrie, *Athribis*, 1.

## 1.2 The results of the BSAE excavations:

### published reports etc., unpublished records and artefacts in museums

The final results of the 1907/08 Sūhāḡ season were presented in ‘*Athribis*’,<sup>22</sup> the first of two excavation reports of that year. A short *addendum* was provided in the second report of the 14<sup>th</sup> BSAE memoir year, ‘*Memphis I*’.<sup>23</sup> Some further notes are retrievable from two occasional publications of the same year – a brief descriptive catalogue for an exhibition on the 1908 season, organised by Petrie and his students, shown at University College,<sup>24</sup> and a short announcement published by the British School concerning the work accomplished during 1908.<sup>25</sup>

The excavation report related to the work in Upper Egypt combines the results achieved at all three sites near Sūhāḡ: ‘Hagarseh’ [pl. III], Athribis-Atrīpe [pl. IVb], and the Shenute Monastery [pl. IVa]. In general, the work centred on epigraphic and architectural recording – drawings, photographs, and descriptions of the epigraphic and architectural record. Most of the pencil drawings were inked on site so that the plates were ready for publication before Petrie returned to London.<sup>26</sup> Tracings of the pottery and drawings of the small finds were only done in London.<sup>27</sup>

As was customary, the final publication included only a selection of the photographs taken on site.<sup>28</sup> Forty-eight of the photographs Petrie took in the course of his excavations have been identified in the archives of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, University College London.<sup>29</sup> Many of the glass negatives bear notations that aid in ascribing them to specific sites.<sup>30</sup> In the case of the ‘Athribis’ negatives, fifteen of forty-eight are annotated. Aside from the glass negatives and Petrie’s publications, the notebooks and pocket diaries<sup>31</sup> are the only additional records known to exist today for the years 1907 and 1908.<sup>32</sup> The last are most problematic, not only due to illegibility, but mainly because, in general, there is no discernible structure enabling identification of the precise find spot of a particular item. The notebooks provide little information concerning the discoveries of the season that go beyond the published excavation report. On the other hand, some scattered remarks about the 1907/08 season near Sūhāḡ can be also gleaned from Petrie’s correspondence.<sup>33</sup>

The artefacts that were excavated and sent to London in spring 1908 still can add fundamentally to our understanding of the sites investigated.<sup>34</sup> Most were distributed in summer 1908, primarily among British and continental European collections. Only some remained at University College London and are at the Petrie Museum today. The artefacts, embedded in multiple excavation and museum contexts, will be discussed in detail in the forthcoming segments of the study.

22 Petrie, *Athribis*.

23 Petrie, *Memphis I*.

24 British School of Archaeology in Egypt, *Catalogue 1908*. On the post season exhibitions see now A. Thornton, ‘Exhibition Season: Annual Archaeological Exhibitions in London, 1880s-1930s’, *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* 25,2 (2015), 1–18. See also A. Thornton, ‘“... a certain faculty for extracting cash”: Collective Sponsorship in Late 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century British Archaeology’, *Present Pasts* 5,1 (2013), 1–12.

25 The British School of Archaeology in Egypt, *Excavations at Memphis. 1908* (London, 1908).

26 Drower, *Letters from the Desert*, 182–183.

27 Petrie, *Memphis I*, 15. On the pottery cf. the forthcoming second segment of this study. On the small finds see the third segment of this study.

28 M. Serpico, ‘History of the Petrie Photographic Archive’, in J. Picton and I. Pridden (eds), *Unseen Images: Archive Photographs in the Petrie Museum. Volume I: Gurob, Sedment and Tarkhan* (London, 2008), 10. On page 28 of the 1907 notebook Petrie lists the illustrations to be included into the final publication.

29 See below 1.2.

30 On these annotations see Serpico, in Picton and Pridden (eds), *Unseen Images*, 10.

31 Discussion of this recently digitised record is found in Del Vesco, in Betrò and Miniaci (eds), *Talking along the Nile*, 83–92.

32 Originals of the diaries and copies of the journals were consulted at the Petrie Museum.

33 Drower, *Letters from the Desert*, 165, 182–184. The copies of the 1907 and 1908 journals held at the Petrie Museum did not include any letters concerning the Sūhāḡ mission. At Manchester, however, a copy of Petrie’s letter concerning this mission dating to January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1908 could be identified. The letter does, however, not provide any information going beyond the published reports.

34 In the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, no finds could be located that could be attributed with certainty to Petrie’s 1907/08 campaign at the sites near Sūhāḡ.

### 1.3 Identifying sites, monuments and artefacts in the records

For various reasons Petrie's 1907/08 dig season presents problems of interpretation. Confusion arises, first of all, with the attribution of finds either to Memphis or to one of the Sūhāḡ sites since both missions, one in northern and the other in southern Egypt, took place during the same season. The finds arrived together in London in spring 1908; some mix-up might even have occurred during the packing as well as during the unpacking of them. Furthermore, for published and archival provenance information, even museum register entries and words or numbers written directly on objects, the same critical assessment has to be applied as to any historical document.<sup>35</sup>

The main potential for confusion, however, arises from the topography and related material culture of the two sites located at the mountain of Atrīpe (**pl. I**), since both were closely associated with the toponym (geonym) Athribis-Atrīpe (see below).<sup>36</sup> These two sites, three kilometres apart, were in fact closely related, at least during late antiquity (ca. 280–850 AD; see below). They must, however, be clearly differentiated topographically and from an archaeological standpoint as well.

Before late antiquity these sites, although within the same cultic landscape, were independent settlements. Early in the fourth century AD they both became associated with the 'White Monastery federation'. Centred at the northern extension of Mount Atrīpe, this federation also comprised the monastic site known today as 'Pshoi Monastery' (Dayr al-Anbā Bīšūy) or 'Red Monastery' (ad-Dayr al-Aḡmar) respectively.<sup>37</sup> The third site, the necropolis of al-Haḡārīsa, is located three kilometres south of Athribis-Atrīpe. It was tentatively identified by Petrie as the cemetery of the predecessor settlement of 'Athribis' which he presumed was located at the modern village of aṣ-Ṣalā'.<sup>38</sup> He based his hypothesis on the fact that he could not locate any evidence for occupation earlier than the Late Period at Athribis-Atrīpe, even though at the site of al-Haḡārīsa, the tombs dated as early as the Old Kingdom. While this is not the place to go into the details of this problem it should be mentioned that the attribution of al-Haḡārīsa to the ninth nome of Upper Egypt is not entirely certain.<sup>39</sup> Furthermore, the cemetery belonged to a town named *Hr-šn*,<sup>40</sup> which must be distinguished from Athribis-Atrīpe. This renders Petrie's hypothesis quite unlikely.<sup>41</sup>

Today all three sites are located within the borders of the administrative district of Sūhāḡ. The modern town of Sūhāḡ<sup>42</sup> is situated on the west bank of the Nile, directly on the river and thus about six kilometres distant from the western mountains and both the Shenute Monastery and Athribis-Atrīpe. It must not be amalgamated with the monastic sites on the desert fringe, as has sometimes been the case.<sup>43</sup> In this study the following nomenclature is employed. The place name Athribis(-Atrīpe), if not set off typographically (e.g., with quotation marks), refers to the archaeological site of Athribis (Atrībīs in modern Arabic) situated near the village of Naḡ' aṣ-Ṣayḡ Ḥamad. To distinguish between the archaeological site named after the village of al-Haḡārīsa and the village itself, the former is always specified as *site/necropolis* of al-Haḡārīsa, while the latter is called the *village* of al-Haḡārīsa. The White Monastery (of Shenute) is so named, without adding 'at Atrīpe' or a similar qualifier.

35 See the next part of this study. I thank Stephen Quirke for discussing this aspect with me.

36 R. El-Sayed, 'Shenute und die Tempel von Atripe. Zur Umnutzung des Triphisbezirks in der Spätantike', in H. Knuf et al. (eds), *Honi soit qui mal y pense. Studien zum pharaonischen, griechisch-römischen und spätantiken Ägypten zu Ehren von Heinz-Josef Thissen*, (OLA 194; Leuven etc 2010), 519–538, pls. 93–97. El-Sayed, in El-Sayed and El-Masry (eds), *Athribis I*, 7.

37 B. Layton, *The Canons of Our Fathers: Monastic Rules of Shenoute*, (Oxford, 2014), 11–14.

38 Petrie, *Athribis*, 1. The identification goes back to C. R. Lepsius (see below).

39 N. Kanawati, *El-Hagarsa I*, (ACE Reports 4; Sydney, 1993), 7 considers it more likely that the necropolis and the associated town were situated within the borders of the 9th nome. See as well N. Kanawati, 'Akhmim', in K. A. Bard (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt* (London and New York, 1999) 125–126 and H. Brunner, *Die Anlagen der ägyptischen Felsgräber bis zum Mittleren Reich* (ÄF 3; Glückstadt-Hamburg-New York, 1936), 23.

40 El-Sayed and El-Masry (eds), *Athribis I*, 15.

41 Discussed in detail in El-Sayed, *Die Archäologie des religiösen Wandels* (forthcoming).

42 For the available information on the archaeology and history of the town site of Sūhāḡ see El-Sayed, in El-Sayed and El-Masry (eds), *Athribis I*, 5, 9. The subject is dealt with more extensively in the author's forthcoming study on the Aḡmīm district.

43 Verbeek, s.v. 'Sohag', in *LÄ IV*, 1052–1054; D. Klotz, 'Two Studies on the Late Period Temples at Abydos', *BIFAO* 110 (2010), 129; S. Grallert, *Bauen – Stiften – Weißen. Ägyptische Bau- und Restaurierungsinchriften von den Anfängen bis zur 30. Dynastie*, (ADAIK 18; Berlin, 2001), 490.

## 1.4 Locating and contextualising the finds

For localising the finds reproduced or only mentioned in the publications, a systematic procedure was not practicable since no comprehensive register of them exists. Neither the notebooks<sup>44</sup> nor the distribution lists<sup>45</sup> include such information. According to a few indications in Petrie's publications and the information that can be extracted from the distribution lists, objects were sent in the main to the following museums and private sponsors (who very often sold them to museums or other collectors):<sup>46</sup> London, The British Museum; London, Victoria and Albert Museum; Bristol, The Bristol Museum; Manchester, The Manchester Museum; Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Museum (now the National Museum of Scotland); Brussels, Musée du Cinquantenaire; Munich, collection von Bissing, now in large part in the Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam.<sup>47</sup>

The contextualisation of the finds is, again, a complex affair which will be discussed in more detail in forthcoming installments of the study. For the majority of finds attribution to any one of the three different sites – Athribis-Atrīpe, al-Haġārīsa site, Shenute Monastery site – remains in general uncertain. Moreover, in some instances, a possible attribution to Memphis must even be considered (see below).

## II Petrie Museum Archive negatives: Sites and monuments in the photographic record

### 2.1 'Athribis' in the Petrie Museum Archives (PMA)

Forty-eight<sup>48</sup> negatives in the Petrie Museum archives are currently ascribed to the 1907/08 season near Sūhāġ, although for some attributions doubts persist. More may exist among the unidentified negatives while others might have been lost.<sup>49</sup> Views of the landscape, monuments, and finds at/from the sites of al-Haġārīsa and Athribis-Atrīpe (near Naġ' aš-Šayḥ Ḥamad) are included, but no photographs of the Shenute Monastery site could be identified and probably none were ever taken during the BSAE excavations at this site.<sup>50</sup> Petrie himself took most of the photographs.<sup>51</sup> Those of the tomb of Mery II in the cemetery of al-Haġārīsa were, however, reportedly taken by Ernest Mackay.<sup>52</sup> Unfortunately, no photograph of the exhibition held following the season could be identified among the PMA negatives.

44 On the notebooks see S. Quirke, 'Petrie Archives in London and Oxford', in: D. Magee et al (eds), *Sitting Besides Lepsius. Studies in Honour of Jaromir Malek at the Griffith Institute* (OLA 185; Leuven-Paris-Walpole, Mass, 2009), 442–461.

45 For the distribution system see A. Stevenson, 'Artefacts of Excavation. The British collection and distribution of Egyptian finds to museums', 1880–1915, *JHC* 26,1 (2013), 89–102.

46 See the list on the 'Digital Egypt for Universities' website <<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/museums-static/digitalegypt/archaeology/athribismemphisdistribution.html>> and PM V, 33 and now the website <[www.egyptartefacts.griffith.ox.ac.uk](http://www.egyptartefacts.griffith.ox.ac.uk)>.

47 On the history of von Bissing's collection see C. E. Loeben, *Die Ägypten-Sammlung des Museum August Kestner und ihre Kriegsverluste*, (Rahden/Westf. 2011), 85–115; A. Grimm, S. Schoske, *Friedrich Wilhelm Freiherr von Bissing. Ägyptologe – Mäzen – Sammler*, (Ramses 5; München, 2010).

48 This is the total number in the PMA ascribed to 'Athribis' and 'Hagarseh'. The current labelling of the negatives was done in the 1980's by Joan Merritt. Cf. Quirke, 'Petrie Archives' in: Magee et al (eds), *Fs Malek*, 442. The unpublished inventory *Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology University College London, Photographic Archive I: Negatives from Archaeological Sites* (London, 1996) compiled by Merritt lists 46 negatives for Athribis (without 'Hagarseh') but still including one view (PMAN 625) that has without any doubt to be attributed to the site of al-Haġārīsa.

49 The history of the archives is told by Serpico, in Picton and Pridden (eds), *Unseen Images*, 10 and in more detail by Quirke, 'Petrie Archives', in Magee et al (eds), *Fs Malek*, 442; idem, 'Borderlines: questions of definition among the documentary and pictorial archives amid the collections of the Petrie Museum', *Egyptian & Egyptological Documents, Archives, Libraries I* (Milano, 2009), 129–130. A systematic revision of the archives by the author proved impractical. On the history of the Petrie Museum see now A. Stevenson and D. Challis, 'Introduction: a modest little museum' in A. Stevenson (ed.), *The Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology. Characters and collections* (London, 2015) 11–23.

50 There is no explicit mention of photographs being taken at the Shenute monastery site.

51 This can be assumed based on the explicit mention of photographs taken by other members of the mission, see Petrie, *Athribis*, 4.

52 Petrie, *Athribis*, 4.

## 2.2 ‘Hagarseh’ (al-Haḡārīsa, site)

El-Sayed & El-Masry, *Athribis I* (2012), 15, 53–55, 57–58. – Grallert, *Bauen* (2001), 490. – Bard, *Encyclopedia*, 124–128, 316–319 (1999). – Kanawati, *El-Hagarsa I–III* (1993–1995). – Schenkel, *MHT* (1965), 38–40. – PM V, 34–35 (1937). – Brunner, *Felsgräber* (1936), 23–25, 61–62, 79, 86. – Urk. I, 266–267 (1933). – Petrie, *Athribis* (1908), 2–4, pls. I–XIII. – LD, Text II, 159–160.

### 2.2.1 The Site: location,<sup>53</sup> toponymy, topography, and history of exploration

The archaeological site of al-Haḡārīsa is located at 26°29’20’’N/31°40’05’’E; it covers an area of low desert and extends to the escarpment of the Libyan Desert plateau. The site was named by Petrie after the modern village of al-Haḡārīsa<sup>54</sup> [26°28’30’’N/31°40’30’’E], half a kilometre to the southeast of the escarpment. The nearest village of noteworthy size at that time was aṣ-Ṣalā’<sup>55</sup> [26°29’34’’N/31°43’28’’E], situated at a distance of five kilometres to the east of the archaeological site. Immediately south of al-Haḡārīsa is the village of al-Kawāmil<sup>56</sup> (baḡrī) [26°28’05’’N/31°40’56’’E], that had already received mention in Lepsius’ account (see below).

The archaeological site comprises a series of rock-cut tombs datable to the end of the Old Kingdom<sup>57</sup> and settlement remains on the low desert. At least some of the tombs were allegedly reused in later periods of Egyptian history as burial places for crocodiles.<sup>58</sup> Both sites were occupied in late antiquity by a monastic community recently identified as the Monastery of Apa Paulos (see below).

The first survey of the site was made by the Prussian expedition in 1845.<sup>59</sup> Lepsius reported extensive mounds below the tombs of al-Haḡārīsa, more precisely at the village of ‘kauāmi’,<sup>60</sup> a name most likely linked linguistically to al-Kawāmil baḡrī. The next expedition to al-Haḡārīsa was led by Petrie, who, astonishingly, does not mention any mounds near the site.<sup>61</sup> Petrie’s brief account of his initial brief visit in February 1901 reads:

[...] so we took our way to Kawamil, a straggly village on the desert edge, where men were weaving in the side alleys. While Ali had the camel unloaded and tent pitched, F. and I went off exploring to the cliff-face of the high gebel which here projects to the cultivation, and discovered a ruined Coptic monastery under the precipitous headland which was itself the home of many other brethren formerly, as all the natural caves and all the rock-cut Egyptian tombs had been used by Coptic hermits and monastics. The face of the rock was riddled with rows of small square openings, the tomb-doorways being hewn out with a lintel above: there were thirty or more in each row! We climbed up about 250 ft. to the tomb, and just got down by sunset. [...]

This epitome can be compared to Petrie’s general description of the location and condition of the site’s main features in his 1908 report:<sup>62</sup>

[...] The site of the older [scil. compared to Athribis] city was probably more to the south, most likely at Es Sala’a, as the tombs of the Old Kingdom are opposite to that. From Sohag is seen a great headland of cliff projecting into the Nile

53 Coordinates are given according to Esri ArcGIS online.

54 Petrie, *Athribis*, 1. M. Ramzī, *al-Qāmūs al-ḡuḡrāfī li-l-bilād al-miṣrīya min ‘ahd qudamā al-miṣrīyīn ‘ilā sanat 1945*, 3 vols. (al-Qāhira, 1953–1968), 131. Al-Haḡārīsa is classified as nāḡiya/village by A. Boinet Bey, *Dictionnaire Géographique de l’Égypte* (Le Caire, 1899), 225, with 841 inhabitants in 1899.

55 Ramzī, *Qāmūs*, 123. aṣ-Ṣalā’ is classified as nāḡiya/village by Boinet Bey, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, 476, with 2.926 inhabitants in 1899.

56 LD, Text II, 160–161. On al-Kawāmil baḡrī see Ramzī, *Qāmūs*, 131. al-Kawāmil baḡrī is classified as nāḡiya/village by Boinet Bey, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, 315, with 3.676 (including suburbs: 6.282) inhabitants in 1899.

57 Kanawati, in Bard (ed.), *Encyclopedia*, 125.

58 Petrie, *Athribis*, 3.

59 25. May 1845, LD, Text II, 160.

60 LD, Text II, 159–160; cf. El-Sayed and El-Masry, *Athribis I*, 15, 53.

61 Petrie, *Athribis*, 2 mentions only the ‘brick-built deir’ in the plain. The mounds noted by Lepsius might have been located a little more to the south and were thus not recognised by Petrie. Nor is there any mention of them in his letter of 1901, see Drower, *Letters from the Desert*, 165. By 1901, Lepsius’s mounds at al-Kawāmil(l), might have been dug away by *sabbāḡīn*. For *sibāḡ* exploitation in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries cf. D. M. Bailey, ‘Sebak, Sherds and Survey’, *JEA* 85 (1999), 211–218.

62 Petrie, *Athribis*, 1–2.

valley; the early tombs [scil. those of al-Haḡārisa] are south-ward of that, and the later town [scil. 'Athribis'] to the north. The modern village nearest to the tombs is Hagarseh, a mile south-east [scil. from the rock cemetery at al-Haḡārisa], and they are here named from that place.

[...] Nearly five miles south of Sohag, the cliffs of the western desert are pierced with a large group of rock-tombs, as shown in the diagram-view, Pl. I. [...] Few of the tombs contain any inscriptions or sculpture. Most of them are small recesses, about three feet square, leading to a pit; some of them have a chamber about five feet wide above the pit. Most of them have been occupied by Coptic recluses, belonging to a brick-built *deir* which stands on the plain below. Some Coptic paintings remain in the chamber at the south end of the top row, and there is one scene of the ascent of Elijah.

In the late 1980s the rock-cut tombs were reinvestigated completely for the first time by a team from Macquarie University directed by Naguib Kanawati. The architectural and epigraphic record of the decorated tombs was published shortly thereafter.<sup>63</sup> In 2010/11 another team from Macquarie University surveyed the Late Antique monastic remains at the site which, thanks to a Coptic inscription, could be identified as the hitherto unknown Monastery of Apa Paulos.<sup>64</sup>

### 2.2.2 Reprography of recordings

Some of the plates prepared for the publication showing inked plans and drawings were photographed by Petrie. The Petrie Museum Archive preserves photographs of five of the forty-three plates published. The photographs were probably taken for teaching purposes.<sup>65</sup> Some of the drawings and plans shown at the post-season exhibition held at University College were most likely the original plates.<sup>66</sup> With two exceptions (PMAN 591 and 592), the reprographies of published plans and tracings are neither reproduced nor commented upon here but for the sake of completeness they are included in the appended negative and thumbnail lists.

### 2.2.3 Site views

Among the photographs taken during the season are several general views of sites and landscapes. They must be regarded as unique documentations of the individual sites and the area of Sūhāḡ-Aḡmīm which, down until the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, were counted among the remote areas of Egypt, neither frequently photographed nor sketched by archaeologists, artists, or the military like other regions of Egypt.<sup>67</sup> PMAN 625 and 627 in particular illustrate the documentary value of the site views as regards the archaeology of each site. PMAN 622 and again 627 moreover constitute invaluable documentation of the state and development of landscapes in the Sūhāḡ district in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

PMAN 625: This view was taken from a position up the mountain looking southeastwards. The juxtaposition of low desert at the foot of the mountain and the cultivated plain is clearly distinguishable. The view with building remains in the centre was obviously meant to show their position on the low desert ground. The structure can be identified as the '*brick-built deir*' that Petrie mentions in his excavation report.<sup>68</sup> The photograph shows the masonry still preserved at places nearly to the top of a second storey. The southern walls are pierced by rows of windows. Since Petrie's day the building has severely deteriorated (see **Pl. IIIb**).<sup>69</sup> Its precise function remains unknown. A considerable number of circular pits dug into the soil are clearly distinguishable, distributed regularly around the structure.

63 Kanawati, *El-Hagarsa I–III*.

64 M. Choat and K. Parry, The Sohag Survey Project's unpublished internal reports for the 2010 spring and winter seasons.

65 Cf. Serpico, in Picton and Pridden (eds), *Unseen Images*, 10.

66 British School of Archaeology in Egypt, *Catalogue 1908*, 4, 5.

67 No photographs were taken e.g. by Wreszinski, cf. W. Wreszinski, *Bericht über die photographische Expedition von Kairo bis Wadi Halfa zwecks Abschluß der Materialsammlung für meinen Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte*, (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse, Jahr 4, Heft 2; Halle a. S., 1927).

68 Petrie, *Athribis*, 2.

69 M. Choat and K. Parry, The Sohag Survey Project's unpublished internal reports for the 2010 spring and winter seasons.