Memorial monuments at Abydos and the ‘Terrace of the Great God’

Steven Snape

Private stelae of the Middle Kingdom from Abydos constitute one of the most important datasets available to the Egyptologist. They have been used by scholars interested in, for instance, the epigraphy, genealogy and prosopography of the Middle Kingdom. They have been especially useful in the study of interactions between Osirian cult practice at Abydos and the interests of non-royal individuals. The way in which these private individuals operated within the specific topography of the sacred landscape of Abydos is an important subset of such scholarship, and one which will also be explored in this paper.

Many museum collections include stelae from Abydos, although few have any significant information regarding their original context or circumstances of removal from the site. Much of the reason for this combination of ubiquity and poor provenance is, of course, the history of their large-scale ‘harvesting’ at Abydos before any serious attempts at recorded excavation there. Some of these circumstances as they relate to the formation (and subsequent dispersal) of some of the great collections of Abydene stelae in the 18th and 19th centuries are explained in Simpson’s *Terrace of the Great God* (1974). That volume is of fundamental importance in the study of Abydene stelae in that it attempts to link some of these individual artefacts by assigning them to related assemblages, Simpson’s ANOC (Abydos North Offering Chapel) groups. The underlying idea of the ANOC is that its contents were not intended to be displayed as individual, independent objects, but were part of a carefully curated collection of stelae (and other objects, although for our purposes stelae are the main focus of attention), displayed together, in order to provide a greater opportunity for these memorial monuments to reveal different aspects of the activities/identities of individuals represented on them, and to enable those individuals to enjoy the benefits of a permanent presence within the specific sacred landscape of Abydos.

Clearly the elements of the ANOC groups required a physical context which would allow their display to an appropriate audience. The term ANOC indicates some form of ‘chapel’ in which these stelae were originally located, but the specific nature of these ‘chapels’ is not immediately obvious from the internal evidence they provide, although Simpson (1974, 11)
notes examples of stelae which refer to the construction of a *mḥ.t*, in the case of Cairo CG 20733 a *mḥ.t* made of mud brick.

**Private *mḥ.t*-chapels at Abydos**

A *mḥ.t* is neither a tomb nor a conventional offering chapel attached to a tomb. The term *mḥ.t* might be used in contrast to an *js* (tomb) and owners of a *mḥ.t* at Abydos are known to own a tomb elsewhere in Egypt; this has given rise to the use of the term ‘cenotaph’ to refer to these structures (O’Connor 1985, 166 & refs cit.). However, a key feature of a *mḥ.t* at Abydos seems to be its relationship to processional routes (Damarany in this volume). The standard object placed within a *mḥ.t* is a vertically displayed round- or square-topped limestone stela, but other types of minor monument might be placed here, such as small-scale statuary and horizontally placed offering tables; an example is ANOC 9, which contains the well-known statue and niched stela of Sahathor. A number of small statues, mostly of unknown specific provenance, come from Middle Kingdom Abydos; Garstang excavated several such small statues (see, for example, Fig. 2, which shows just such a small statue of a squatting figure, close to the stela of Bmbw from 310/325 A’07).

As far as their location at Abydos is concerned, O’Connor attempted to make a distinction between true tomb-chapels and *mḥ.t*-chapels or ‘cenotaphs’, commenting that, ‘as far as present knowledge goes, Middle Kingdom “cenotaphs” do not occur in the “North Cemetery”, while tombs do not occur in the “cenotaph” zone on the promontory overlooking the Osiris temple complex’ (O’Connor 1985, 166, n. 9). O’Connor’s conclusions were primarily based on his excavations through the Pennsylvania-Yale Expedition to Abydos. This fieldwork project was successful in locating a group of these ‘chapels’ which had been preserved under the later ‘Portal Temple’ of Ramses II, which was built immediately to the west of the Kom el-Sultan, i.e. in a location adjacent to, but outside, the precinct of the Middle Kingdom temple of Osiris. The chapels discovered by the Pennsylvania-Yale team comprise a dense cluster of relatively small mud-brick structures, which were oriented to face eastwards, towards the Osiris Temple. Individual ‘chapels’ varied in size and shape, but each had the basic purpose of displaying its stelae in such a way that they were accessible to the beneficent living making offerings for the stela owner, and allowed the stela owner to take part (especially post-mortem) in festivals connected to the cult of Osiris at Abydos. Evidence for these intentions is provided by information from the stelae themselves, whose textual content refers directly to the provision of offerings (‘Appeal to the Living’) and the beneficent participation in the Osiris cult (the ‘Abydos Formula’: Lichtheim 1988, 55–64). However, it
is notable that, even in this zone, few stelae have been found in situ within their chapel; an
exception is the stela of Ankhu found by the Pennsylvania-Yale team in 1969 (O’Connor
1969, 33; Simpson 1974, 9). The lack of in situ recovery means that some of the best-known
private monuments of the Middle Kingdom from Abydos cannot be placed at the site with
any degree of precision at all. An outstanding example here is the extensive group(s) of stelae
belonging to Ikhnofret and his family (ANOC 1), whose location, were it known, would
undoubtedly illuminate discussions concerning the locations of mḥt.t-chapels and their
relationship to the Abydene landscape (especially processional routes) in late Dynasty 12.

However, evidence that the cenotaph/tomb-chapel dichotomy might not be so clear-cut is
provided by Peet’s Cemetery S (Peet 1914, 38–39, fig. 8). This is a cluster of mud-brick
chapels very similar in form to those from the ‘Votive Zone’, although Cemetery S—as its
name suggests—also contained tomb-shafts associated with these chapels. Also, like the
‘Votive Zone’, these chapels are oriented eastwards to face the Osiris Temple Enclosure.

Another aspect of Abydene stelae relevant to the argument of cenotaph/tomb-chapel is the
extent to which they include examples which were brought to, or commissioned at, Abydos
by those individuals who lived and were buried elsewhere in Egypt. These individuals wished
to undertake what was clearly an important aspect of religious practice in Middle Kingdom
Egypt: that of travelling to Abydos in what we might call ‘pilgrimage’. The evidence left by
the ‘pilgrims’ themselves at Abydos suggests the presence of the key elements one associates
with much Medieval and modern pilgrimage, especially participation in rituals carried out at
the site during particular festivals. Mḥt.t-chapels could preserve the memory of the visit to
the site by an individual, or their proxy, at the site itself. The extra-Abydene origin of stelae
found at the site is an issue which has been examined in depth by Ilin-Tomich (2017), who
has concluded that a very high proportion of stelae from the late Middle Kingdom found at
Abydos were produced in workshops in a number of key centres (especially Thebes and the
Memphite region) and brought to the site.

The ‘Terrace of the Great God’ at Abydos and the topography of the North Cemetery
Simpson defined the area from which the ANOC came as being: ‘… the Nécropole du Nord
of Mariette, specifically the area outside of and abutting on the northern end of the western
enclosure wall of the Osiris-Wepwawet precinct … Topographically, the area formed part of
or else was adjacent to the rwdw n nṯr ʾīt, “the stairway of the great god”’ (Simpson 1974, 1–
2).
This statement is not entirely indisputable in its identification of the *rwdw n ntr* 𓊭 (a term which only appears on private monuments) as being largely congruent with the location of the offering chapels/stelae of the ANOC groups in a tight topographic grouping close to the Osiris Temple (Kom el-Sultan). This is, however, an assumption which has driven much of the debate around the nature and location of the *rwdw n ntr* 𓊭, more recently under the term ‘Votive Zone’. Simpson’s identification of this close grouping was to a large degree (as he notes in 1974, 1–2, n. 7) derived from descriptions of the find-spots of Abydene stelae given in the *Catalogue général* of the Cairo Museum. Only category 21 (‘westliche Nekropole nicht weit von Shûnet el-Zebîb’) appears to be a description of a location in the North Cemetery any distance at all away from the vicinity of the Kom el-Sultan, and this is represented by a single stela (Cairo CG 20518). Simpson (1974, 9) postulates that ‘The high ground overlooking the Osiris temple to its east and the wadi to the south may have been considered the terrace of the great god’. This is not an interpretation which has found universal acceptance. Lichtheim (1988, 129–34) argues that the ‘Terrace’ should be narrowly defined as all or, more probably, part of the Osiris Temple itself, while Kemp (1975, 35) argues for a very much wider definition: ‘The term mꜣt.t includes tomb-chapels, and the North Cemetery was within the area called the “staircase” of Osiris.’ The argument put forward in this study is that the latter wider definition fits the evidence better, at least as far as the late Middle Kingdom is concerned.

**Temporal usage of the North Cemetery**

It is tempting to see the way that the North Cemetery developed in the Middle Kingdom as a direct function of the rituals of the Osiris cult. By this time the eastern ridge had already been largely abandoned, possibly because it had become too full for further use, although Richards (2010) notes the presence of some Middle Kingdom burials/chapels in the Middle Cemetery, using major late Old Kingdom tombs as localized foci. Probably because of the desire to have one’s tomb/chapel placed as close as possible to the Osiris cult-temple and the processional route to the god’s tomb in the Umm el-Qa‘ab, which probably ran along the Great Wadi, the major focus of activity was moved to the northern side of the Great Wadi. Garstang (1901, 3–4) believed that a rough chronological division could be made between most of the tombs to the east of the Shunet el-Zebib and ‘Middle Fort’, which dated to the Middle Kingdom, and those to the west, which were mainly from the Second Intermediate Period/New Kingdom (for this patterning see also Ilin-Tomich 2017, 136 ff., table 47). However, the North Cemetery does not present a simple pattern of usage over time. During the Middle Kingdom,
and probably at other periods, different regions within the area available for interment (and for the construction of chapels without attached burials) had their own hierarchy of desirability with the most favoured positions being those most closely connected with locations within the sacred landscape of North Abydos.

A good example of this is provided by Petrie’s (1925) ‘Tombs of the Courtiers’ excavations when he excavated a group of memorial monuments around the remains of the ‘Funerary Enclosures’ of the Early Dynastic period. These include chapels and stelae, located on Fig. 1, belonging to Montuhotep (Fitzwilliam E.9.1922) from ‘a large pit full of ruined brickwork of the tomb, which had been constructed at the N.E. corner of the Zer square’ (Petrie 1925, 10, pls 22–23); Montusahathor (Ashmolean 1922.144), which was ‘let into the face of a little brick mastaba at the S.E. corner of the square of Merneit’ (Petrie 1925, 10, pl. 12,6); Shenu (Petrie Museum, UC 14334) from ‘a wide tomb pit, ravaged and destroyed, in the square of Zet’ (Petrie 1925, 11, pl. 27); Antef and Sentuankh (Hunterian Museum, Glasgow D1992.13) from ‘the ruin of a large pit tomb, 197, in the S.E. of the square of Zet’ (Petrie 1925, 10, pl. 24). The date range of these stelae varies from late Dynasty 11 in the case of Montuhotep (Lichtheim 1988, 68–69; Bourriau 1988, 21–22) to Dynasty 13 in that of Montusahathor (Ilin-Tomich 2017, 183). The Antef/Sentuankh (dating to early Dynasty 12; Franke 2004, 103–4) is the most interesting of these stelae with regard to the question of the extent of the ‘Terrace of the Great God’ in that it refers to itself as *st.f m t3 dsr r rwd n ntr c3* (‘Its place is in the Sacred Land at/on the Terrace of the Great God’).

More recent Pennsylvania-Yale excavations have produced groups of chapels and burials, especially from the wide-ranging investigation of the area around the Shunet el-Zebib by Richards, most notably the chapel and stela of Dedu from close to the Djer enclosure (Richards 2005, esp. 163–64 & refs cit., figs 76–77 and 184–85, fig. 87). Middle Kingdom chapels and burials have also been excavated to the northeast of the main Aha enclosure (not shown on Fig. 1, but immediately adjacent to the north of the Djer enclosure), especially the *in situ* stela of Nakht, described by Adams (2010, 12–14, fig. 10), and also used by him as the starting point for an important discussion of the way in which that part of the North Cemetery around the Early Dynastic ‘Funerary Enclosures’ became, after a long period when it seems to have been avoided for non-royal activity, much-used in the Middle Kingdom (see also Richards 2005, 156–57). More specifically, the material excavated by Petrie, Richards and Adams points to significant use in the early Middle Kingdom. Part of the impetus for this may be, as Adams notes (2010, 20), a Middle Kingdom association of the Early Dynastic ‘Funerary Enclosures’
with the presence of the ‘Great God’, that deity being in this context ‘an amalgam of all dead kings’ (Eyre 1987, 22). We have no clear idea exactly how the identity and nature of the monuments of early kings—both the ‘Funerary Enclosures’ and the tombs at the Umm el-Qa’ab—were understood in the Middle Kingdom, but it is difficult to imagine that the dominating physical presence of the Shunet el-Zebib was irrelevant to the sacred landscape of Abydos during the Middle Kingdom.

However, as Leahy notes, it is possible to identify the development of Abydos around the identification of the Early Dynastic royal cemetery at the Umm el-Qa’ab as early as Dynasty 11 (Leahy 1989, 56–57 & refs cit.; Yamamoto 2015, 250) with a particular emphasis in the reign of Senwosret I, which is also identified by Müller (2004), on the basis of seal impressions from the Umm el-Qa’ab, as the key reign for the restoration/refurbishment of the site as the tomb of Osiris. This royal activity is amply mirrored in private stelae, including many from the reign of Senwosret I, referring to processional activity. Two private stelae from this period, unfortunately without specific provenance, are especially useful in providing an early reference to the ‘Terrace’, its use for burials at this time, and its links to processional activity connected to Wepwawet. The Dynasty 11 stela of Nakhty (Chatsworth 720/12; Lichtheim 1988, 67–68) says: ‘I made this tomb (is pn) at the terrace of the august god in the sacred land of the western horizon, on the ground that gives offerings, the arrival place of every god, so that I might be in the following of Wepwawet … Going to the terrace of the necropolis (hrt ntr) following the god in his strides’. The stela of Intef-Iker (Leiden V3; Simpson 1974, 13), self-dated to year 33 of Senwosret I, says ‘I have come to this tomb (is pn) at the terrace of the august god … I shall see Wepwawet on all his festivals at his footsteps’.

The relationship between royal and private activity at Abydos in the Middle Kingdom, from a private monument, is best exemplified by Ikhernofret (Lichtheim 1988, 98–100). His activities in reviving the ‘Osiris Mysteries’ at the behest of Senwosret III provided the context for his own memorial monuments (original location sadly unknown) on which, with neat circularity, he could report his royal mission. Ikhernofret’s work can be seen as part of a major initiative on the part of Senwosret III to develop Abydos, most notably his own memorial monument/tomb in South Abydos. Other stelae from Abydos reflect the activities of other officials engaged in similar royal missions (e.g. Lichtheim 1988, 84–100).

Another surge of royal activity at Abydos occurred in Dynasty 13. The most notable evidence for this comes from the ‘Osiris-bed’, installed in the tomb of Djer by a king of Dynasty 13,
possibly Khendjer (Leahy 1977; but cf. Ryholt 1997, 217), and a contemporaneous but now very fragmented monolithic ‘shrine’ which probably enclosed it (Effland, Budka and Effland 2010, 30–35). The tomb of Djer had also been provided with a new staircase to the burial chamber, which post-dated the tomb’s catastrophic burning event (of the First Intermediate Period?) which Petrie (1901, 9) believed was associated with the installation of the ‘Osiris-bed’. In addition a set of four boundary stelae was set up, which defined the processional area: one of these has survived, originally the work of Wagaf and later usurped by Neferhotep I (Leahy 1989). It is especially noteworthy that the Wagaf/Neferhotep stela refers specifically and only to Wepwawet, not Osiris, whose role as the spearhead of the procession of Osiris is amply evidenced, including by Ikhernofret. Pouls Wegner (2007) argues that the placement of depictions of Wepwawet on Middle Kingdom stelae at Abydos is strongly influenced by their position within the site’s sacred/processional landscape. The boundary stela, a royal monument, does not refer to the ‘Terrace of the Great God’, but is concerned with protecting the $\beta \, d\!s\!r$, which Kemp (1975) and Leahy (1989) identify in this context as the Great Wadi, acting as a processional route to the Umm el-Qa‘ab.

**Excavations in the North Cemetery**

In order to understand the location of $m^h\!c\!.t$-chapels and stelae within the ‘Terrace of the Great God’, and to identify the extent of the Terrace, it is now necessary to review the evidence concerning the locations of excavations carried out within the North Cemetery. The (very) tentative results of this review are shown on Fig. 1. In the discussion below, cardinal points refer to (local) directions at Abydos (see directional indicators on Fig. 1).

**Nécropole du Nord**

Mariette’s Nécropole du Nord included most of the eastern half of the North Cemetery. Mariette (1880, 42, 240) states that it was bordered on the east by the Osiris Temple Enclosure and on the west by the Shunet el-Zebib, while its southern boundary was probably on the ridge of the Great Wadi. The northern limits of the Nécropole du Nord would seem to be roughly half way between the Great Wadi and the village of Deir Sitt Damyana. Peet’s (1914, 30) statement that the southern part of his Cemetery S had been ‘worked sporadically by early excavators’ while the northern portion had, until then, been virtually untouched, suggests that this marks the northern extent of Mariette’s work. The location of the northwest corner of the Nécropole du Nord is something of a problem. Leahy (1975, 255) places it on the northeast corner of the Shunet el-Zebib; this may be justified by Amélineau’s illustration
of a shallow ridge running from here to the northwest corner of the Kom el-Sultan, which would make a neat boundary for the Nécropole du Nord. Kemp and Merrillees (1980, 286) place the northwest corner of the Nécropole du Nord on the southeast corner of the Shunet el-Zebib—this would seem possible if the northern extent of the Nécropole du Nord was a straight line running from the northwest corner of the Kom el-Sultan and through Peet’s Cemetery S, and thus hitting the Shunet el-Zebib close to its southeast corner. The position of Peet’s Cemetery S (Peet 1914, xiv, 30–47) can be fixed with some accuracy since it included part of the northern wall of the ‘Funerary Palace’ of Merneith, which was later planned in relation to the other ‘Funerary Enclosures’ (including the Shunet el-Zebib) by Petrie (1925, pl. XV). Cemetery S covered an area of approximately 40 × 45m (Peet 1914, 30, fig. 8).

Another area in the North Cemetery close to the Shunet el-Zebib to be explored by Peet was his Cemetery Y, located not far to the east of the southern half of the Shunet el-Zebib.

**North and northwest of the Shunet el-Zebib**

A number of excavations have been carried out which are not directly relevant to the present study and do not appear on Fig. 1. These include Peet’s Cemeteries A (Peet 1914, xiv, 54, 70–72) and G (Peet 1914, xiv, 54), Currelly’s excavations (Ayrton, Currelly and Weigall 1904, 7–8, pl. VIII) and Randall-Maclver’s excavations (Randall-Maclver and Mace 1902, 55), Peet’s Cemeteries K, L, M and N (Peet 1914, xiv, 54) and D (Peet and Loat 1913, 23–28; Peet 1914, xiv, fig. 1).

**South and southwest of the Shunet el-Zebib**

Peet excavated in a large, contiguous area consisting of his Cemetery Z (to the south of the southeast corner of the Shunet el-Zebib), Cemetery W (between Cemetery Z and the edge of the Great Wadi), and Cemetery O (lying just to the west of Cemetery Z and south of the Shunet el-Zebib). To the southwest of the Shunet el-Zebib lies Garstang’s Cemetery E.

Randall-Maclver and Mace (1902, 63) state that this was an area about 250 yards long, between their Cemetery D and the Shunet el-Zebib. Garstang himself described Cemetery E as ‘a strip of eight or ten acres in area, bounded on the south by this valley [i.e. the Great Wadi], marked off on the north by the Shuna, and so westward’ (Garstang 1901, 2). Garstang also published a useful plan of the site (1901, pl. 2) but, as Kemp and Merrillees (1980, 287) point out, at least some of the information provided on this plan is wrong. Randall-Maclver and Mace’s Cemetery D is described by its excavators as being in the furthest half away from the Shunet el-Zebib of the 500 yards between it and the edge of the cemetery (Randall-
Maclver and Mace 1902, 63), this edge being the most westerly extent of the North Cemetery during the Dynastic/post-Dynastic period and marked with the boundary stela of Neferhotep I. They note (1902, 65) that not one tomb in Cemetery D was found intact and that Mariette and Amélineau worked in the area. Although they may have been mistaken in assigning any of Mariette’s work to this part of the North Cemetery, Amélineau records that he himself worked here (7 on the frontispiece-map of Amélineau 1899). Between Randall-Maclver and Mace’s Cemetery D and Garstang’s Cemetery E, and the ridge of the Great Wadi, were a few small areas which were explored by Peet, his Cemeteries B, C, X and F (Peet 1914, xiv, 61, 73). Possible positions of these are located on Fig. 1, but Kemp and Merrillees (1980, 289) note that considerable caution should be used in relying on the locations of Peet’s cemeteries on his published map.

It is worth noting that the sites discussed above have been subject to ‘diagonal stratigraphy’, by which material of one period is reused in a later period in a different part of the cemetery. Stelae can easily be transported around an archaeological landscape, not least because they had the useful attribute of often being readily to hand in ground-level superstructures, and are conveniently shaped slabs of stone with many possible applications, including their use as battering stones by robbers trying to break into stone sarcophagi (Peet 1914, 91) and as coffin-stands (Ayrton, Currelly and Weigall 1904, 50). This point needs to be borne in mind as a caveat against the assumption that find-spot is equivalent (or close to) the place of original deposition, in the discussion which follows.

The Garstang Abydos excavations of 1906–9

We now turn to an important set of largely unpublished data; the records of John Garstang’s excavations at Abydos from 1906 to 1909, together with the published material from his earlier (1899) work at the site. An understanding of this material will allow us to cast some light on the location of the ‘Terrace of the Great God’, especially in the late Middle Kingdom.

Although the published record (Garstang 1901) suggests that Garstang’s most significant fieldwork at Abydos was the excavation of Cemetery E for Petrie’s Egyptian Research Account in the 1899–1900 season, his most substantial activity at the site was actually the major series of excavations he carried out there between 1906 and 1909 on behalf of the Institute of Archaeology at Liverpool. Garstang advertised that the results of this work would be published as Thousand Tombs of Abydos (Garstang 1913, 107) but no such volume ever
appeared and no manuscript of this work (if it ever existed) has survived. Garstang published very little on the Abydos excavations, even in the way of preliminary reports. Exceptions are a brief note in the Egypt Exploration Fund Archaeological Report for 1906–7 in which Garstang mentions his major finds of the 1907 season (Garstang 1907), and a preliminary discussion of the Minoan material from tomb 416 A'07 (Garstang 1913 – more fully published in Kemp and Merrillees 1980). In the absence of Garstang’s own definitive published account, a range of sources needs to be utilized in order to give as full an account as is now possible of the Garstang/Abydos excavations. These sources, as they relate to the 1907 season, are discussed in Kemp and Merrillees (1980, 107–8) with a broader account of sources for the 1906–9 period given in my doctoral thesis (Snape 1986).

No plan showing the position of the tombs excavated at Abydos now exists for any of the four seasons Garstang worked there. Also missing are the individual tomb-cards, compiled by Garstang’s assistant Harold Jones and, after May 1907, by Jones’ replacement, Horst Schliephack. At least some of these Abydos tomb-cards were in existence for some time after the excavations since Emery notes that he used the tomb-card for one of the graves (524 A'08) in his publication of the ‘Nubian Graves’ from 1908 (Emery 1923, 34). The only substantive written record of the day-to-day progress of the excavations is provided by Garstang’s field notebooks, now in the archives of Liverpool University. The entries for each tomb and its contents were, for the most part, made by Garstang himself. These notebooks are by no means a complete set; only those for 1906 (1-34 A'06), the second part of 1907 after Garstang had arrived at the site (300-436 A'07), and 1909 (730-1130 A'09) have survived.

Garstang sent monthly reports to his financial backers, the Abydos Excavations Committee. One member of this committee was Sir Francis Chatillon Danson. His collection of antiquities was passed on to his son, Lieut. Col. J. R. Danson, on whose death in 1976 the collection was bequeathed to what is now the World Museum, Liverpool, together with the Danson family archive. Documents within this archive include the surviving copies of the monthly reports, as well as a set of postcards which Garstang, as a personal friend, sent to Danson.

The final significant piece of documentation for the Garstang 1906–9 excavations is the archive of 803 plate-glass Abydos photographic negatives at Liverpool University (these are referred to below using the formula ‘Neg.A.xx’). These photographs are useful in helping to locate the particular areas in which Garstang was working at Abydos, while his photographs of excavated objects are invaluable in identifying objects which are now widely scattered and
without their original tomb-numbers. That many of the photographs are of more substantial excavated objects (including stelae, e.g. Neg.A.125= Fig. 3) is fortunate for, as Kemp and Merrillees (1980, 108) point out, these were likely to be the ones which were distributed to the individual members of the Abydos Excavations Committee and subsequently dispersed further afield.

The concession granted to Garstang was ‘in the necropolis of Abydos within a radius of half a kilometre around the Shunet el-Zebib’ (Kemp and Merrillees 1980, 105). As has already been noted, Garstang had previously excavated at Abydos in 1899–1900 in Cemetery E, on the southern fringe of the North Cemetery. The quality of material he had excavated then presumably attracted him back to this productive site, and the places at which he first renewed his activities at Abydos were unexcavated portions of Cemetery E. The plan of Cemetery E published by Garstang (1901, pl. II), shows an area on the edge of the Great Wadi which is marked ‘not completely excavated here’. The entries for the first few tombs in the 1906 excavation notebook also indicate that the first 1906 soundings were in this area, while the Liverpool University copy of El-Arâbah has pencil annotations, in Garstang’s hand, which locate tombs 6 A’06 and 7 A’06 immediately to the west of E.39, and 17 A’06 in the centre of Cemetery E, not far to the northeast of E.330. Garstang did not confine his activities in 1906 entirely to within, or in close proximity to, the area of Cemetery E, but dug much further afield—15 A’06 and 20 A’06 were both to the east of the Shunet el-Zebib, while 34 A’06 was found to the west of it. Notebook entries state the location of some of these loci, including: 1 A’06 (‘About 50m south of the Shuna’); 2 A’06 (‘110m true south of the Shuna’); 3 A’06 (‘north of the valley on the ridge’); 4 A’06 (‘on the north side of the valley’); 24 A’06 (‘At the western end of the old ‘E’ cemetery, to the west of 301’ [i.e. E.301 in Cemetery E] ); and 25 A’06 (‘In the western end of the ‘E’ cemetery, south-west of tomb 301’).

Excavations for 1907 began in a Graeco-Roman necropolis (not shown on Fig. 1) in the western part of the Great Wadi, followed by his ‘having a turn at the outskirts of the XI–XIIth Dynasty Necropolis’ (Report of 8 February 1907), that is to say, close to Cemetery E again. Garstang described this area as ‘the limit of a plateau raised about 6 metres above the level of the valley leading to the tombs of the Kings’ (Report of 7 March 1907). In his description of 416 A’07, Garstang mentions that the work of Spring 1907 was ‘occupied chiefly with the excavation of a portion of the great necropolis of Abydos lying immediately to the north-west of [the Great Wadi]’ (Garstang 1913, 107). Photographic support for these statements is
found in Neg.A.122, which shows the group 308 A’07 to 310 A’07 (see Fig. 2) on the top of the slope at the southern edge of the Northern Cemetery, just west of a line along the main axis of Garstang’s dig house. The approximate area covered by these 1907 excavations is shown on Fig. 1 (see also Kemp and Merrillees 1980, 106, fig. 36,3b.)

In early March Garstang reported that ‘we have been going on steadily with the work of clearing away the mounds of sand that fringe the XII Dynasty Necropolis’ (postcard to Danson, 8 March 1907). He seems to have been working from east to west, since he refers to his first trenches as being among ‘the early tombs’ of the ‘XI–XIIth Dynasty Necropolis’ (postcard to Danson, 16 February 1907) while later he was moving ‘well into the XIIth Dynasty portion’ (postcard to Danson, 8 March 1907). By the middle of February, 321 A’07 had been cleared (postcard to Danson, 16 February 1907). Considerable progress was made during March and April (Report of 27 April 1907) before excavation was halted in the second week of April 1907. Just before digging stopped, tomb 416 A’07 was discovered and cleared (Kemp and Merrillees 1980).

A series of loci from the 1907 season produced stelae, or fragments of them, associated with structures which may be mḥJeremy’s chapels. Reported in Garstang’s 1907 notebook, these include: 300 A’07 (‘Much broken mastaba with only S wall complete. Broken stele found in redee[m] loose fill to E’); 302 A’07 (‘Very much broken mastaba with kiosk to the N. S and E walls of kiosk complete, with fragment of the West. Behind the west wall, to the west and lower down, a shrine facing E’); 303 A’07 (‘Mastaba with surrounding walls almost entirely gone. Fragments of northern, eastern and southern walls’); 305 A’07 (‘W and S walls of kiosk with trace of plaster. In W wall to S a square projection 2m. by 1m. about, with oblong shrine’); 322 A’07 (‘Mastaba with 3 false doors in E wall’); 330 A’07 (‘Near to 330 to north, fragment of limestone stela’); 351 A’07 (‘Stone stele near 351’); 360 A’07 (‘Fragment of stele’); 383 A’07 (‘Fragment of stele found in redeem over 383’); 408 A’07 (‘Fragment of limestone stela’); 409 A’07 (‘3 frags of limestone stelae’); 410 A’07 (‘Limestone stele with figures’); 414 A’07 (‘fragments of inscribed stele’); 415 A’07 (‘Small limestone stele’); and 429 A’07 (‘Broken limestone stele, ?XII dyn’).

As Marée (2010, 245–66, n. 23) notes, there is significant confusion regarding the number, original find-spot and current location of stelae from the 1906 season, as is also the case with 1907. Also, it must be emphasized that a full exploration of this material is not being attempted here. However, some of the loci from 1906 and 1907 are especially relevant to the current discussion and deserve further comment.
6 A’06

It is unclear precisely how many inscribed stone monuments came from this locus, but they include the central panel of the chapel (Mer.16.11.13) framed by two jambs (Snape 1986, pl. 4) and a separate round-topped stela. They are inscribed for the ‘royal seal-bearer and overseer of an estate division’, *ḥmty-bḥty imy-r gs pr*, Khonsu. This rather elaborate assemblage has been dated to the reigns of Neferhotep I–Sobekhotep IV (Franke 2004, 109–110).

301 A’07 + 328 A’07

‘deep tomb. mastaba to E …. Good small stele – broken in two’. The stela (Glasgow City Museum ’23-33ad; Fig. 3 [left]) is inscribed for the ‘steward, counter of cattle’, *imy-r pr ḫsb ihw*, Sobekhotep, dated by Franke (2004, 109–10) to the first half of Dynasty 13. This stela is especially interesting in that it is a good example of a stela associated with a burial showing signs of being ‘used’ for some time by repeated rubbing of the figure of Min (Kemp and Merrillees 1980, 234–36).

304/360 A’07

‘Two parallel walls 3 ft. below surface running N and S, about a metre apart. E wall slopes outwards about 2 ft down. Part of stela with ? cut out of the middle, found in redeem 6 ft. below surface to SE’. This is the well-known stela of Amenyonb (Liv.E.30: Kitchen 1961; Bourriau 1988, 60–3; Baines 2009; Yamamoto 2015, 268–9) which can be firmly dated to the reign of Khendjer. A further fragment of the stela was found at locus 360 A’07. This is one of three stelae attributed to ANOC 58 (see below).

310 A’07

‘Large ḫōsh complete. Entrance at E. 3ft below surface’ (cf. Fig. 2, where it appears that the entrance is in fact in the southern wall). The term ḫōsh is used by Garstang to designate a mud-brick enclosure or courtyard, perhaps similar to the courtyards marking the limits of some of the chapels in the ‘Votive Zone’ (see O’Connor 1985, 176, fig. 6). Close by is:

325 A’07

‘Stele in redeem. 1ft. Below surface’. The stela (BM EA1562; Simpson 1974, 22, pl. 65 = ANOC 65.1) is inscribed for the ‘great one of 30 of Upper Egypt, district councillor of Abydos’, *wr md ṣmfw ḫnty n W n ḫḏw*, Bmbw and can be dated to Dynasty 13 (Franke 1984, 165). Fig. 2 shows 310/325 A’07 as being close to the southern edge of the North
Cemetery with Garstang’s dig house in the background, giving an indication of how far west along that ridge it was.

316 A’07
‘Square enclosure lying NNE. SEE. SSW. NNW. Stele XVIIth? Found 7 ft from NE corner face down.’ The stela (Dublin 1920.273; Fig. 3 [right]) is inscribed for the $s\text{sw \ rwdw n Wsir}$ Nakhti-ankh, dated by Ilin-Tomich (2017, 225) to the Second Intermediate Period. It is especially noteworthy that this individual bears a title related to the policing of the ‘Terrace’ – might this suggest that 316 A’07 is itself located on the ‘Terrace’?

321 A’07
See fuller description below in next section, under ANOC 19.

361 A’07
‘Small limestone stele coloured. XII’. The stela (Mer.1977.109.36: Bienkowski and Southworth 1986, p1. 1) is inscribed for the untitled Sekher and is dated by Ilin-Tomich (2017, 240) and Marée (2010, 246 [x], pl.77) to the Second Intermediate Period.

368 A’07
‘Large part of XII Dyn stele’. The stela (Coll. J. H. Fisher, Detroit) is inscribed for the ‘Governor of Upper Egypt’, $imy\text{-r } s\text{m}^5\text{w}$, Amen-Wosret and can be dated to the reign of Amenemhat III (Simpson 1965; 1966; Kemp and Merrillees 1980, 109).

Locating the ANOCs
As noted above, the vast majority of the stelae assigned to Simpson’s ANOC groups cannot be placed in specific parts of North Abydos. However, there are some exceptions where some stelae which have been included within the ANOC groups, or indeed constitute all the stelae in an ANOC group, were excavated in locations which can, to some extent, be identified. Most of these examples come from the work of Garstang and Peet in the southwestern part of the North Cemetery, and the evidence they contain is telling. The groups in question are ANOC 19, 46, 47, 56, 58, 65, 69 and 70, which will be discussed below in numerical order, apart from ANOC 19, which requires special consideration.

ANOC 46
Of the four items from this group, three (a stela, stela fragment and statue-base) come from Peet’s Cemetery X—specifically X.58 (Peet 1914, pl. 15,1–3; pl. 23.5; Peet and Loat 1913,
The group belongs to Nebankh, a known official of Sobekhotep IV (Franke 2004, 100). Although, as noted above, caution is needed when utilizing Peet’s site plan, it seems reasonable to conclude that Cemetery X was close to the southern edge of the North Cemetery, somewhere in the vicinity of the area between Garstang’s Cemetery E and Randall-MacIver and Mace’s Cemetery D.

ANOC 47
Two stelae, one from Peet’s Cemetery W (Peet and Loat 1913, pl. 13.4) and the other from Garstang’s Cemetery E (Garstang 1901, pl. 4.3). They belong to Pepi, son of Sehetepib, dated to late Dynasty 12 or Dynasty 13 (Franke 1984, 166). If found close to their original locations, then an overlap (or at least reasonably close proximity) between these two cemeteries seems possible, although this is not reflected in Fig. 1. Unfortunately, the locus given by Garstang (E.238) does not appear on his site plan (although there are two E.237s).

ANOC 56
Two stelae from E.295 in Garstang’s Cemetery E (Garstang 1901, pl. 6; Simpson 1974, 20, pl. 77). They belong to Amenemhat-Nebwy and are dated to late Dynasty 12 or Dynasty 13 (Franke 1984, 85; Ilin-Tomich 2017, 230). This locus is described by Garstang as ‘limestone steles from a disturbed mastaba of the XIth dynasty, surrounded by XVIIIth dynasty tombs’ (Garstang 1901, 6).

ANOC 58
Three stelae make up what is one of the more notable ANOC groups. Two are from an unknown location at Abydos (Louvre C11–12), while the third is of two fragments, from 304/360 A’07 (see above). The two Louvre stelae specifically refer to the ‘mission’ element of Amenysonb’s presence at Abydos as being involved with the renewal of temple-building which had originally carried out under Senwosret I. The stela group is dated to the reign of Khendjer. Lichtheim (1988, 80) believed that the two larger Louvre stelae were made to be placed in the ‘immediate vicinity of the temple’ of Osiris, while the smaller, ‘more coarsely done’ Liverpool stela was made for Amenysonb’s tomb. But perhaps the most relevant point here is the distinctly ‘architectural’ nature of the Liverpool stela which, with its ankh-shaped central hole and double-sided inscription, seems certain to have been made for a serdab-like chapel (not discussed more fully here, but see Hill 2010 and note that one of the other five ankh-stelae discussed by her comes from ANOC 47). It is also worth noting that, in respect of
location and function of this group, Louvre C.11 specifically refers to ‘praising Wepwawet at his procession’.

**ANOC 65**

Four stelae dating to Dynasty 13, three of unknown origin but one, BM EA1562, excavated by Garstang from 310/325 A’07 (see above and Fig. 2).

**ANOC 69**

Two stelae belonging to the well-known soldier Sobek-khu (Manchester 3306 and BM EA 1213; Baines 1987 & refs cit.), who was active during the reign of Senwosret III (and probably Amenemhat III). The find-spot of the BM stela is not known, but that of the former is E.11 in Garstang’s Cemetery E (Garstang 1901, 6). The Manchester stela was found displaced, but if it was originally set up close to E.11 (as suggested on Fig. 1) it is especially noteworthy since the stela specifically refers to itself as coming from a m+f.r.t which was set up on the ‘Terrace of the Great God’. Simpson noted (1974, 11) that this stela is one of those which refer to themselves as being constructed on/at the ‘Terrace of the Great God’, although the specific location of Cemetery E, some distance away from the main ‘Votive Zone’, is not remarked on.

**ANOC 70**

Mastaba H in Peet’s Cemetery S produced a group of stone objects—two door jambs, an offering table and the lower part of an in situ stela belonging to Iww (no title surviving) (Peet 1914, pl. 6.3).

**ANOC 19 and 321 A’07**

321 A’07 is, after 416 A’07, the single most productive single locus from Garstang’s 1907 season. It dates to Dynasty 13 (see Franke 1984, 217). A series of contemporary photographs shows the progress of its excavation, the most informative being Neg.A.134, already published by Bourriau (1988, 40) and Wegner (2010a, 367), and reproduced here as Fig. 4. A fuller picture of the structure of 321 A’07 becomes clearer by looking at Negs.A.129 and 131 (Figs 5 and 6) and the plan sketched by Garstang in his 1906 notebook (reproduced here as Fig. 7), which helpfully gives an indication of north. This memorial monument consists of a solid block of mud brick sitting on a platform also made of mud brick. It appears that the whole was covered in mud plaster and whitewashed. Towards the top of this ‘tower’ four niches were formed from the brickwork, designed to contain stelae, one on each face. The
upper part of the block, including the tops of all four niches, has been badly eroded. The block is a tight fit within a mud-brick enclosure wall, which appears to be one of the hōsh courtyards referred to by Garstang. At the southern edge Cemetery E Garstang shows an unnumbered feature (see Fig. 1) which appears to be a square enclosure containing a shaft and, notably, a shaded solid oblong with what appear to be four niches, one on each face. It is unlikely that this un-numbered feature was 321 A’07, although its location would fit well with what we can deduce about the latter’s location. If this feature was 321 A’07 then it needs to be explained why Garstang did not excavate this feature in 1899 if he had located it, since the amount of clearance required to see the four niches would also have revealed the in situ 321 A’07(a). What this might indicate, however, is the presence of other four-sided niched chapels similar to 321 A’07 in this part of the cemetery.

It is striking that both the photographs and notebook sketch indicate that 321 A’07 was part of a larger group of connected structures, the most important being the rather larger 326 A’07, a corner of which is shown in Garstang’s sketch. Unfortunately, Garstang’s notebook has nothing at all to say about 326 A’07. His descriptions of the objects recovered from 321 A’07 follow:

‘a Fine stela’
‘a / Fine stela. 3 rows of figures and inscription between. In niche facing west’.

This is Bolton Museum 10.20/11, Simpson’s ANOC 19.4 (see also Bourriau 1988, 54, 65); measuring 51 × 33cm, it was found in situ within its niche. It belongs to the family of the f’w n sītw, ‘bearer of documents of lands’, Iy.

‘b Unpainted stela’
‘b/ Unpainted stela, four rows of figures, lying face up, Heads to the south of wall. Nail? through top left corner’. Neg.A.129 shows this stela adjacent to the southern niche b on Garstang’s sketch plan. This stela is Cairo CG 20803 (= JdE 39069), Simpson’s ANOC 19.5 (for illustration see also Baligh 2008). Measuring 37 × 25cm, it is slightly smaller than 321 A’07(a), but clearly capable of fitting within the niches of 321 A’07, and it too depicts the family of the f’w n sītw Iy. Facing this niche is what appears to be a gap in the enclosure wall, formed by an arch of mud brick, later filled in (shown in Figs 5 and 6). This looks similar to ‘loopholes’ in the northern walls of other chapels at Abydos (Adams 2010, 9–11; Peet 1914, 36–37) which Adams suggests allowed the ‘sweet breath of the north wind’ to
enter the chapel (Adams 2010, 16). Stela 321 A’07(b) is inscribed with a $htp \ di \ nsw$ formula to Min, and refers to the god’s ‘going forth’ ($m\ prt.f$).

‘c Stela … Inscribed in hieroglyphs’
‘c Stela, upper part worn away. Inscribed in hieroglyphs, 2 figures. Found in redeem to north of 321, 5 ft. below surface’. This stela, Garstang Museum E.31, is shown in Neg. A.129. Note that Garstang states that this stela was also not found within one of the niches of 321 A’07, but in giving it the designation 321c he clearly identified it with the nearby niche c on his sketch plan. Its dimensions ($45 \times 21$cm) make this likely.

Garstang’s notebook does not refer to any stela from niche d, but Neg.A.129 shows a stela in a position which suggest that it had been originally placed in that niche. The current whereabouts of stela d are unknown. The contents of these stelae c and d are currently being prepared for publication by my colleagues Nicky Nielsen and Huw Twiston Davies, and I am grateful for their information that both stelae can be attributed to the family of Iy. Thus, all four niches of the block in 321 A’07 seem to have been filled with stelae belonging to the Iy family. This is worth emphasizing, as there are three other stelae connected to ANOC 19 which need to be considered.

**ANOC 19.3 (Manchester Museum 2963)**
This stela was excavated by Garstang (Garstang 1901, 9, 35, 46, pl. XII) at the locus E.330 in Cemetery E. On Garstang’s plan of Cemetery E, locus E.330 is drawn as a solid, shaded square with what appears to be a shaft adjacent to it (see Fig. 1), but Garstang notes that the stela was not found in situ. It is inscribed for the $idnw\ n\ nr\ htm$, ‘deputy treasurer’, Netjeruraw and of a similar size ($47.4 \times 28.8$cm) to the stelae from the niches in 321 A’07. If one were trying to find a home for the Netjeruraw stela, the solid block of plastered mud brick in the courtyard west of the 321 A’07 ‘tower’ has what appears to be a (now-broken) round-topped niche facing into that courtyard (see Fig. 4), albeit at a lower height than 321 A’07, but this is speculation.

**ANOC 19.1 (Cairo CG 20087) and 19.2 (Cairo CG 20100)**
These stelae belong to the $hmt-y-bt\ imy-r\ pr\ wr$, ‘royal seal-bearer and high steward’, Amenemhatseb-Nemtyemweskhet. The two stelae are similar in their dimensions ($83 \times 48$cm and $82 \times 48.5$cm) and much larger than the 321 A’07 stelae. The Garstang photographs of 321 A’07 do not indicate any obvious place where they could have been set up; indeed CCG 20100 is described in the Cairo Catalogue Général as coming from the nördliche
Nekropolen, nordöstliche Zone, which is not a good description of Garstang’s Cemetery E nor his work of 1907. Both stelae include depictions of minor figures bearing titles of inferior status to that of Amenemhatseneb-Nemtyemweskhet; Cairo CG 20087 includes the tꜣw n sꜣtw Iy, while Cairo CG 20100 includes the idnw n mr sDꜣt Netjeruraw.

Simpson (1974, 23) noted the possible connection of the individuals from ANOC 19 with Qau/the 10th Upper Egyptian (Tjebite) nome, on the basis of their names. Wegner (2010b) goes further in describing the presence of a significant cohort of officials with Tjebite origins in the administration of the town of Wah-Sut, including sealings found there belonging to Netjeruraw and Iy. Wah-Sut was founded to serve the memorial monument/tomb of Senwosret III at Abydos. Therefore, these three officials might have been both ‘local’ to Abydos (they worked there) but also ‘unlocal’ in that their family connections were elsewhere (Qau). Which of these two locations would have been most appropriate for their burial is not clear, but they were, self-evidently, able to create memorial monuments in a location which seems to have become very desirable real estate by Dynasty 13.

At this point, although the three men are connected through the appearance of the two junior officials on stelae belonging to the senior (perhaps an extension of a power relationship which existed when the stelae were produced), there seems to be no reason to believe that ANOC is a single structure which housed the stelae of all three men. It is clear that the four-niched block in 321 A’07 was completely filled with four stelae belonging to Iy and, while one might speculate about the original location of the stela of Netjeruraw, there is no reason to physically connect the two Amenemhatseneb-Nemtyemweskhet stelae to 321 A’07. However, there is one final significant object excavated by Garstang at 321 A’07, 321 A’07(e). This is a limestone miniature sarcophagus, containing a wooden coffin, containing a mummiform figure inscribed for Amenemhatseneb-Nemtyemweskhet (Wegner 2010a, 367–71). This object (see Fig. 4) appears to have been buried below the floor level of the courtyard on the western side of 321 A’07. The Garstang sketch plan (see Fig. 7) indicates a complex history of building and rebuilding to the south and west of 321 A’07, which is now difficult to resolve. However, it is difficult to believe that the miniature sarcophagus of Amenemhatseneb-Nemtyemweskhet was originally buried anywhere other than at his own memorial monument, since this part of the North Cemetery was not one of the parts of the Abydos landscape—like ‘Heqareshu Hill’ near the Umm el-Qa‘ab – which was used for the deposition of extrasepulchral shabtis (Wegner 2010a, 366). If the miniature sarcophagus was found by Garstang where it was originally deposited, that might strengthen the case that 326
A’07, much larger than 321 A’07, had been the mḥt.t-chapel belonging to Amenemhatseneb-Nemtyemweskhet. If this were the case, then it would appear that Iy’s memorial monument had a subsidiary relationship to that of Amenemhatseneb-Nemtyemweskhet, as the two men had in their official roles at Wah-Sut.

Whatever the case, it is worth noting that Garstang does not record any actual burial associated with the (admittedly partially preserved) 321/326 A’07 structures, suggesting that they represent a substantial complex of non-funerary mḥt.t-chapels in the southwest of the North Cemetery during Dynasty 13.

**Cultic participation on Abydene stelae of Dynasty 13**

A final level of connectedness in this discussion for some of the stelae described above comes from Franke’s 2004 study of a group of Abydene stelae whose distinguishing feature is that they are ‘inscribed with hymns or solemn invocations of a god’ or similar texts (Franke 2004, 95). Franke linked these stelae to individuals who had seen or participated in the ‘Osiris Mysteries’, with the hymns on the stelae recording a version of the hymns they had heard/recited at these festivals. The overwhelming majority of these stelae can be dated to early Dynasty 13 (Franke 2004, 95), that is to say broadly contemporary with an important phase of royal activity at Abydos associated with the ‘Osiris Mysteries’, most notably the work in the tomb of Djer, the Neferhotep boundary stela, and another stela of Neferhotep I (Leahy 1989, 59, n. 79 & refs cit.) commemorating a visit to Abydos by that king to participate in the ‘Osiris Mysteries’.

One question which Franke did not address is the issue of the actual original locations of these stelae and the extent to which those locations can be related to contemporary processional routes around which they might have clustered. Relevant stelae whose locations are known (see Fig. 1) with their dates, are: ANOC 46 (Sobekhotep IV); ANOC 65 (Dynasty 13); Tomb 14 in Cemetery D (dated to second half of Dynasty 13 by Franke 2004, 98–99); Antef from Petrie’s ‘Tombs of the Courtiers’ (early Dynasty 12); 6 A’06 (reigns of Neferhotep I–Sobekhotep IV); and 328 A’06 (first half of Dynasty 13). This is, admittedly, a relatively small sample, but it might be noted that, apart from that of Antef, all the above stelae date to Dynasty 13 and all can be assigned to the western half of the northern side of the Great Wadi.
In conclusion

This study has argued that the southwestern part of the North Cemetery can be regarded as being part of the ‘Terrace of the Great God’ by Dynasty 13 at the latest. Although this part of the North Cemetery may well have seen some memorial monuments constructed during Dynasty 12, it was in Dynasty 13 that it became densely filled with such monuments—with or without associated burials. It is likely that the development of this part of the North Cemetery was, in part, a response to a surge in royal activity (both in building work and cultic performance) at Abydos under some Dynasty 13 kings, comparable to similar bursts of activity in late Dynasty 11/early Dynasty 12 and during the reign of Senwosret III.
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FIGURE CAPTIONS

**Fig. 1** Map of north Abydos, indicating areas of excavation and individual loci referred to in the text.

**Fig. 2** View, looking southwest over locus 310 A’07 towards Garstang’s excavation house. Note the stela of Bmbw from 325 A’07 in the right foreground (Neg.A.121). Photo © Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool, reproduced with kind permission.

**Fig. 3** Stela of Sobekhotep from 328 A’07 (left), and that of Nakhti-ankh (right) (Neg.A.125). Photo © Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool, reproduced with kind permission.

**Fig. 4** View looking southeast over the western side of 321 A’07, including the *in situ* stela 321 A’07(a) and miniature sarcophagus 321 A’07(e) (Neg.A.134). Photo © Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool, reproduced with kind permission.

**Fig. 5** View looking west over the eastern side of 321 A’07, showing stelas 321 A’07(b)–(d). The kneeling figure to the right is Harold Jones (Neg.A.129). Photo © Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool, reproduced with kind permission.

**Fig. 6** View looking west over the eastern side of 321 A’07, at a later stage of excavation than Fig. 5 (Neg.A.131). Photo © Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool, reproduced with kind permission.

**Fig. 7** Garstang’s notebook entry for 321 A’07, with transcription. Photo © Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool, reproduced with kind permission.
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