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Preface

Zahi Hawass

The Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, held in Cairo in March 2000, marked the opening of the new millennium as an opportunity to evaluate and redefine the focus and goals of Egyptology in the twenty-first century. Through the Millennium Debates and the papers of other participants published here, we are made aware that now more than ever, Egyptology is facing a period of change and challenge and we must meet these challenges if our field is to remain relevant to the modern world. The Congress was attended by some 1,400 scholars, and of the 400 papers delivered, 248 were selected by our scientific review committee to be published in these volumes. It is notable that this Congress included a higher number of Egyptian Egyptologists than we have seen in many years. In fact, some 500 Egyptian Egyptologists attended the conference. Their inclusion with the more well-known names in Egyptology is an indication of one of the frequently mentioned themes in the Congress: the need for education and training of more Egyptian scholars and excavators to study and maintain their country’s monuments as part of the world’s heritage.

The enormous quantity of submissions to the Proceedings led to the decision to publish them in three volumes. Volume One contains all the archaeology papers; Volume Two, those dealing with history and religion; and Volume Three covers the topics of language, literature, museology, and conservation. Each volume of these Proceedings opens with the text of the corresponding Millennium Debates and their respondents, and the papers of the specific subjects follow in alphabetical order by the contributor’s name.

The Millennium Debates formed a special focus for this Congress. Chaired and responded to by eminent experts in the field, the Debates covered archaeology, art, history, language, literature, museology, religion, site management, and conservation. In his paper (opening the Debates in Volume One) on “Egyptology in the Twenty-first Century,” David O’Connor provides a cogent summary of the trends in field work in Egyptology in the last forty years and discusses three points crucial to the future of Egyptian archaeology: the changing attitudes of Egyptians toward
their archaeology, the need for comprehensive mapping (rather than excavation) of the national archaeological landscape, and theoretical issues and their impact on archaeology, epigraphy, and other scholarly disciplines.

Volume Two continues with keynote speakers addressing the Millennium Debate issues of history, art history, and religion. In his paper, "Writing the History of Ancient Egypt," Donald B. Redford challenges the appropriateness of new approaches to historiography such as retrospective economic theory. Egyptology as anthropology, deconstruction, and 'history from below,' as he characterizes the tendency to use anecdotal evidence to draw far-reaching conclusions about the 'common people' in Egyptian history. Edna R. Russmann, in her contribution to the Millennium Debate on the study of the art of ancient Egypt laments the failure of Egyptian art scholarship to coalesce into a recognized subdiscipline with an academic tradition of acknowledged interests and methods of its own. She goes on to give a summary of the most urgent needs facing the study of Egyptian art as well as possible solutions. In the last Millennium Debate paper in Volume Two, Herman te Velde writes on "The History of the Study of Ancient Egyptian Religion and its Future," which he considers one of the most urgent topics in Egyptology today, since the core of ancient Egyptian culture is its religion. He speculates that although Egyptologists with various special interests will contribute to the study of religion, the most progress should be expected from those willing to focus their research specifically on religion and its accompanying issues, such as polytheism versus monotheism, pharaonism versus local religions, and religion in life as well as death.

Perhaps the most challenging of Millennium Debate papers come in Volume Three. John Baines’ comprehensive examination of the current and future possibilities for research on Egyptian literature is complemented by Antonio Loprieno’s notes on the problems and priorities in Egyptian linguistics. Baines provides extensive analysis and definition of the Egyptian literary corpus, its relation to the wider stream of tradition and range of written forms, and the social and ideological situation and status of what was written. Loprieno concentrates on the achievements of Egyptian linguistics over the last fifteen years and considers the impact of recent developments in linguistic research on Egyptian phonology and lexicography. Regine Schulz’s paper, "Museums and Marketing: A Contradiction" is a timely examination of the pressures facing museums around the world to provide "blockbuster entertainment" while maintaining their five basic mandates of collecting, preservation, research, presentation, and mediation. Finally, my own contribution to the Millennium Debates, "Site Management and Conservation," addresses some of the principal problems and threats to the conservation of Egyptian heritage sites and makes recommendations, some perhaps controversial, for improving site management methods and protection as well as giving suggestions for salvage and excavation over the next ten years.

In addition to being a forum for debate and report, the Congress honored several prominent Egyptologists for their outstanding contributions to the field, including Abdel-Aziz Saleh and Sayed Tawfik from Egypt; Harry Smith of England; William K. Simpson from the United States; Rainer Stadelmann from Germany; Jean Leclant of France; Sergio Donadoni from Italy; Kazimierz Michalowski of Poland; and the late Gamal Mokhtar, former Chairman of the Antiquities Organization of Egypt and Member of the Supreme Council of Culture.

I took great pride in the many complimentary comments I received regarding the organization and success of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, but credit for this must be shared with the many people whose efforts made that success possible. I would like to thank the members of the different committees who planned and executed the many aspects involved in holding such a large conference. The Congress was held at the Mena House Oberoi Hotel in
the shadow of the Giza Pyramids and thanks to its General Manager, Rajiv Kaul, everything ran smoothly in the day-to-day operations. The Congress would also not have been possible without the financial support of many Egyptian business corporations. Another important contributor was the American University in Cairo Press. Its director, Mark Linz, and the Press's editorial staff were of great help in completing the Congress's mission by publishing the Abstracts, edited by Angela Jones, and of course these final three volumes of Proceedings edited in collaboration with Lyla Brock.

In conclusion, I would urge the International Association of Egyptologists to review and expand its activities in the future, with the aim of making itself better known to the general public and potential sponsors. This would enable it to raise the funds to undertake and complete valuable projects, many of which are discussed in these volumes. I would also urge that scientific studies and research programs should be geared less to the personal interests of the researcher, but should follow an overall action plan targeting those areas where monuments are especially endangered, such as the Delta and the great deserts of Egypt. I believe that all who participated in the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists and all those who read these volumes of Proceedings will take wise and positive action in regard to these concerns.
Since a very early date after the Arab conquest of Egypt, Arab travelers and historians have paid special attention to Egypt. It has fascinated them with its gigantic monuments, such as the pyramids and temples. They admired them, described them, and wrote about them, saying “The wonders of the world are thirty in number, ten of them only are in all the world, and the rest are in Egypt alone.”

One of these twenty wonders that specially attracted them was mentioned in their writings as “The Colossus of the mate of the Sphinx.”

According to the detailed description given by Arab historians of the Colossus, “It was a very huge statue, precisely figured, in the shape of a seated woman,” “with a child on her lap and a pot on her head.” “It is made of solid granite stone.”

As to its location, Ibn Iyas and al-Maqrizi stated that it once stood in al-Fustat, the first capital of Egypt in the Islamic Period, now the site of Misr al-Qadima or al-Atiqa, on the east bank of the Nile facing the Sphinx, and, more exactly, near Qasr al-Sham’a (Babylon enclosure), in a little street named, after the Colossus, Zuqaq al-Share or Zuqaq al-Sanam (Alley of the Idol). This street begins at the beginning of a main street of the great market (Sharia al-Suq al-Kabir) near Darb ‘Ammar.

A further interesting point concerning its location is that it stood on the east bank of the Nile facing the Sphinx on the opposite bank, positioned so precisely that if one had drawn a straight line from the head of the Sphinx, it would come exactly to the head of the Colossus. Meanwhile it is not clear if this means that they were at the same height or on the same axis, but the latter seems to be what they meant. In another passage we are informed that both the Sphinx and the Colossus are facing the east, and that both are supposed to be a kind of talisman: “the Sphinx protects the pyramids against the stormy sand of the desert whereas the idol protects against the floating water of the inundation.” These connections between it and the Sphinx were the reason for calling it the “Mate of the Sphinx.”
In another secondary and unreliable quotation it was also connected with the Pharaoh and known as his mate "surraiat Phir‘aun."  

As for the fate of this mysterious colossus we are informed that it was completely destroyed in 1305 CE by a prince called Ballat, who was searching for treasure underneath. Because he did not find anything underneath he had it cut into pieces which were used as bases for columns in the new al-Masjid al-Jadid Mosque known as al-Masjid al-Nasiry. This mosque, which neighbored al-Madrasah al-Mu‘aizziah, near Fumm al-Halij in al-Fustat must be the one which Sultan al-Nasir Mohamed ibn Qalaoun built. This sultan is known to have reused columns and blocks of stone taken originally from Babylon and elsewhere in the building of this mosque and the citadel (Iwan al-‘Aadl). Sultan Qalaoun ruled between 1287 CE and 1335 CE in three intervals, the last one beginning in 1303 CE.

The reports above yield the following facts:

- According to the detailed and precise description of the Arab historians and especially the eyewitness Almuqaddasy al-Bishary the existence of the colossus is beyond doubt.
- Casanova concluded that the colossus represented the Goddess Isis with her son Harpocrates on her lap. The pot ☐ (Majour in the Arabic version) must have been the base of the so-called Hathor crown.
- The Colossus must have stood in an ancient Egyptian temple, as Casanova also rightly suggested. That temple would have been in the vicinity of the Babylon Enclosure, which is correctly identified with Qasr al-Sham‘a. This was the name of the Roman enclosure at Babylon after the Arab conquest.
- There must have been a certain connection between this Isis colossus and the Sphinx, as a reason for the emphasis that Arab historians gave the name the "Mate of the Sphinx."

These observations lead us consequentially to the following points:

- How far can these reports on the colossus be trusted?
- Can any temple, in which the Colossus would have stood, be identified on the site of Babylon or Misr al-Qadima?
- How can the Colossus be connected with the Sphinx?

The first two questions will be dealt with sequentially. The third will be left for another time.

Evidence for the Existence of the Colossus

The Arab authors were not the only ones who noticed this special connection between the sites in Giza and Babylon. In the Roman Period, Strabo also noticed this connection and expressed it in his description of Memphis, while coming from Babylon after visiting Heliopolis, saying "Memphis itself, the royal residence of the Egyptians, is also near Babylon..." and from here [Babylon] one can clearly see the Pyramids on the other side of the river at Memphis and they are near to it." A similar observation, made much earlier, could be understood from a unique passage on the Great Sphinx Stela, known as the Dream Stela. It is related there that the young prince (later Thutmose IV) was resting at "stp Hr m sht," the Sanctuary of Harmachis / the Sphinx, which was described as: ☒. The splendid place of the primeval time opposite or in the neighborhood of the lords of Kheraha, the sacred road of the western necropolis [horizon]. Kheraha is the Egyptian name for Babylon (Old Cairo). Here again Babylon is shown specially connected with the pyramid site.
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Place names related to the reported location of the colossus: Qasr al-Sham'a, Kheraha (Babylon)

As for the location of the places mentioned above in connection with the colossus and their existence, the main place in whose neighborhood the colossus was said to have stood was Qasr al-Sham'a. This place as mentioned was the name given by the Arabs to Babylon, whereas Babylon was the name given by the Greeks to the Egyptian hri "h3.22

The name of Kheraha according to PT 550 and PT 1272 refers to the field of the battle in which the fight between Horus and Seth took place, and in whose vicinity (Pi-Hapy) the dividing line between Upper and Lower Egypt is supposed to lie.23 The name Babylon is supposed to be derived from the last name in connection with Heliopolis (Pr-h'py n Iwnw)24 “Hapy Temple of the Heliopolitan nome.”

The name of Qasr al-Sham'a in its turn is supposed to be a direct equivalent to Babylon's enclosure. In an interesting analysis of the name Casanova suggested that the first word, “Qasr” in the Arabic version signifies a cupola (or a fortress), and had been used in reference to a cupola in Babylon, which is thought to have been a reminder of a Persian temple (dedicated to fire) and referred to as “Qubbat Babylon” (Cupola of Babylon). This name is exactly preserved in the Coptic
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"ΚΕΝΤΙΩ ΒΑΒΥΛΟΝ." \(^{25}\) The second word, "al-Sham'a" had nothing to do with the words for wax or Syria, as supposed, but is very probably derived from the Ancient Egyptian word "Kmt" (Egypt), Coptic "ΧΜΙ" with which the name of Babylon is usually connected as in the Coptic "ΒΑΒΥΛΟΝ ΧΜΙ ΝΤΕ ΝΙ ΧΜΙ" or, briefly "ΧΜΙ" \(^{26}\) as a current name for it. On the other hand the name "ΚΕΝΤΙΩ" is shown in a recent interpretation to be a bohairic Coptic rendering of hwt k3 Pth, one of the names of Memphis which became current for Egypt (Αίγυπτος). \(^{27}\) This opinion in any case does not contradict the suggestion that the name XHMI, the designation of the whole land, was also used, but in a reversed way, as a designation for the city among the Copts. This tradition was followed by the Arabs later in using "Misr" in the same way for al-Fustat \(^{28}\) and it is still used today in referring to Cairo as Misr (Misr al-'Atiq or al-Qadima). Also, it cannot explain the Arabic rendering Qasr (with the substitute "Qubba"), which clearly designates a certain building.

Anyhow, it is not improbable that Qasr al-Sham'a could be a later rendering of "cupola of Egypt" in reference to its enclosure "Qal'a Kima" \(^{29}\) i.e. Babylon.

In addition to Qasr al-Shama'a and in connection with it, there were two other places given as the location of the idol: Zuqaq al-Sanam and Darb 'Ammar. Both were connected to the main street of the market. Fortunately all these places and streets have been proven to have existed. Casanova, in an exciting achievement, managed to reconstruct the buildings and streets of al-Fustat and exactly locate the idol. The main street of the market is shown to extend at the south and west of Qasr al-Sham'a and is connected with it through Darb al-Mu'allqa. Darb 'Ammar begins at the very beginning of the main street at the east. \(^{30}\) Near to it at the
south east corner of Qasr al-Sham’a lies the street of the idol. It begins nearly at the Nile and ends to the south of the great market street. According to Casanova, the colossus would have been standing about 200 meters south of the main gate of Qasr al-Sham’a, which leads to al-Kanisa al-Mu’allqa.

Identification of the suggested cult place for the colossus
Since the location is clearly attested to, we come to the second point, which concerns the temple or sanctuary in which the Isis colossus once stood.

The Temple of Pi-Hapi
In this regard we have to refer to Casanova’s suggestion that the temple in question would have existed near the Nile. In this temple the Apis Bull used to rest after coming from Heliopolis to Memphis, and so it should be identified with the famous temple of Pr- Hrpi n Iwnw in Nilopolis. This Pr- Hrpi Temple, which is connected with the Kheraha in Piankhi stela, was the port of Heliopolis on the Nile. The Sphinx statues which had been found near al-Madabigh (on Helwan line) should also belong to this temple.

So, according to him, the temple with which the colossus should belong is to be identified with the famous temple of Pr- Hrpi.

In a detailed discussion concerning this site, Gardiner has shown that Nilopolis, in which Pi-Hapy was supposed to be found, cannot be identified with Kheraha, namely Babylon or Misr al-‘Atiqa, but that it should be two kilometers to the south in Athar al-Nabi, the place in which some important finds, dedicated to Merenptah and Amasis to Hapy, father of the gods, have been made. According to these finds, there can be little doubt that the temple of Hapy was located there. This agrees with the textual evidence, which indicate that Pi-Hapy lies to the south of Kheraha. Moreover, in a later study of the location of Pi-Hapy, it was proved that it should be a little south from where Gardiner suggested, exactly in ‘Aezbet al-Walda (four kilometers northwest of Helwan). The city of Pi-Hapy should have been in this place, and consequently his temple. According to the textual evidence, the mythological sources of the Nile of Lower Egypt were in this place, corresponding to that of the Nile of Upper Egypt in Biggeh, and here, on the other hand, the ancient Nilometer existed before it was replaced with the one in al-Roda by Osama ibn Zeid (under Khalif Abd el Malik).

As for the monuments which have been found in Athar al-Nabi, they should have been the sanctuary on the territory of Pi-Hapy, and not necessarily standing in the main temple of Hapy.

The relationship of Pi-Hapy, on the one hand, Kheraha and Helioposi on the other, with the site and with each other is attested to in the texts. Pi-Hapy is shown to be the pre-historical name of the site. Then, after 3,200 BCE, it was replaced by Kheraha since the battle for the union had taken place on this site. The place was also connected with Osirian legend, since the enemies of Osiris were defeated there, and also, as mentioned before, with the struggle between Horus and Seth.

Later on in the Greek documents, the ancient mythological name of Pr Hrpi n Iwnw was adopted and reused in the current name of Babylon.

So accordingly, since the temple of Pi-Hapy has been shown to be further south, at ‘Aezbet al-Walda, it is very unlikely to identify the temple in question with it (i.e. Pi-Hapy). Even the other site of Athar al-Nabi seems unlikely, since it lies two kilometers to the south of our site.

The Temple of Kheraha “Pr psdt”
Apart from the temple of Hapy, the texts referred to another great temple directly connected with
Kheraha and Heliopolis. It is the well known Temple of the House of Enead. This temple, which is well known from the Piankhy stela, had occurred in the same context with Kheraha. So it is supposed that Pi-pesedjet was the alternative name of Kheraha. A passage on the stela of Menshiyet es-Sadr gives evidence that these places should be identified with one another. Pi-pesedjet is also mentioned Edfou list A, with Atum as its great god. This temple is presumably the same as that referred to once as Atum in Kheraha and the Ennead in Psdt. The main gods of Kheraha

The principal god of Kheraha or Pi-pesedjet was, obviously, Atum as is shown on the Piankhy stela, the Edfou text, and other texts. But the god Atum who was worshipped there was in fact a special form of the sun god. It is Atum of hry h3, "who shoots up his enemies from far away," illustrated as an ifw-ape who shoots with his arrow, a form which is connected with the bow (arc) of the sun. He is often referred to as "Atum who resides in his city," namely Kheraha. This epithet, as well as "imy psdt," construct the special form of Atum in his city, Kheraha. Both epithets occur in reference to Atum in connection with hry h3 in the Mammisi of Edfou: Aren't you Atum, who resides in his city and (who holds) the bow and the Arrow. In an offering formula on a lintel dated to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, Atum in his city is mentioned together with the Ennead in connection with Kheraha Psdt imyw hry h3. The temple of Kheraha would have been considered as a second residence for the god Atum parallel to, and maybe equal to, his known residence in On (Heliopolis). Both are referred to with the expression "Hry ib niwt." This can be concluded from a title of a heliopolitan Priest named Amenopic: "prophet of Atum, who is residing in his city in On and in Kheraha." This temple is also referred to on a statue in Berlin from the Twenty-sixth Dynasty as: Ht ntr n 'Itm hry ib niwt.f. The location of Pi-pesedjet is shown on the stela of Menshiyet Es-Sadr to be to the south of Al-Gabal al-Ahmar hist 'Iwnw hnt n Pr- Rr mhty Pr-Psdt. The desert of Heliopolis (G. Al-Ahmar) is lying in the south of Pr-Rr and north of Pr-Psdt. So accordingly it agrees with Kheraha or Old Cairo.

Atum, as seen in some texts, was not the only lord of Kheraha. Beside him stood the Psdt or the Ennead, who were also considered its lords, as clearly expressed on the Piankhi stela. Evidence concerning the Ennead in Kheraha go back at least to the Middle Kingdom as concluded from a door jamb found near al-Azhar mosque from the time of Senoseret I. Another reference to the Ennead is shown in P. Harris (29, 7), where they are referred to as "the lords of Kheraha:" Psdt nbw hry 'h3 hprw m hb "The lords of Kheraha became in jubilee." So the Ennead is seen equally as its lords just like Atum. Both are mentioned again side by side on a stela of "Djadatoumioufankh:" htp di nsw 'Itm hry ib niwt.f Psdt imyw hry 'h3 "kings offering to Atum, who is in his city and the Ennead, who is in Kheraha." Further on, the Ennead is referred to on a stela in Berlin as Psdt cht imy(t) 'lpt "the great ennead, who is in the temple of Opé." This Ennead of Opé may be connected with the Ennead in Heliopolis or in Kheraha. The latter seems more probable, since the epithet 'Itm hry ib niwt.f, which is more connected with Kheraha, follows directly.

A further reference about the lords of Kheraha is in the passage referred to above in the Sphinx stelae ... r h3w nbw hry 'h3, "... in the neighbourhood of the lords of Kheraha." The reference here is to Atum and the Ennead.

A very interesting reference reveals the existence of this temple even in the Arab times. On
an Arabic document in the Bibl. Nat. (Nr. 150), referred to by Casanova there was mentioned the “Birba Babyloun” (Temple of Babylon).67

Furthermore, the existence of such a temple in Babylon may also be supported by some reports which inform us that the Sultan Al-Salih Najmeddin Ayyoub, during the building of his famous citadel on Gezirat al-Rodah (opposite to Al-Fustat) in 1239 BCE (638 H), had reused many columns of granite and alabaster, which he had brought from temples and churches in Memphis, Babylon, and Heliopolis.68

**Exact Location of the Temple of Pi-psedjet**

As for the exact location of the temple of Pi-pesedjet or Kheraha, two close sites could be taken into consideration.

The first one, which is favored by Hamza, is the above mentioned site of Athar al-Nabi.69 The other is the main place in Babylon or Misr al-'Aatiqa, as Gardiner argued.

Athar al-Nabi was suggested as a site of this temple on account of the many finds which were made there, such as the Naophorous statue of Merenptah, the sphinx of Amasis, and remains of buildings found by Gollenischeff.70

The strongest evidence in favor of Athar al-Nabi as a location for that temple was the Naophorous statue of Merenptah. This statue shows a king kneeling while dedicating a Naos, with a figure of a solar deity (Atum) inside it and a figure of a scarab, the Kheperim, depicted above it. These solar aspects which the Naos represents denote that this statue should have been dedicated by Merenptah to a sun temple in Athar al-Nabi, whose god is Atum with the Ennead, which should be identified with Kheraha and Pi-Pesedjet.71 But no interpretation has been given to the epithet *Mry-n-Pth mri m Hrpi Ntrw.*72 “Merenptah beloved of Hapy, father of the Gods.” This epithet, which is also given on the sphinx of Amasis,73 found on the same site, was a reason for Gardiner to assign the site of Athar al-Nabi for *Pi-Hapy*74 not Kheraha. He didn’t refer to the solar representations on the Naos.

A possible interpretation of this problem is that Merenptah is dedicating here a solar chapel or sanctuary presumably of Atum in a temple dedicated mainly to *Hapy*, as Joyotte concluded.

As for the second site of Pi-Pesedjet in Babylon, no monuments have been found from this site, but the textual evidence75 discussed by Gardiner tells in favor of its existence in the vicinity of Babylon.

Since it has been stated that the Colossus stood about 200 meters from Babylon (Al-Kanisa Al-Mu'allaqa), and since Athar al-Nabi lies two kilometers south of this site, and the Colossus could not have stood in Babylon with its temple two kilometers away, the site of Athar al-Nabi can be excluded.

One may conclude then that the temple in which the colossus once stood should very probably be located in Babylon, very close to Al-Mu'allaqa, i.e. Qasr al-Sham’a, and that it would have been part of the main temple of Kheraha or *Pi-Pesedjet*. This Isis colossus, before its destruction in 1305 CE, can be considered the sole monument from that temple.

Since Pi-Pesedjet was consecrated to the Ennead, one would suppose that its members (similar to the case in the great temple of Atom in Heliopolis) would have been represented in it in some way or another, i.e. having a little temple, sanctuary or a chapel of their own. Evidence to support such an assumption is lacking, with the one exception of the Isis temple, which is now well attested through this Isis colossus. However, the existence of such a temple may be confirmed through other evidence. This will be sought this time in the Egyptian documents. The discussion of this point and the remaining third part dealing with the connection between Isis and the Sphinx, already dealt with, should be left for a coming occasion.
In conclusion, the above study has drawn attention to a colossus for the Goddess Isis which was mentioned in the writing of the Arab historians and referred to as the Mate of the Sphinx. Their reports are shown to be trustworthy. The colossus should have been standing in a temple or sanctuary consecrated mainly to Isis and been part of the great temple of Pi-Pesedjet in Kheraha in the vicinity of Al-Kanisa Al-Mull‘allqa in Babylon.

That temple or sanctuary can very probably be identified with her Hr rhyt (temple of the people) known through the texts as will be seen in the coming part.
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