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Excavations at Pharaoh-Queen Tausret’s Temple of Millions of Years: 2012 Season

Pearce Paul Creasman*

Abstract: In the summer of 2012, the University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition continued its excavations at the 19th Dynasty Pharaoh-Queen Tausret’s “temple of millions of years,” located near the mortuary temple of Amenhotep III in Western Thebes. This article summarizes the findings from this season, in which the temple sanctuary was excavated, and includes the significant advancements that were made in the understanding of the post-New Kingdom history of occupation at the site.


Keywords/Mots-clés: Tawosret/Tausert, Thebes/Thèbes, 19th Dynasty/19ème Dynastie, Late Period/basse époque, Houses of Millions of Years/les châteaux de millions d’années.

Since 2004, the University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition (UAEE) has been excavating the 19th Dynasty Pharaoh-Queen Tausret’s “temple of millions of years” in Western Thebes (Fig. 1)1

Once the “Great Royal Wife” of Sety II, then regent to Sety’s heir Siptah, and ultimately pharaoh herself, Tausret is one of very few women to have ruled ancient Egypt as king.2 At

* University of Arizona (pcreasman@ltrr.arizona.edu)

1 Our work would not have been possible without the kind permission of the Supreme Council of Antiquities/Ministry of State for Antiquities and support from the members of the MSA Permanent Committee. Regarding our 2012 season, we are grateful for the continued help of Mohamed Ismael (Director of Foreign Missions) in arranging our work in Egypt, as well as the support of Mohammed el-Bialey, Mansour Boraik, Mohammed Abdel-Aziz, Fahti Hassin, Mohamad Hamdam, and all other members of the archaeological administration where our work took place. Mahmoud Abd el Gawad, MSA Inspector, was supportive, punctual, and professional, for which we are especially grateful. We give our thanks also to Don Ryan, Ted Brock, and Elena Pischikova for their hospitality, and, for their great efforts on our behalf, to Mme. Amira Khattab and the American Research Center in Egypt, Reis Ali Farouk Sayed El-Quftawi, and Reis Omar Farouk Sayed El-Quftawi. The 2012 team consisted of: Pearce Paul Creasman (Field Director), Rebecca Caroli, Adam Cirzan, Stephanie Denkowicz, Richard Harwood, Danielle Phelps, and Reis Omar Farouk Sayed El-Quftawi. Furthermore, we employed some 60 local workmen, guards, drivers and assistants, for whom we are also thankful, along with the residents of Sheikh Abd el-Qurna. Richard H. Wilkinson (Director) and Ashleigh Baddour supported the work remotely from the U.S.

2 Also “Tautert” or, less frequently, “Twosret” or “Tawosret.” For details about her and her reign, see R. H. Wilkinson (ed.), Tausret: Forgotten Queen and Pharaoh of Egypt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); R. H. Wilkinson (ed.),
the end of the 19th Dynasty, Tausret served as regent for nearly six years and ruled alone for at least an additional two (likely three) years and possibly into a fourth. Tausret’s temple, constructed during the “golden age of Egyptian temple building,” was the complement to her tomb in the Valley of the Kings (KV 14): two halves of the architectural equipment built to honor and sustain her spirit. An integral part of the ruling experience and, perhaps, the expectations of a pharaoh at the time, her temple would have been the focus of a flurry of activity during her reign to support or reinforce the case for her legitimacy. This is especially likely in Tausret’s case, as she probably witnessed succession struggles after the death of Merenptah and perhaps faced her own.

The temple site was very briefly surveyed and selectively excavated in 1896 by a team nominally under the supervision of W. M. Flinders Petrie. Because of Petrie’s claim that “only a few stones of the foundation remained,” the site remained largely overlooked thereafter until the UAEE’s excavations. Most of the UAEE’s work has focused on the temple proper (Figs. 2a and 2b), a structure that, contrary to common assumptions, was substantially completed, if not fully decorated. The existence of ancillary structures adjacent to the temple (e.g. granaries/magazines and probably a sacred lake) suggests that it was

---


5 Demarée, for example, suggests that the real power of the court during Tausret’s reign may have resided with Sethnakht (R. Demarée, “Hieratic Texts,” in *The Temple of Tausret: The University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition Tausret Temple Project, 2004-2011*, ed. R. H. Wilkinson (Tucson: University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition, 2011), 126).


8 The temple was so thoroughly destroyed in antiquity that little remains other than deep foundation trenches, the occasional foundation stone, and piled masses of mud bricks from the upper courses of walls. The plan of the temple plan has thus largely been reconstructed based on the foundation trenches and the “surface areas.” The latter comprised floors of rooms or open spaces in the temple. The contrast between surface areas and foundation trenches can be seen in figures 2a, 2b, and especially 3.

operational in some form (see Fig. 1). Subsequent occupation at the temple site and periphery is evident, indicating utilization over a span of 1,500 years or more.

In the spring of 2012, the UAEE continued its excavations at Tausret’s temple, focusing on examining the sanctuary and developing a more complete understanding of Late Period occupation(s) at the site. With permission from the Ministry of State for Antiquities, fieldwork was conducted between 23 May and 29 June 2012. This article summarizes the findings from that season and places them in context of previous work.

During the 2012 season it was our intent to: 1) fill exposed temple foundation trenches to better preserve the site, while leaving less than 30 cm exposed to demonstrate the outline of the temple; 2) excavate our previously designated “surface area 54” (see Fig. 2b “S54”), the sanctuary of Tausret’s temple; and 3) further investigate an area in the northwestern corner of the temple (the upper strata in surface area 41 [“S41”]), where Late Period features are evident. The latter two foci were anticipated to permit development of a more holistic understanding of the site and its ancient use(s).

**Site, Trench, and Foundation Preservation**

Preservation of the site is one of the project's priorities. Portions of the temple proper and all of its peripheral areas are used locally as roads or social spaces (e.g. sporting fields). Local interference has negated multiple efforts to construct a fence around the site to safeguard it from ongoing damage. In lieu of a fence, we now routinely rebury foundation-related features of the temple in sand after they have been photographed and mapped, with only the surfaces showing at ground level (see Fig. 3). More difficult to preserve are the fragmentary remains of superstructure walls. To protect such features, we filled the superstructure and temple foundation trenches with sand and built protective mud-brick walls that support and isolate the above-ground remains.

In previous seasons, we stabilized trench walls and reinforced weaker areas where necessary. This season, we backfilled all previously excavated or exposed foundation trenches to within 30 cm of capacity. The reinforced walls are now more secure and stable than they would be if left freestanding. Filling these trenches was not a small undertaking and involved moving hundreds of cubic meters of material, but the process is critical to preserving the temple remains. The method adopted ensures that the architecture remains clearly distinguishable, as the surfaces of walls remain exposed. Empirical observation of the site, which is visible from the West Bank road between the taftish and prominent sites such as the Valley of the Kings and Deir el-Bahri, reveals the long-obscured temple’s floor plan.

---

10 A pottery midden discovered in 2013 and 50 meters north of the temple, provides additional evidence of ritual activity at the temple site. This is by far the largest concentration of ceramics yet found in the vicinity of the temple and is remarkably homogenous, with of thousands of sherds of typical New Kingdom beer jars and red-rimmed bowls (identified by R. Hummel), representing hundreds of individual vessels.
The Sanctuary of Tausret’s Temple

According to Petrie’s site map and notes, the sanctuary (surface area 54 in Fig. 2b) was left largely unexcavated by his team. This westernmost section of the temple abuts a cliff face that was cut back in antiquity to accommodate the northwest corner of the temple. Since the temple was built, numerous construction, flood, and rockslide events have resulted in approximately 2650 cubic meters of debris being deposited between the New Kingdom floor level and the present surface at the rear of the temple. The volume of debris seems to have discouraged Petrie’s team from thorough investigation in this area. His team only traced some of the edges of the temple sanctuary, removing the mud-gypsum *dekka* floor where they worked (see Figs. 4a and 4b), presumably in search of temple boundaries or foundation deposits.

The accumulated archaeological deposits covering more than 50 percent of the surface area of the sanctuary floor, therefore, remained intact. This material proved to be of great importance in addressing several outstanding questions such as: a) was the temple completed, b) did a previous structure stand at this site, as indicated by historical texts,11 and c) who occupied the site and when (i.e. site chronology)?

a) Was the temple completed?

UAEE excavations and analysis have concluded that Tausret’s temple was much more advanced in its construction than Petrie’s results suggested.12 While the corpus of evidence does not at this time permit a conclusion that temple decoration was complete, the construction of the structure reached an advanced stage of construction. All of the intact temple floor surfaces have evidence of a *dekka* covering, so at least the floors of the temple rooms had been prepared for use. Furthermore, the frequency and location of plaster and whitewashed stone fragments found support this interpretation. Hundreds of such fragments were recovered from site, distributed over all areas of the temple but with the highest concentration deriving from the sanctuary area. While preparing the floors with *dekka* may have been associated with an early phase of construction, necessary for leveling the rough natural surface of the *gebel*, a whitewash of plaster, which was used to fill cracks and other


imperfections in stone or brickwork and to prime surfaces to receive painted decoration, would likely not have been applied until the structure was at some advanced stage of completion. It seems logical to infer that the roofing of the temple must also have been completed prior to the whitewashing of the floors and walls of the structure, since the installation of ceiling blocks would have caused damage to those finished surfaces. Unfortunately, although many fragments of stone that may have derived from the ceiling blocks have been recovered, no fragments unambiguously attributable to the ceiling have been identified to date.

However, a find from the northwest corner of the temple lends additional support to the case for an advanced state of temple construction. Two pieces of sandstone that have worked surfaces with tool marks consistent with those of in situ temple foundation blocks were found reused as part of a Late Period mud-brick structure’s threshold (Fig. 5). Critically, the pieces are coated with whitewash on only two sides, as would be expected of a stone block from a wall corner. The whitewashed sides were face down in the reused application, indicating that the plaster coating was not a result of the reuse event with which they were associated. The combined direct and circumstantial evidence supports the conclusion that these two joining pieces formed part of a corner in Tausret’s temple that was whitewashed before being subsequently dismantled and reused. These fragments thus support the suggestion that the temple had reached a stage of construction in which at least some of its walls were finished with a surface treatment of whitewash, perhaps immediately prior to (or even after) decoration.

Similarly, with the same caveat of attribution as to their source, the presence of at least six small mud-brick fragments with painted plaster found in the lower strata of the sanctuary deposits could suggest that this portion of the temple specifically was completed or at least in the process of receiving decoration (Fig. 6), most likely dating to the New Kingdom based on stratigraphy, associated ceramic analyses, and color scheme). Dozens of other mud-brick fragments had pigment transfer from contact with painted objects with color schemes common in the 18th and 19th Dynasties. These shadows of a lost structure possibly resulted from the initial destruction of the sanctuary where prepared and (freshly?) painted wall

---


15 Other interpretations of this evidence are certainly possible but deemed unlikely for a variety of reasons. One interpretation, for example, is that temple corner stones were, after being removed from Tausret’s structure, reused some time before their current iteration, the coating being added for this (hypothetical) initial reuse. Given the trends of reused stone at the site, such an explanation seems extremely unlikely.

16 Yellow, blue, and brown were most common (and were also the primary colors used in temples during this period; Arnold, Temples of the Last Pharaohs, 28), followed by traces of red and green.
fragments fell onto other bricks. Mud-brick walls with plastered and painted scenes would certainly have made for more expedient construction than would stone walls decorated with sunk relief.\textsuperscript{17}

b) \textbf{Did at least one previous structure exist at this site?}

It is possible that the painted/plastered mud-brick fragments described above may have derived from a structure predating the temple. While the temple’s walls were undoubtedly filled with mud brick, they were probably cased in stone. Why apply a thick plaster and painted finish to unseen, internal mud bricks, unless time necessitated a few shortcuts, possibly including internal walls of mud brick, rather than stone?\textsuperscript{18} An equally likely interpretation of the painted mud-brick fragments, supported by additional evidence noted below, is that a mud-brick structure with whitewashed and painted walls previously existed on this site. This hypothesis has, in fact, been a common supposition although previously unsupported by any archaeological evidence.\textsuperscript{19} For example, based on a graffito in the temple of Thutmose III at Deir el-Bahri that mentions a “mansion of the king” belonging to the queen in her year 7, Martina Ullmann suggested that a temporary structure—perhaps constructed of mud brick, or maybe even no more than a tent—was erected at the site to serve as a barque station while little more than the temple foundation existed.\textsuperscript{20} Indeed, foundations of the Tausret’s temple did exist in her year 7, as evidenced by an inscription on one of the remaining foundation blocks reading, “Regnal year 7, 1st month of Akhet, day 23,” very likely in reference to its placement.\textsuperscript{21} It has also been established that the temple foundations were not completed until at least “Regnal year 8, 2nd month of Shemu, day 29,” a date inscribed on another temple foundation block.\textsuperscript{22} For reasons of sheer practicality, the builders may have opted to encase such a preexisting structure or to dismantle it and use its components as fill for new walls. Additional supporting evidence for the possibility of a

\begin{itemize}
  \item Tausret’s tomb in the Valley of the Kings was decorated in sunk relief and plastered/painted, but it was begun nearly ten years before her ascension as pharaoh (that is, during Sety II’s second regnal year, while she was still queen), providing sufficient time to make progress; see H. Altenmüller, “A Queen in a Valley of Kings: The Tomb of Tausret,” in \textit{Tausret: Forgotten Queen and Pharaoh of Egypt}, ed. R. H. Wilkinson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 67–91.
  \item Viewed in retrospect, time was short, and it is reasonable to assume that Tausret, a veteran of the royal court, would have perceived this. Furthermore, the unfavorable treatment of her legacy by her successor Sethnakht (which included appropriation of her tomb), compared to his relatively benign treatment of Siptah’s monuments, might suggest a palpable friction between Tausret and Sethnakht during her lifetime.
  \item Ullman, \textit{König für die Ewigkeit}, 436–37.
  \item Demarée, “Hieratic Texts,” 127.
\end{itemize}
preexisting structure has been found elsewhere on site.\textsuperscript{23}

Furthermore, three mud bricks stamped with Tausret’s cartouche were recovered from the destruction layer immediately above the New Kingdom floor in the sanctuary. This is the highest concentration of such bricks found at the site and accounts for approximately 10 percent of the total number of stamped bricks bearing her name that have been recovered to date. Two other mud bricks with indistinguishable cartouches were also found in the sanctuary: one might be that of Tausret, and the other was illegible. All of these bricks were found in strata above the fragments of painted mud brick. While this may be the result of destruction, reuse, and chance, it is a curious relationship nonetheless.

When the sanctuary was excavated to the \textit{dekk\ae} level,\textsuperscript{24} numerous small circular recesses were discovered around the edges of the sanctuary, cut into the \textit{geb\ae} (\textbf{Figs. 4a} and \textbf{4b}). Initially it was presumed these represented foundation deposits of the Type II variety found elsewhere on the site,\textsuperscript{25} but the dimensions are not consistent with confirmed foundation deposits associated with the structure, and every one of these features in the sanctuary was empty, with no associated artifacts of any kind. While it is possible that Petrie’s men or other early excavators removed artifacts from these recesses, as was the case in foundation deposits elsewhere in the temple where small traces such as loose beads, fragments of faience, or leaves attested to the original contents and their removal, in the case of the sanctuary recesses there were no traces of evidence of such activity.

The sanctuary recesses are regularly positioned around the north, south, and west edges of the surface unit and were initially sealed beneath the \textit{dekk\ae}. The regular spacing, depth, and width may suggest that these recesses cut down into the limestone surface of the \textit{geb\ae} functioned as postholes, but if these are remnants of structural features, it was for a building phase that predated construction of Tausret’s temple and the installation of the sanctuary floor. As nearly 50 percent of the sanctuary’s \textit{dekk\ae} floor remains intact, it is possible that other such features are preserved beneath it, which will be investigated during the next UAEE season.

The aforementioned cut in the escarpment at the northwest corner of the temple (\textbf{Fig. 7}) also suggests that an earlier structure existed at the site.\textsuperscript{26} Given the advanced understanding of the geography of the site gained through the work of specialists in the field,\textsuperscript{27} it appears

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{24} Cleared to \textit{dekk\ae} in areas not excavated by Petrie’s men and to \textit{geb\ae} in the few places excavated by them.
\item\textsuperscript{26} Wilkinson, “History of the Temple,” 161–62. Petrie (\textit{Six Temples at Thebes}, 13) originally made this observation.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
that the temple builders could have avoided the significant investment of time and labor required to modify the *gebel* cliff by building the temple 10 meters farther south, a location that would not have conflicted with any other known features nor presented problems for the orientation of the temple. So, then, why build the temple in this specific place? A desire to incorporate a smaller or more ephemeral structure of significance into the temple design might have provided sufficient motive to override building and design efficiencies. Whatever the reason, it is clear that this specific location was significant and that the landscape was tailored to accommodate the temple (as shown in Figs. 1, 7, and 8).

c) Stratigraphy and site occupation

Excavations near the present surface levels (stratum I0/Ia) in all areas worked in 2012 (Fig. 8) revealed a coherent pattern of deteriorated mud-brick structures consistent with Late Period construction.

The ceramics and other material culture contemporary with this series of mud-brick walls suggest at least two phases of use dating to the Late Period and/or the Greco-Roman Period. Further analysis of the ceramics is planned for future seasons, but the pottery is consistent with that found previously, which dates from the 25th–27th Dynasties to the 4th–5th centuries C.E. More importantly, this layer extended over the sanctuary and was undisturbed at that location, providing a closed context for excavation. The material below this later stratum was not disturbed in the course of Petrie’s work at the site. The stratigraphic profile and artifactual material associated with the intact deposits in the sanctuary area allow for a revised understanding of the site’s development (Tab. 1, Fig. 9).

**Tab. 1: Refined Interpretation of Strata**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I0</td>
<td>Surface finds and everything above the presumed Late Period layers (in which at least two occupation/construction events occurred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>Where a distinct rock chip layer exists (presumed as a result of Late Period rock-cut tomb construction in the <em>gebel</em> cliff west of the temple site), this subdivision is the material above the rock chips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


29 See also Wilkinson, “The UAEE Excavations,” 38–41.
Where the rock chip layer exists (contents presumed to pre-date construction of the aforementioned rock-cut tombs), this subdivision is the material in or below the rock chips.

| Stratum II | New Kingdom level (unchanged from previous interpretation) |

Ceramic remains were found in Strata I0, Ia, and Ib in secure contexts. Future analysis should yield a more precise understanding of the dates of these cultural layers. For example, in stratum Ia a nearly complete inscribed vessel containing plant leaves was recovered from an otherwise sterile layer of stone chips (Fig. 10). Rexine Hummel (Royal Ontario Museum) has identified the vessel as a Phoenician import datable to the Egyptian 25th Dynasty. According to Robert Demarée (Leiden University), the short text written on the vessel is either very late hieratic or demotic, consistent in date with its stratigraphic provenience. The short inscription most probably reads “day 22,” written with a somewhat abnormal spelling. Demarée also notes that such brief texts usually appear on embalming material and that brief docket texts of this type without secure context are difficult to interpret. However, this vessel seemed to have been intentionally placed in the middle of the layer of stone chips. It was in an area overlying the sanctuary that Petrie’s men had not disturbed. It seems that the vessel was put into the stone chip level, leaves were placed on the rim, and the entire deposit was then covered over with more stone chips. Given that the rest of the rock-chip layer was virtually sterile, and that we recovered no other organics, inscribed vessels, or ostraca from the area, it seems unlikely that this was an accidental deposit.

Numerous ceramic sherds were recovered from all strata of surface area 54. Three nearly complete vessels were found in association with the upper strata and have been tentatively identified as Phoenician amphorae dating to the 25th Dynasty or later. Such a date confirms the interpretation of the history of use of the site provided in Table 1 and Figure 9. The amphorae were reconstructed and have been placed in storage for review by a specialist in 2013. Few other diagnostic pottery finds were recovered from surface area 54, but the datable ceramic remains were a number of fragments of blue-painted jars from the New Kingdom stratum, much like those found in 2006. As evidenced elsewhere in the temple, it is likely that these had been ritually smashed on the floor of the sanctuary in ceremonies related to the temple’s foundation, expansion, or operation.

---

30 R. Demarée, personal communication, 19 September 2012.
31 The leaves have been tentatively identified as persea (Mimusops schimperi; M. laurifolia), common in funerary bouquets and found elsewhere on site; see I. Friis, F. Nigel Hepper, P. Gasson, “The Botanical Identity of the ‘Mimusops’ in Ancient Egyptian Tombs,” JEA 72 (1986): 191–204.
Late Period features (Surface Areas 41, 49, 54)

Excavations near the northwest corner of Tausret’s temple, at the base of the modern road embankment, revealed a series of mud-brick walls extending from the temple toward the west that appear to represent a series of small courtyards or rooms ranging from 6 - 10 meters wide (Fig. 8 and 11). Doors were present, evidenced by associated door jambs, stone thresholds, and scant remnants of wooden doors. The structures are reminiscent of Late Period tomb chapels, like those found behind the Ramesseum, but further excavation is necessary to confirm such an interpretation of the architecture, as only the outermost court and damaged walls are presently exposed.

Recovery of indirect evidence for at least three tombs cut into the gebel cliff at the western edge of Tausret’s temple complex continued in 2012. The existence of late Third Intermediate or Late Period burials of some kind (likely 25th or 26th Dynasty) is certain. At least one such burial must have been disturbed, as fragmentary human remains and numerous artifacts without apparent monetary value were discarded seemingly at random in the northwest corner of the temple site. More than 300 fragments of disarticulated human remains associated with the abovementioned mud brick walls have been recovered, comprising fragments ranging in size from individual phalanges to intact crania, and representing at least 15 individuals (see Fig. 8). Understanding the Late Period phases of use of the temple site will form our primary goal for future seasons of fieldwork at the site.

Other notable finds

A mapping exercise recovered a fragment of a carved limestone foundation deposit plaque with part of the name of Tausret near the foundation pit at the temple’s southwesternmost corner (Fig. 12). The reverse has an ancient graffiti with one or more unidentifiable characters. This piece likely matches another fragment found in the same vicinity during the 2009–2010 season.

Conclusions

Evidence continues to mount that Tausret’s temple was very close indeed to completion in terms of construction, and a suggestion can be offered that the sanctuary was functional before its destruction. Given the relative brevity of Tausret’s reign, it would not be surprising if the sanctuary, as the “center of movement” of the temple, had received a full complement of preparations even while the remainder of the temple lacked it. The temple seems to have been at least functionally operational prior to its destruction.

Excavations in stratum I, especially above surface area 54, which was largely untouched by Petrie, were exceptionally informative. This work permitted development of a much better understanding of the later phases of activity at the site. However, more work is needed west of the temple proper to resolve outstanding questions regarding the nature and duration of subsequent use. During the Late Period, burials in tombs constructed at the site are attested. The site was probably perceived as a contiguous part of the Qurnet Murai cemetery at that time, but any relation to the temple is speculative at best. It is hoped that future excavations can clarify the question of whether such a relationship existed or if the site was simply viewed as prime eternal real estate.

37 Arnold, Temples of the Last Pharaohs, 26.
Figure 1. Virtual interpretation of the temple based on archaeological remains and comparable contemporary structures (after A. Brewer).

Figure 2a. Simplified plan of Tausret’s Temple showing UAEE excavations and surface area designations; 2012 excavations in surface areas 41, 49, 54, 56 and adjacent.

Figure 2b. Map (created with CAD) displaying the outline of the temple (foundation trenches are lined in blue; surface areas in solid black), among other features at the site, from UAEE excavations.
Figure 3. Foundation trenches (light) and surface areas (dark) in the southwestern quadrant of the temple (surface areas 50 [left] and 43 [right] in the foreground).

Figure 4a. Excavated sanctuary of Tausret’s Temple.
Figure 4b. Temple sanctuary detail (R. Caroli).

Figure 5. Potential corner stones from Tausret’s Temple with whitewash.

Figure 6. Mud-brick fragment, with plaster and paint.
Figure 7. Modified historic satellite imagery displaying the basic outline of the temple (black rectangle) and highlighting section of the gebel escarpment cut to accommodate the temple in this precise location (white oval).

Figure 8. Detail of Strata I0/Ia mud brick walls in the area of the northwest corner of Tausret’s Temple. Human remains indicated are only representative of the hundreds of bones recovered in this area, usually in small groups.
Figure 9. Refined stratigraphic profile in the temple sanctuary (see also R.H. Wilkinson [ed.] 2011, 38-41, Fig. 4-4).

Figure 10. Vessel intentionally placed in rock-chip stratum Ia with inscription & leaves.
Figure 11. Representative mud-bricks walls: remains are only three to four courses by three wythes.

Figure 12. Fragment of Tausret foundation deposit plaque.