

A RAMESSIDE USHABTI FROM ROMAN KARANIS AND SOME PROBLEMS OF CONTEXT

TERRY G. WILFONG* (KELSEY MUSEUM OF ARCHAEOLOGY)

It is a great pleasure to offer this small tribute to Emily Teeter. Emily may not realize this, but she was a hero to many of us Egyptology students at Chicago in the mid-late 1980s. Already a curator at the Seattle Art Museum before she had her PhD, Emily would periodically breeze into Chicago in her leather jacket: she was the smart, funny, stylish and cool Egyptologist we all wanted to become. When she came back to Chicago in 1990 to be curator at the Oriental Institute Museum, I was lucky to have her supervise my first exhibition and later involve me in her work on the Medinet Habu material, giving me valuable museum experience and helping my dissertation project. She has been a valued friend, mentor, collaborator and role model ever since. I hope she finds this examination of an out-of-place ushabti figure of interest.

The University of Michigan excavation of the site of Karanis (modern Kom Aushim) from 1924–35 yielded an extraordinary amount of artefactual material from this Graeco-Roman period Fayum town. Over 45,000 artefacts from the excavation were ceded to the University of Michigan and are currently in the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, along with extensive archival documentation of the excavation.¹

* For this article, I am indebted to the wonderful staff of the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, specifically Conservators Suzanne Davis and Caroline Roberts, Collections Managers Sebastián Encina and Michelle Fontenot, and former Registrar Robin Meador-Woodruff. I first discussed the problem of accounting for the ushabtis at Karanis with my late friend Traianos Gagos, who, as always, urged me on; I only wish I'd had the benefit of his insight and comments when I came to write this up. Note that the full Karanis excavation database, including information on all finds from the University of Michigan excavations, is available online: https://fms.lsa.umich.edu/fmi/webd/kelsey_excavation_karanis.

¹ For the history of the excavations generally, see Wilfong and Ferrara 2014; for the documentation, see Encina 2014 and Wilfong 2014.

The 2009 addition of the William E. Upjohn Wing to the original Kelsey Museum building led to the re-installation of the museum's permanent display and a re-investigation of many of the Karanis artefacts on display, resulting in new findings and raising new questions. Among the many puzzles uncovered during this effort was the identification of a New Kingdom ushabti figure from a Roman period context at Karanis.



FIG. 1: Ushabti of Pahemnetjer (front), Kelsey Museum inv. 24263. (Photograph courtesy Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan.)

The ushabti in question, Kelsey Museum inv. 24263 (field number 29-CS58-D), is, at first glance, an entirely typical example of this common category of artefact: a mould-made mummiform figure in blue-green faience with details of features and simple inscription painted in black, the figure heavily abraded in places (figs 1–2). The ushabti is 14.5 cm tall, 4.9 cm wide, and weighs 162 g. The deceased is represented holding a hoe in each hand, with a seed-bag across his back, facial features and broad collar simply delineated in black. Somewhat less typically, the figure wears a ‘wig of daily life’ with a side-lock, which is a feature seen on ushabtis made for men who held the office of high priest of Ptah of Memphis.² This fact is reflected in the brief inscription: written in a single column down the front of the ushabti, flanked by column guidelines, the inscription reads: *Wsir wr-ḥrp-ḥmw(t) P³-ḥm-nṯr³* ‘The Osiris, the high priest of Ptah of Memphis (literally ‘Master Craftsman’), Pahemnetjer’.

Pahemnetjer is a known high priest of Ptah of Memphis for whom we have a fair amount of documentation and whose career has been reconstructed by Charles Maystre.⁴ Born at the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty, Pahemnetjer became high priest of Ptah at Memphis under Seti I and spent most of his career serving under that king, in whose reign he began preparation of his tomb at Saqqara. Pahemnetjer had some antiquarian interest in his predecessors in office (based on commemorative inscriptions he erected on their behalf) and married well, placing two of his sons in high office. Pahemnetjer continued in office at least a few years into the reign of Ramesses II, who honoured him further. Pahemnetjer died and was buried around 1275 BCE. Pahemnetjer’s tomb at Saqqara no longer exists, but a block from it was noted by Quibell,⁵ and various monuments of Pahemnetjer that survive would have also come from this tomb and its chapel. The material



FIG. 2: Ushabti of Pahemnetjer (back), Kelsey Museum inv. 24263. (Photograph courtesy Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan.)

2 Schneider 1977: I: 206.

3 The name is unclear in the photograph (fig. 1) because it is written on the curve from the legs to the foot of the figure, but it is relatively clear on the original.

4 Maystre 1992: 143–45, 291–97 for what follows.

5 Maystre 1992: 293.

surviving from Pahemnetjer's burial suggests a generally well-equipped elite tomb, and this ushabti would have formed part of its funerary equipment. The lack of a location for Pahemnetjer's tomb but the survival of various items from it suggests it was robbed and its contents dispersed before the destruction of the tomb itself.

The Kelsey Museum's ushabti, then, would have originally come from Pahemnetjer's tomb at Saqqara, but that is not where it was found: the ushabti came to light in 1928 during the University of Michigan's excavations at Karanis, in a settlement context far removed from Rameside Saqqara in time and place.

The University of Michigan's Egyptian expedition was part of a larger archaeological effort initiated by Francis W. Kelsey to investigate Graeco-Roman period archaeological sites across the Mediterranean and Middle East. The Karanis excavation was begun primarily in search of papyri, as were many Fayum archaeological projects of the time, but Karanis quickly became much more complicated, as excavators found not just papyri, but also a wealth of other artefacts of daily life in a well-preserved site with a complex stratigraphy. Eleven years of excavation at Karanis yielded over 65,000 individual finds (containing over 100,000 artefacts), and over 45,000 of these artefacts were ceded, in a generous division of finds, to the University of Michigan, where they formed the nucleus of the collection of the newly-founded Museum of Classical Archaeology, later renamed after its founder as the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology. Many additional objects from the Michigan Karanis excavation were retained for the Egyptian Antiquities Service (and today form part of the collections of the Cairo Museum, the Coptic Museum and the Agricultural Museum in Cairo), while still more artefacts—mostly very fragmentary or fragile items – seem to have been left on site or otherwise disposed of (sometimes noted in the excavator's files as 'n.t.h.' for 'not taken home').

The wealth of artefacts discovered during the Michigan excavation was unexpected and the excavators were largely unprepared for the logistics of handling and processing the sheer mass of material they were uncovering. Although the Kelsey Museum's archives hold an impressive amount of documentation from the excavation, the level of recordkeeping for individual finds is usually minimal: excavators identified stratigraphic layers that were assigned letters, individual structures were numbered and individual rooms in structures were assigned letters, as were individual finds, and specific finds were assigned field numbers identifying year found, structure and room in which the find was made, with sequential identifiers, but this is often as far as it goes. The actual excavations of individual rooms in structures, and thus the majority of artefact finds, were largely handled by the site workers and unsupervised by the archaeologists (not uncommon in larger-scale excavations

of the time). It is uncommon to have specific information about a given find – location within a room, associated materials – and even more unusual to have an in-situ photograph for a particular find.

Added to this is the complex nature of the archaeology of the site itself. The extensive remains and well-preserved nature of Karanis have led some to refer to it as the ‘Pompeii of Roman Egypt’, but this is an entirely inaccurate and misleading characterisation. Far from a pristine site with a single endpoint, Karanis was gradually and irregularly abandoned, with likely periods of rehabilitation, and modern destruction and looting before it became the focus of archaeologists, and even then attention to the site was erratic and, until relatively recently, unsystematic. Conventional wisdom from the University of Michigan excavation tells us that Karanis was abandoned by 450 CE (although this view has been challenged)⁶ and that the stratigraphy of the site could be divided up into layers, designated A for the most recent to F for the earliest. The excavators assigned rough dates to the layers based on datable objects found in them, but also influenced by their own preconceptions of the site and their own understanding of its history. Recent work on Karanis has only begun to show how complicated the dating of the site really is and how disrupted and permeable the original excavators’ ‘layers’ really are.⁷ It is beyond the scope of the present study to examine this issue in more detail, but it is relevant to note the relatively chaotic state of many of the ‘contexts’ at Karanis and how context is often of little use in determining date or deposition history, given the lack of more detailed information about finds recorded by the excavators.

The findspot of the ushabti of Pahemnetjer is a street context in level C as identified by the excavators, context CS58, east of the courtyard (K) for structure C55. Like most street contexts at Karanis, CS58 was excavated over multiple seasons between 1927 and 1929. Although the ushabti was found in 1928, it was not entered in the records until 1929, which accounts for its field number, but also raises questions about the reason for the delay. Over 30 artefact finds come from CS58 (summarized below in table 1), but they are a disparate assortment, and none are obviously associated with each other. This is very common with street contexts at Karanis, where the artefacts often represent a mixture of street debris, objects from nearby structures that have collapsed or contexts that have ‘leaked’ into the street, and material blown in by winds or brought in after the site’s abandonment. Thus, the use of datable artefacts to date other material or its deposition is of limited value. The datable material from CS58 is relatively consistent: a coin of Constantine I from 312–13 CE (27 CS58-A = Kelsey Museum inv. 64839)⁸ and a papyrus of the

6 See discussion and references in Wilfong and Ferrara 2014: 102–6.

7 Landvatter 2014a.

8 Haatvedt and Peterson 1964: 307 (no. 1505).

3rd–4th century CE (27 CS58-E = P. Mich. inv. 5228), while nearby contexts yielded similarly datable material: a coin of year 2 of Diocletian from 285–86 CE from the nearby courtyard C55K (C55K-N = Kelsey Museum inv. 53544 = Haatvedt 1202)⁹ and an ostrakon of the 3rd–4th century CE (28-C57N-B = O. Mich. inv. 9243).¹⁰ Other, non-dated, material from the context includes typical finds from Karanis (pottery vessels, lamps, wood fragments from furniture and tools), but also some odd and unexpected items: a toy wooden fish (27-CS58-T = Kelsey Museum inv. 7486) and a gilded wooden cobra, likely a fitting for a piece of furniture or a portable shrine (27-CS58-S = Kelsey Museum inv. 8510). However, as tempting as it might be to associate the cobra, relating to indigenous religion, to our ushabti, there is no obvious connection and the two artefacts were not even found in the same season.

As is very often the case with the Michigan Karanis excavation, the contextual material offers little help in interpreting the specific artefact. Although it might be possible to construct a ‘story’ around the disparate finds of CS58, as some have done with other finds at Karanis, there is no evidence of coherent connections between the finds. None of the other finds from the context provide any clues as to the reason that a Ramesside ushabti from Saqqara was found at Karanis. At most, we might take the dated material from late 3rd/early 4th century CE as being suggestive of a possible date of deposition for the ushabti. But the evidence does not permit us to draw any firm conclusions as to why the ushabti was present in the first place. So it remains to look farther afield across the site for clues.

Pahemnetjer’s ushabti, on its own, could be seen as a fortuitous find, a chance survival of something collected by a traveller to Saqqara or traded as a curio to Karanis over a thousand years after its making. But the Michigan excavators, in fact, uncovered seventeen ushabtis between 1924 and 1929, all found separately in domestic or street contexts spread across the site (summarized below in table 2). Most, if not all, were of faience and extremely fragmentary; only two were retained by the excavators (possibly because of the presence of inscriptions) and the rest seem to have been discarded on site, surviving only in very brief and passing descriptions in the Record of Objects books. The excavators’ unfamiliarity with this category of object (manifested in their uncertainty over its spelling—the term is given variously as “ushebti”, “ushepti” and “ushebte”, with “ushabti” only used in reference to Pahemnetjer’s figure) suggests that even more may have been found but not identified as such.

In addition to Pahemnetjer’s ushabti, the University of Michigan retained one other ushabti in the division of finds, now Kelsey Museum inv. 87990

⁹ Haatvedt and Peterson 1964: 268 (no. 1202).

¹⁰ Amundsen 1935: 145 (O. Mich. I 548).



FIG. 3: Ushabti of Hor-udja (?) (front), Kelsey Museum inv. 87990. (Photograph courtesy Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan.)

(= 25-321A-E, figs 3–4). This figure of purple faience is an extremely fragmentary portion of the lower body of an ushabti, approximately 2.0 cm high and 2.0 cm wide. The front preserves only a few hieroglyphs, between two column guidelines, possibly to be read *Wsir Hr-wd[3 ...]* ‘The Osiris Horudj[a ...]’. Too little survives to date this ushabti, but it is certainly pre-Roman, and likely pre-Ptolemaic. It was found in structure 321, room A; a structure from the latest level (designated ‘A’ in later seasons).

Associated finds include beads and non-diagnostic pottery, but nothing easily datable; in general, the ‘A’ level material is the latest at the site, and tends to be dated 4th–5th century CE. So, again we have a ushabti figure found out of its original place, in a non-funerary context considerably later than the figure itself.



FIG. 4: Ushabti of Hor-udja (?) (back), Kelsey Museum inv. 87990. (Photograph courtesy Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan.)

The distribution of ushabti figures at the site seems to show no pattern: none were found in funerary contexts and none were found together or even near each other, nor do they have associations with institutional structures (such as the two temples on the site). Most come from rooms in domestic structures, with only the two ushabtis ceded to Michigan coming from street contexts. All these ushabtis come from contexts conventionally dated to the 2nd–5th centuries CE and thus most are likely to have been at least a few hundred years old at the time of their deposition, but others (like the ushabti of Pahemnetjer as well as an example dated to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, field number 24-59-C) were much older.

Exactly why all of these ushabti figures were found at Karanis is unclear. They are unlikely to be of local or even nearby manufacture. The University of Michigan excavation of Karanis found only four burials, none of which contained any funerary equipment nor had particularly Egyptian cultural features—there was no embalming evident and the bodies were buried, full length, in graves without funerary equipment or grave goods.¹¹ Although only a few of the ushabtis were datable, these all date to before the foundation of Karanis around 250 BCE, and as such were unlikely to have been found or acquired locally. These ushabtis must have been brought to Karanis, but by whom, and under what circumstances, is unclear. Pahemnetjer's ushabti had to have been brought a considerable distance from Saqqara, especially given the means of travel available in ancient times, but other ushabtis from the group may have come from even farther away. However they came to Karanis, they were likely brought deliberately.

Karanis is not, of course, the only later, non-funerary site to yield earlier ushabtis apparently unrelated to their findspots. An interesting parallel can be found in the early Islamic period site of Fustat: a number of ushabtis were found in the excavation of the settlement at Fustat by the American Research Center in Egypt in the 1960s and 1970s, and a selection of these were recently published in an exhibition catalogue from the Oriental Institute Museum.¹² Like the Karanis ushabtis, most of the Fustat ushabtis are fragmentary, and they range in date from New Kingdom to Late Period. Also like the Karanis ushabtis, the Fustat figures come from different non-funerary contexts with no clear pattern of deposition, and are likewise unlikely to have originally come from elsewhere on the site itself, which had no earlier Pharaonic habitation or burials. The accompanying essay by Vanessa Davies concentrates mostly on re-use of Pharaonic building stone at the site, but also addresses portable

11 Landvatter 2014b summarizes the excavated burials. See Wilfong 2017: 303–6 for discussion of a Ptolemaic-Roman coffin panel found by the Michigan excavation (Field number 30-C189B-C, with further information in Wilfong 2015: 83–85) that was repurposed for a door of a shrine, possibly for a local cult of Anubis; there is no evidence that this piece was of local manufacture.

12 Vorderstrasse and Treptow 2015: 154–57.

Pharaonic objects, including the ushabtis, with a reference to the ‘lure of the artefact’,¹³ and this may account for the presence of earlier ushabtis found in later contexts more generally. As at Karanis, the Fustat ushabtis may well have been souvenirs or artefacts casually picked up or deliberately brought from other sites and kept as curios.

All of the foregoing, of course, assumes that the Karanis ushabtis came from secure contexts and that the contextual information is accurate and reflects an ancient deposition of artefacts, and this is probably correct. However, the archaeology of Karanis, and its reflection in the processes and procedures of the University of Michigan expedition, is not always as clean and straightforward as often assumed. From the first, one gets the distinct sense that the Michigan team was overwhelmed by the amount of material they were uncovering, complicated by the fact that the archaeologists were stretched thin and at some remove from the actual excavation, much of which was left to the workers on the site with relatively little oversight. Moreover, the Michigan archaeologists were also actively engaged in the purchase of antiquities while in Egypt, both for the University of Michigan but also for their own personal collections.¹⁴ Add to this the relatively long periods between excavation when the site was minimally supervised and the complexities of the *baksheesh* system in place at the time, and the result is a project where anomalies did occur. Although in-depth analysis of these factors is not practical in the context of the present article, I’d like to close with two apparently intrusive artefacts from the Karanis excavations that could suggest alternative explanations for the presence of the Ramesside ushabti of Pahemnetjer from Saqqara among the artefacts of Karanis.

Kelsey Museum inv. 3727 (fig. 5) is a small silver offering cup with a Demotic inscription around its rim.¹⁵ This artefact was assigned the field number 30-X, meaning that it was registered in 1930 and was a ‘surface find’. This phrase can indicate a number of things: material found on the site surface before excavation, material found without clear context, material found in disturbed surface debris, or material picked up on site during the off-season, among other possibilities. Surface finds from the 1930 season, when no significant excavation was taking place, were particularly numerous: over 2,300 objects were given the field number 30-X, with no further indications of circumstances

13 Davies 2015: 88–90.

14 Project director Enoch Peterson was the primary purchaser, both for the museum (Talalay and Root 2015: 125, 165) and for himself (Talalay and Root 2015: 82–83), with Peterson’s personal collection ultimately coming to the museum. Peterson was sometimes accompanied by his nephew Peter Ruthven, who also purchased antiquities (Talalay and Root 2015: 140–41) that were later donated to the Kelsey Museum in his memory.

15 Text 48762 in Trismegistos <http://www.trismegistos.org/text/48762>; published Speigelberg 1928: 38–39, and republished in Vleeming 2001: 56, with discussion in Farid 1995, Wilfong 1997: 24; Louvre parallels are published in Farid 1994: 124–26.

of their finding. About all one can say about the silver cup, or any of these 2,300 other finds is that they come from the University of Michigan Karanis excavation. Or do they? Closer examination of the inscription on the silver cup makes it unlikely that this artefact could have been found as a surface find during the Karanis excavation, and thus raises questions about the overall record-keeping of the excavation.



FIG. 5: Silver cup with Demotic inscription, Kelsey Museum inv. 3727. (Photograph courtesy Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan.)

This piece is identifiably Ptolemaic-Roman period and, as such, a plausible Karanis find. However, the inscriptions on this cup show it to be an offering to Hathor of Dendera and thus presumably originally from Dendera. Moreover, the Kelsey Museum cup is a close parallel to a number of similar offering cups in the Louvre, also dedicated to Hathor of Dendera and said to have been found there. Indeed, the names involved make it probable that the Kelsey Museum cup was dedicated by a member of the same family that dedicated the Louvre cups, suggesting that the Kelsey Museum cup is part of the same Dendera find. This is not to say definitively that the Kelsey cup did not, in fact, come from Karanis—one can envision a variety of scenarios whereby such an artefact could have been separated from related cups and brought to Karanis in antiquity. But the simpler explanation is to assume the Kelsey cup was not found at Karanis but somehow added into the material from the Karanis excavation, perhaps a purchase by one of the excavators, either inadvertently or deliberately presented as a surface find from the 1930 season at Karanis. Certainly, its lack of secure context will always leave doubt as to its status as a find from Karanis.

Even material with apparently secure excavated context at Karanis cannot always be trusted, as we see in the case of a textile, Kelsey Museum inv. 22602 (field number 26-BS18-D; fig. 6). A fragmentary child's garment (described by excavators as a child's tunic) made of wool, this textile is described as a find in a street context, specifically BS18, excavated in 1926. Like Pahemnetjer's ushabti, this textile is listed as having been found with a group of disparate objects, including a ceramic jar lid (Kelsey Museum inv. 20872 + 26-BS18-c)¹⁶ and a Greek ostrakon (Kelsey Museum inv. 4616 = 26-BS18-B),¹⁷ dated to 3rd–4th century CE. As with the ushabti of Pahemnetjer, the records give no further details about the find or the relationship of the objects in the context. We might take the presence of the datable ostrakon to be suggestive, if not indicative, of a date of deposition in the late 3rd or early 4th century CE, as we did with the ushabti. Fragmentary textiles are relatively common as street debris in the Karanis excavations, so this is not in any way a surprising or unusual find.



FIG. 6: Textile fragment, Kelsey Museum inv. 22602. (Photograph courtesy Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan.)

In the case of this child's garment, however, closer examination of the textile's materials raises questions about the date of the piece as well as the date of its deposition. Based on observation alone, the dyes used are visibly inconsistent with Roman textiles and show signs of colours and processes

¹⁶ Johnson 1981: 87 (no. 607).

¹⁷ Amundsen 1935: 71–72 (= O. Mich I 250).

not available until the 19th or 20th century. Likewise, the use of multicolour yarn and other details of its construction are inconsistent with a Roman date, and more likely to indicate modern manufacture.¹⁸ Indeed, this was already apparent to someone at the Kelsey Museum in the 1930s, as the Kelsey Museum accession register, compiled as objects were assigned accession numbers (as opposed to the excavation Record of Objects book, compiled in the field), has the notation '(Modern?)' next to the entry for this piece, indicating that there were already questions about its antiquity when the piece entered the museum's collections. Further dye analysis, planned by Kelsey Museum conservators, can resolve this question more definitively, but for now we can say that the evidence makes it very likely that this textile is roughly contemporary with the excavation of Karanis rather than the associated artefacts it was found with, and that a description of 'sweater' or 'jumper' might be more accurate than 'tunic'. Perhaps the most likely scenario is that it was abandoned or lost by a child working on the excavation site, perhaps in the course of the excavation of street context BS18 in 1928. But it is also possible that it was deliberately placed in the context, accidentally associated with the context, or attributed to the context for some other reason. The fact that this textile was assigned a field number and treated like ancient, excavated material raises many questions about the security of Karanis contexts and the reliability of contextual information from the site more generally.

Thus, the questions around these two artefacts ostensibly from the Karanis excavation – the silver cup and the child's garment – suggest other scenarios that could also account for the presence of the ushabti of Pahemnetjer at Karanis. Rather than a curio of an ancient past, deliberately acquired and saved by a Karanis inhabitant, this ushabti could be entirely intrusive: an artefact with no connection to Karanis, inadvertently or deliberately added to excavated material in modern times. The year's delay in recording the Pahemnetjer ushabti, found in 1928, but not registered in the Record of Objects Book until 1929, and the assignation of a field number for the 1929 season, is particularly suggestive in this regard. If the ushabti was indeed found in context CS58 in 1928, why was its registration held back for a year? Was there some question about the ushabti that made the excavators hesitate about registering it? Or was it an intrusive piece, a surface find or a purchase added to material from this context and, if so, how and why?

However, the finding of multiple ushabtis in the course of the Karanis excavation, and the presence of ushabtis in much later contexts at other sites, like those found at Fustat, may suggest that Pahemnetjer's ushabti was found when and where the excavators said it was. The saving or collecting of ushabtis

¹⁸ For all the foregoing, I am indebted to Kelsey Museum Conservators Suzanne Davis and Caroline Roberts for sharing their preliminary opinions of this piece.

may indeed have been a practice in later Roman and early Islamic Egypt. Perhaps wider study of ushabtis from later contexts at other sites will provide a better understanding of this phenomenon and account for these out-of-place Pharaonic artefacts. †

REFERENCES CITED

- Amundsen, L. 1935. *Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection*. University of Michigan Humanistic Series 34. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Davies, V. 2015. 'Observations on Antiquities in Later Contexts'. In *A Cosmopolitan City: Muslims, Christians and Jews in Old Cairo*, edited by T. Vorderstrasse and T. Treptow, 85–91. Oriental Institute Museum Publications 38. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Encina, S. 2014. 'Karaniš in the Kelsey Museum Archives'. In *Karaniš Revealed: Discovering the Past and Present of a Michigan Excavation in Egypt*, edited by T. G. Wilfong and A. W. S. Ferrara, 7–14. Kelsey Museum Publication 7. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.
- Farid, A. 1994. 'Sieben MetallgefäÙe mit demotischen Inschriften aus Kairo und Paris'. *Revue d'Égyptologie* 45 117–32.
- Farid, A. 1995. *Fünf demotische Stelen aus Berlin, Chicago, Durham, London und Kairo*. Berlin: Achet Verlag.
- Haatvedt, R. A. and E. E. Peterson. 1964. *Coins from Karaniš: The University of Michigan Excavations 1924–1935*. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.
- Johnson, B. 1981. *Pottery from Karaniš: Excavations of the University of Michigan*. Kelsey Museum of Archaeology Studies 7. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Landvatter, T. 2014a. 'Karaniš Findspots and Stratigraphy'. In *Karaniš Revealed: Discovering the Past and Present of a Michigan Excavation in Egypt*, edited by T. G. Wilfong and A. W. S. Ferrara, 39–43. Kelsey Museum Publication 7. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.
- Landvatter, T. 2014b. 'A Skeleton from the Karaniš Excavation'. *Karaniš Revealed: Discovering the Past and Present of a Michigan Excavation in Egypt*, edited by T. G. Wilfong and A. W. S. Ferrara, 141–42. Kelsey Museum Publication 7. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.
- Maystre, C. 1992. *Les grands prêtres de Ptah de Memphis*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 113. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.
- Schneider, H. D. 1977. *Shabtis: An Introduction to the History of Ancient Egyptian Funerary Statuettes with a Catalogue of the Collection of Shabtis in the Museum of Antiquities at Leiden*. Leiden: Rijksmuseum van Oudheden.

Spiegelberg, W. 1928. ‚Demotica II (20–34)‘. *Sitzungsberichte, philosophisch-philologische und Historische Klasse* 1928.2.

Talalay, L. E. and M. C. Root. 2015. *Passionate Curiosities: Tales of Collectors and Collections from the Kelsey Museum*. Kelsey Museum Publication 13. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.

Vleeming, S. P. 2001. *Some Coins of Artaxerxes and Other Short Texts in the Demotic Script Found on Various Objects and Gathered from Many Publications*. Leuven: Peeters.

Vorderstrasse, T. and T. Treptow. (eds) 2015. *A Cosmopolitan City: Muslims, Christians and Jews in Old Cairo*. Oriental Institute Museum Publications 38. Chicago: The Oriental Institute.

Wilfong, T. G. 1997. *Women and Gender in Ancient Egypt*. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.

Wilfong, T. G. 2014. ‘Notes on Three Archival Sources for the Michigan Karanis Excavations: The Record of Objects Books, the Division Albums, and the “Peterson Manuscript”’. In *Karanis Revealed: Discovering the Past and Present of a Michigan Excavation in Egypt*, edited by T. G. Wilfong and A. W. S. Ferrara, 15–24. Kelsey Museum Publication 7. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.

Wilfong, T. G. 2015. *Death Dogs: The Jackal Gods of Roman Egypt*. Kelsey Museum Publication 11. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.

Wilfong, T. G. 2017. ‘The Changing Jackal Gods of Roman Egypt: Evidence from Karanis and Terenouthis’. *Religions of the Roman Empire* 3: 298–317.

TABLE 1: KARANIS CONTEXT CS58, SUMMARY OF FINDS

All information transcribed from the 'Record of Objects Book' for the relevant season, Kelsey Museum Archives, is available in online database at: https://fms.lsa.umich.edu/fmi/webd/kelsey_excavation_karanis.

FIELD NO.	DESCRIPTION	MUSEUM NO.	FINDSPOT NOTES
27-CS58-A	Coin. Constantine I 306–37 A.D.	Kelsey Museum inv. 64839	Just below level of furnace at N end.
27-CS58-B	Wooden scale beam, finely turned with knob like ends fastened on by means of an iron nail running through. Beam m. 0.22 long, knobs each m. 0.055 long.		
27-CS58-C	Frag. of coarsely plaited palm leaf carrying basket.	N.T.H.	Very high in filling.
27-CS58-D	Frag. of leather.		
27-CS58-E	Papyrus. Late III/early IV cent. A.D.	P. Mich. inv. 5228 In Cairo	On level with top of furnace.
27-CS58-F	Turned wooden leg of some piece of furniture.	Kelsey Museum inv. 10236	
27-CS58-G	V toggle.	Kelsey Museum inv. 8311	
27-CS58-H	Piece of wood with hole at one end and in the center. Holes at right angle to each other.	Kelsey Museum inv. 24867	
27-CS58-J	Small wooden stake.		
27-CS58-K	Wooden stake.		
27-CS58-L	Wooden wedge.		
27-CS58-M	Wooden pin.		
27-CS58-N	Rope hobble.		
27-CS58-O	Textiles.		
27-CS58-P	Grinding stone.		
27-CS58-Q	Ball of plaster.		
27-CS58-R	Animal bones.		
27-CS58-S	Frag. of wooden cobra head (?) with traces of plaster and gilding and dark blue paint.	Kelsey Museum inv. 8510	
27-CS58-T	Piece of wood cut in fish shape, m. 0.16 long, m. 0.077 across, with hole at pointed end. Apparently made from a piece of a box. Decorated with incised lines.	Kelsey Museum inv. 7486	

TABLE 1 (continued)

FIELD NO.	DESCRIPTION	MUSEUM NO.	FINDSPOT NOTES
27-CS58-V	Wooden scale pan, m. 0.105 in diam.		
27-CS58-W	Half of wooden stamp.		
27-CS58-X	Papyrus.	P. Mich. inv. 5229 In Cairo.	On level with threshold of C 55.
27-CS58-Y	End of some bone object.		Very low.
27-CS58-Z	Blue glaze frags.	N.T.H.	
27-CS58-AI	3 small mud discs.		
27-CS58-BI	Mud disc.		
27-CS58-a	Pottery vessel. 479.		
27-CS58-b	Pottery vessel. 76. 4 frags. Used as lid of a, and covered with mud.	N.T.H.	
27-CS58-c	Pottery vessel. Body like 105, but rim slightly different.	Kelsey Museum inv. 20648	
27-CS58-d	Pottery vessel. 76, used as lid of c.	Kelsey Museum inv. 20279	
28-CS58-A	Papyrus frags.	P. Mich. inv. 5498 In Cairo	East of courtyard C 55 K
28-CS58-B	Bone pin frags.		East of courtyard C 55 K
28-CS58-C	Lamp III, mark (7)b.	Kelsey Museum inv. 7089	East of courtyard C 55 K
29-CS58-D	Blue glaze ushabti, complete, height m. 0.145.	Kelsey Museum inv. 24263	1929. Found 1928–29

TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF USHABTI FIGURES FOUND DURING THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN KARANIS EXCAVATIONS

All information transcribed from the 'Record of Objects Book' for the relevant season, Kelsey Museum Archives, available in online database at: https://fms.lsa.umich.edu/fmi/webd/kelsey_excavation_karanis.

FIELD NUMBER	RECORD OF OBJECTS BOOK DESCRIPTION	CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION	INV.
24-59-C	Head of blue glaze 26th; dynasty Ushebte	Outside south of S wall of 4009E and Westward.	
24-139B-O	Blue glaze ushebti.		
24-145-I	Small ushebti figure.		
24-5026C-C	Frag. of blue glaze ushebti.		
25-234-J	Head of blue glaze Ushebti.	House destroyed east of street 222, south of H. 237.	
25-244E-J	Fragment of blue glaze ushebti.		
25-321A-E	Frag. of Ushebti		Kelsey Museum inv. 87990
25-4011-Q	Frag. blue glaze ushebti.	From sunken bin no. 9	
25-5076B-I	Foot of blue glaze ushebti.	= 4020A & B/B557 From wind blown sand above staircase	
26-A3-C	Blue glaze ushebti (?).	From high in debris above B houses near house A3.	
26-B44A-B	Frag. of blue glaze ushebti.	Very low in room	
27-C51G-A	Frag. of blue glaze ushebti. M. 0.04 high	Quite high in filling. This house belongs to Reis Ibrahim Abdel Kerim. The top part of it was uncovered 1925-26 and was numbered 227.	
28-160*-F	Ushebti, headless and footless, light green glaze	Low beneath top layer houses.	
28-BS150-B	Frag. of body of blue glaze ushebti.	(As 5027)	
28-B171*-B	Ushebti frag., blue glaze.		
29-158*-YII	Bottom of blue glaze ushebti.	Recorded 31st. Dec. 1929. Z-FII E. of C121. GII - AIII were found E. of C 122.	
29-CS58-D	Blue glaze ushabti, complete, height m. 0.145	1929. Found 1928-29 A - C entered before.	Kelsey Museum inv. 24263



TOP ROW: 2017 CIPEG meeting in Chicago: reception at the Egyptian Consulate.

SECOND ROW: (L) 2017 CIPEG meeting in Chicago: excursion to the Milwaukee Public Museum. (C) 2019 CIPEG meeting in Kyoto: Emily Teeter and Krzysztof Grzymiski at the Miho Museum. (Photo courtesy of Caroline Rocheleau.) (R) Gerry Scott, III, Bri Loftis and Emily Teeter at the 2010 ARCE annual meeting. (Photo courtesy of Kathleen Scott.)

THIRD ROW: Ossama Abdel Meguid; Emily Teeter; Gabi Pieke; and Tine Bagh at the 2014 CIPEG annual meeting in Copenhagen.

BOTTOM: Emily Teeter examines artefacts with Tomoaki Nakano and Regine Schulz at the Kyoto University Museum, 2019. (Photo courtesy of Caroline Rocheleau.)