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ABSTRACT

One of the major problems of Nubian history is assessing the impact of Egyptian rule in Kush during the New Kingdom (c 1550-1070 BC) on the emergence of a powerful 'Egyptianised' indigenous state in the 9th-8th C BC.

In order to address this issue, the nature of Egyptian rule in Nubia is examined. The conventional view of the extent of Egyptian military and political control is questioned. It is proposed that a buffer zone was left between the area of direct control and the official frontier, with local rulers. It is argued that the 'Egyptian' administration was drawn largely from local elite families rather than being 'colonial Egyptians' and that other local political powers were accommodated. An integrated economy is advocated. The cultural impact of Egypt is seen as the explanation of the 'disappearance' of the indigenous population that was argued by earlier archaeologists. The impact of Egyptian religion, notably the promotion of the royal cult is examined. The re-assessment of Nubia under Egyptian viceregal rule allows the conventional view of the period between the end of the Viceregal administration and the emergence of a new indigenous kingdom to be questioned.

Following an examination of the archaeological and historical material, it is argued that immediately following the end of Egyptian rule, local rulers assumed power and modelled themselves on the pharaonic monarchy. The evidence for the continuity of trade is discussed and its importance to the emergence of the indigenous Kushite state is assessed. The whole historical process is viewed against the background of the end of the Late Bronze Age and the changing trade axes and rise of Assyrian power in western Asia.
Non fumum ex fulgore, sed ex fumo dare lucem
Cogitat, ut speciosa dehinc miracula promat. Horace

Upon the Death of my Father I was resolved to travel into Foreign Countries, and therefore left the University, with the Character of an odd unaccountable Fellow, that had a great deal of Learning, if I would but show it. An insatiable Thirst after Knowledge carried me into all the Countries of Europe, in which there was any thing new or strange to be seen; nay, to such a Degree was my Curiosity raised, that having read the Controversies of some great Men concerning the Antiquities of Egypt, I made a Voyage to Grand Cairo, on purpose to take the Measure of a Pyramid; and as soon as I had set myself right in that Particular, returned to my native Country with great Satisfaction.

Joseph Addison, The Spectator, 1 March 1711
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A note on definitions.

In recent years there has been a move to drop some of the older, more familiar, terms defining periods or places. 'Ethiopian', as a general term for things Nubian and Meroitic, or in the case of Egypt, for the 25th Dynasty, was the first to go. Reisner's terminology, based upon the first season's work at Shellal, has, perhaps unfortunately, become engrained: Adams's attempt to replace Reisner's 'Groups' with 'Horizons' seems not to have had any lasting effect, nor has Trigger's 'Early/Middle Nubian'. Although the history of post-pharaonic Nubia was divided into 'Napatan' and 'Meroitic' phases, on the location of the royal burial places, there has been increasing use of 'Meroitic' to apply to all of post-pharaonic Nubia, from the 11th Century BC onwards (even backwards to include Kerma). 'Ballana' now more usually replaces 'X-Group' for post-meroitic Lower Nubia, and the more recently coined 'Post-pyramidal meroitic' for a comparable phase in the south. With the possibility of confusion amongst these terms, the following definitions are used here:

Nubian, is without ethnic connotations, simply 'of Nubia' geographically (not to be confused with 'nubian' language or modern people).

Kushite, ethnically implies indigenous peoples, not Egyptians. The 'kingdom of Kush' has been used as a term for the kingdom based on Kerma, also for the earliest phases of the post-pharaonic monarchy. Here it is used for indigenous monarchies, both Kerma and (usually as 'Kushite kingdom') post-pharaonic.

Meroitic, is here used for the phase from the end of the Viceregal administration until the 4th century AD.

Kurru kingdom, this term seems first to have been used by Kendall (1982), and is applied to the emergent monarchy.
Introduction: history and historiography.

Addressing historical problems, rather than writing a simple Chronicle, must raise questions which cannot be successfully answered - but nevertheless, the questions must be asked, if only to remind ourselves that although there are many limits imposed by the evidence, the reality was more complex. Some aspects of ancient history have, of course, been influenced by general trends in historical research. The most obvious is economics, which, ever since Karl Marx, has been seen as one of the most important factors in historical development. This influence, whether for or against Marx's views of the ancient economy [1], was soon felt in Ancient History, notably in the works of Max Weber and Michael Rostovtzeff [2]. Egyptology, as Jac. Janssen [3] observed, was much slower to consider the importance of economic factors, and then it was the Ptolemaic and Roman periods which first received attention [4]. In the more recent discussion of the ancient economy the work of Karl Polanyi has been the greatest influence. His personal convictions and the influence of these on his work, along with his influence on others have been instructively discussed by Sally Humphreys [5]. Whether following or modifying his views, his theories have been significant in Assyriology (Leo Oppenheim) and the Greek and Roman worlds (Moses Finley), as well as in Egyptology (Jac. Janssen).

More recently, research in Ancient History (Altertumswissenschaft) [6] has been directed towards other groups within society and aspects of culture. Whilst the evidence from the Greek, Hellenistic and Roman worlds is far richer (or more accessible), these trends have also had some impact in the other branches of Ancient History. But the quantity and type of evidence makes the study of, for example, women's history or gay history, much more difficult in the context of North Africa or Western Asia [7]. Aspects for which the archaeological record is important stand a better chance of attention; such as the history of agriculture, or of trade. Yet some aspects of
cultural history, such as music and dance, or food - fundamentally important in all societies - remain elusive. With the first we can go little beyond describing instruments, and occasionally contexts. For the second, knowledge of agriculture and crops is only part of the whole picture, not always supplemented by literary sources. Sauneron's study was informative about negative Egyptian attitudes to Kushite (and Phoenician) food, but not about the food itself [8]. In these cases, a reliance on the artistic and archaeological record restricts a better understanding of the culture: only anthropology can provide parallels.

Timothy Kendall's (1989) paper on Ethnoarchaeology in Meroitic studies failed to receive an enthusiastic response perhaps because its application was less rigorous than its theory [9]. Nevertheless, the methods of anthropology and ethnoarchaeology might be the only way of penetrating otherwise opaque archaeological material and remains. To take the examples of music and food. Macadam, discussing the 'Musician's wall' at Kawa, illustrated a modern double-headed drum and the Mahdi's elephant-tusk trumpet [10] as parallels. Macadam did not comment further, although the Mahdi's trumpet has features in common with other Sudanese tusk trumpets, being side-blown and with its opening covered with a membrane. Without surviving ancient examples, it would be dangerous to draw precise parallels, but the modern examples should alert us to the possible implications of ancient depictions. Whilst types of instrument may have undergone relatively little change and hence their sounds (if not their music) may be heard, the function and importance of music is more difficult to approach. Much recent research has emphasised the use of music as a significant element, rather than an incidental, in the projection of political ideology and cultural self-image in the states of early-modern Europe [11]. In part due to the limits of the evidence, music is still one of the neglected aspects of ancient society. In trying to assess its importance, anthropological, or ethnomusicological [12], perspectives may be valuable. For example, music need not be associated only with religious or 'leisure' activities: in more recent societies,
diplomatic missions from one African ruler to another might involve elaborate panegyrics, sung by one or more herald.

Although anthropologists have contributed to the development of Nubian studies in recent years, it is surprising that Nubian cultures have never been treated as early manifestations of the East African 'cattle cultures' [13]. Adams, particularly, emphasised the distinction between the pastoralist and arable producers in Meroitic times, viewing them as two independent elements - the one settled and to some extent urban, temple building and Egyptianised, the others nomadic and poor [14]. This distinction is not supported by recent research which has focussed on nutritional requirements and how they affect our perception of agriculture in archaeology. John Sutton has drawn attention to the balance between starchy and fatty foods [15]. Dependant on the location, the cultivation of starchy foodstuffs, ensete, yam and millet was balanced by a parallel production of oily foods, noog or oil-palm. In millet-producing areas, Sutton noted that there were few oil-bearing crops and that hunting, or in areas of denser population, cattle herding, supplied the requisite fats. This knowledge allows us to approach Meroitic agriculture and society (and food) with an entirely new model: that far from being separate, the two elements - arable production and pastoralism - were interdependent. This model has further implications for our understanding of the workings of Meroitic society and religion. One element of the population (elsewhere in East Africa, the young men) would be herding cattle, while other groups were involved in the cultivation of millet and other crops. Rather than a 'cattle cult' persisting among sedentary arable producers, as Adams proposed [16], the association between millet and cattle in the temples dedicated to Apedemak can perhaps be better explained. There might also be a connection between young men as cattle herders and as warriors [17], and between Apedemak as a pacific vegetation god and as a warrior god.

Nubian studies has only emerged relatively recently as a field of study independent of Egyptology and non-Egyptologists have made
increasingly important contributions. Recent research has focussed on the important indigenous phases—notably the A-Group and Kerma and on the later Meroitic period. The Viceregal period and the earlier Meroitic period—the 'Napatan' or Egyptian 25th Dynasty—have still (with a very few exceptions) not been effectively integrated into Nubian studies [18]. The predominance of Egyptian types of material (amongst other factors) have left Nubia during these phases as (peripheral) fields within Egyptology [19].

In the following discussions, considerable attention has been paid to the work of earlier scholars. Whilst ideas are continually being modified, there is always the underlying Received Knowledge, which, often remains unchallenged [20]. Exploring the historiography of a subject must inevitably result in self-questioning. As Momigliano encouraged [21]:

A candid admission of the purpose of one's own study, a clear analysis of the implications of one's own bias helps to define the limits of one's own historical research and explanation.

Early in my research I was given contrary advice by two Professors: one suggested that I drop the 25th Dynasty and begin with the Old Kingdom, the other that I drop the New Kingdom and continue through the later Meroitic period. Both Professors ignored, or failed to appreciate, my interest and purpose. That interest and purpose, the central theme of this study, is attempting to define the impact of Egypt upon Kush: how did the five-hundred years of Egyptian presence affect the emergence of a powerful indigenous state?

The diffusion of civilization from Egypt to the rest of Africa was proposed by a number of European writers, such as Meyerowitz, Seligman, Hirschberg and Wainwright [22] following Grafton Elliot Smith. Smith's view was supported by anthropological evidence of Egyptian features of culture and religion, and in some cases, language, in West Africa. In some instances this was also supposed to have involved migrating populations.
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Diffusionism was one of the leading models for the historical process and was advocated by academics across the whole spectrum, from (for example) Flinders Petrie to the Marxist V. Gordon Childe [23]. As with many theories which become generally applied, diffusionism confused different issues. So the diffusion of languages, of technology, and of culture, became associated with that of race. Similarly, the reaction to diffusionism, emphasising independent invention, may have underemphasised the possibility of transmission of technologies and ideas [24].

Diffusionism was falling out of favour as an academic theory by the 1950ies [25], yet has now been adopted completely by African and African-American writers (in the USA) following the work of Anta Diop [26]. Diop, writing at the time of Senegalese independence from French colonial rule, understandably sought to present a new, positive view of African history uninfluenced by the prejudices of European thought, he therefore looked to Egypt as one of the oldest and most influential of cultures, and one which developed in Africa. Diop differed from the European writers in arguing that the ancient Egyptians were 'black' [27], but he followed them in the idea that not only was much of the rest of African culture derived from Egypt, but that there were migrations of people from the Nile Valley westwards. He thus adopted many of the ideas which had been proposed by European academics on racist grounds (whether they were conscious of that or not).

The influence of diffusionism can be seen in Nubian studies, in Reisner's scheme for the development of Nubian cultures generally (new cultures = new people) and in his proposed Egyptian and Libyan origins of the 25th Dynasty (see Chapter 8). Arkell [28] applied the diffusion theory more simplistically, proposing that the royal family of Meroe moved westwards, and thus began the spread of aspects of culture, and technology, notably iron-working to Chad and eventually northern Nigeria. The whole idea of diffusion from Egypt was based, as Shinnie [29] emphasised, on the idea that it was "somehow impossible for Africans to have made these advances on their own". 
Even with the considerable advances in our knowledge of the archaeology of parts of sub-Saharan Africa, the issue of diffusion of culture and technology remains controversial [30].

There has been a considerable re-assessment in attitudes towards the states of the Middle Nile in recent years. While the role of these states as intermediary between Egypt and the rest of Africa is still of significance, more attention has been given to the direct relationship between Egypt and Kush. Adams (1977) proposed to view Nubia as the "corridor to Africa", the control of which dictated control of Egypt's wealth [31]. The power of the early Kushite states (the A-Group, Kerma) has been emphasised by a number of writers, but the emergence of the 'Egyptianised' Kushite state in the 8th-7th centuries BC (which would appear to offer a perfect field for theories of cultural influence) has received less attention. The bizarre 250-year gap in its history (c 1100-850) has probably prevented this; indeed, it stimulated Adams's unfortunate comment that it "took some time for the lesson of the Pharaohs to sink in" [32].

In order to consider what might have happened at the end of the Viceregal period, it is necessary to form a model of how Nubia functioned under Egyptian rule. Egyptian 'imperialism' has received considerable attention in recent literature and the older view has been radically revised, although there is still perhaps no consensus [33]. Examining the main features of Egyptian 'imperialism' - military control, administration, economy and ideology - and how these have been explained in the literature inevitably raises fundamental questions about aspects of (and our assumptions about) those features in Egyptian society. It also raises questions about the interpretation of the archaeology of Nubia.

The Egyptian military expansion into Nubia and continued military activities must be chronicled from the 'historical' texts of campaigns, but it is also important to consider how states control their frontier regions. The time-scale involved is also important:-
Egyptian New Kingdom presence in Nubia lasted a long time compared, for example, with British rule in India, or even Roman rule in Britain. Factors which were important during the period of expansion were not necessarily a priority some two or three hundred years later. Similarly, the indigenous powers opposing Egyptian expansion (eg Kerma) were not necessarily the major indigenous powers later.

Earlier studies assumed that the administration largely comprised 'colonial' Egyptian officials and that the economy exploited Nubia's wealth. More recently, greater emphasis has been placed upon the role of indigenous elites and an integrated economy. This has important implications in assessing what may have happened at the end of the New Kingdom domination.

The introduction of Egyptian religion, particularly the royal cult, resulted in one of the most physically enduring of legacies. Yet the temples have always presented something of a problem to analysis. The biggest temples and building phase belongs to the reign of Ramesses II, by which time it was suspected that Nubia was already partially depopulated. The decoration of the temples appears to be totally Egyptian, and was seen, before the epoch-making study of Habachi, as essentially Aussenpolitik. Nevertheless, the importance of the worship of Amun in the Meroitic period, has always been regarded as a vestige of the Viceregal period, whether continuing at Napata or adopted by the Kushite rulers as a justification for their expansion. A close analysis of temples, their architecture, the deities depicted, the types of statuary used, the names of gateways and subsidiary elements, probably tells us more about the royal cult as practised in Egypt during the later New Kingdom, than it does about indigenous religion in Nubia, but there is certainly continuation (or revival) of New Kingdom cults in the kingdom of Kush.

There are serious problems relating to the archaeology and historical reconstruction of post-Viceregal Nubia, many of which will not be resolved until there is considerably more archaeological
material from Upper Nubia and the Butana. Nevertheless, it is appropriate now, while Nubian studies is still a relatively young discipline, to challenge the conventional interpretation and ask how these ideas developed and whether they should still be accepted.

The approach taken here is necessarily wide-ranging in scope, because I believe the emergence of the Kushite state should be considered alongside the rise of Assyria, changes in the trade axes, the rise of the Arabian routes and development of camel transport, as well as the problems related to its more immediate neighbour, Egypt.

The lack of consideration given here to other parts of sub-Saharan Africa is due to the limits imposed by the evidence. Although there are rich assemblages from Gebel Moya, the remainder of southern and western Sudan is still little known archaeologically and in eastern Sudan and Ethiopia, the pre-Aksumite phases are only now beginning to be better understood. The emphasis is, therefore, still essentially Nilotic, although I have tried to incorporate all available material from outside - and at least be aware of possibilities, even if there is no evidence.
Part 1

VICEREAL KUSH
New Kingdom Nubia: the response to domination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Years of Domination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamose</td>
<td>5 (?) years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmose</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep I</td>
<td>21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmose I</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmose II</td>
<td>4 (?) years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmose III</td>
<td>22 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatshepsut</td>
<td>22 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmose III</td>
<td>sole reign years 22-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep II</td>
<td>26 years (+?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thutmose IV</td>
<td>10 years (+?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>38 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep IV-Akenaten</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smenkhkare</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutankhamun</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemheb</td>
<td>28 (?) years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses I</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sety I</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses II</td>
<td>67 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merneptah</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sety II</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Amenmese]</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siptah</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawosret</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sethnakhte</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses III</td>
<td>31 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses IV</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses V</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses VI</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses VII</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses VIII</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses IX</td>
<td>18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses X</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses XI</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. The small discrepancy between the total years here and the conventional dates for the New Kingdom, c 1552-1069 (Trigger et al 1983: 184) is accounted for by co-regencies, overlaps of the first regnal year, possibility of a sole rule for Amenemesse, etc.
Dominating Nubia.

The Theban princes Kamose and Ahmose were victorious against both the Hyksos rulers of Lower Egypt and the Kushite princes. H.S. Smith and A. Smith [1] have discussed the campaigns of Kamose against Nubia, and conclude that the main function of these was to establish a rear protection before directing a major campaign against Avaris. The effect was the re-occupation and restoration of Buhen, which marked the southern limit of Kamose's expansion, creating a large buffer zone between the Kushite kingdom, probably ruled from Kerma, and Upper Egypt. This expansion was almost certainly before Kamose's year 3 [2], and consequently must have been his first military campaign. Whilst it is likely that Kamose would have regarded the defence of his southern frontier essential as a prologue to any attack on the Hyksos, the opportunity arose with a change of ruler within Kush itself, as is revealed by the text of the letter from Awessere-Apepy to the new ruler (hk3) intercepted by the Thebans [3].

Whilst this interpretation of the military expansion into Nubia as a strategic move related to a broader policy by the Theban rulers is doubtless correct, there may have been other factors which dictated an attack on Nubia before that on the Hyksos. Janssen [4] tentatively raised the possibility that control of the gold-mines and other Nubian resources may have been a means of "paying" for the campaign against the Hyksos. Disruption of the commodity-exchange between the Kerma and Hyksos rulers, which campaigning may well have brought about, would probably have damaged both states [5]. Whilst the rise of the Theban dynasty cannot be simply viewed as the result of a 'trade-war', this may have been one of a number of determining elements.

The evidence of the Kamose texts suggests that campaigning was limited to the re-conquest of Lower Nubia, but the stela of Emhab [6], which probably belongs to this reign [7] indicates that it may
have ranged farther south. The Emhab text states that the army reached the territory of Miu, placed by Störk [8] and Kemp [9] in the Abu Named or Berber-Shendi region. Störk [10] proposes that the army was despatched across the Korosko road, in an attempt to distract the Kushites by a rear attack. Zibelius [11] assumed that Miu was a more northerly locality, either one of the re-conquered territories in Lower Nubia, or a region attacked in a southward thrust into riverine Upper Nubia. O'Connor [12] prefers a southerly location, in the Berber-Shendi reach, whilst acknowledging that the Egyptian evidence (from all periods) is inconclusive. A rearward attack on Kerma territory would have involved a major expedition, across the Desert to the Abu Named reach and then along the river through the 5th-4th Cataract region, or back across the Bayuda. Until further documentary evidence is forthcoming, the attack on Miu remains an obscure episode in Kamose's campaigns.

The length of Kamose's reign is not yet known, but is unlikely to have exceeded five or six years, and he may well have been killed on the campaign against Avaris in year 3/4. As Vandersleyen [13] has argued, Ahmose was probably still a minor at his brother's death and own accession. This accounts for the lack of follow up to Kamose's campaigns until year 11, or perhaps better, a lack of major campaigns led by the king in person. Military activities doubtless continued in Nubia, even if it was largely defending the Egyptian frontier at the 2nd Cataract. An Edfu inscription of this period records six years spent in Kush [14].

Ahmose's military activities in Nubia, discussed by Vandersleyen [15] established an Egyptian presence beyond the 2nd Cataract in the northern part of the Abri-Delgo reach. The quantity of material with the names of Ahmose and Amenhotep I from Sai suggests that a fort was established there during this period [16]. The Ahmose son of Abana text [17] states that the campaign against Mut-hn-nfr came after that against the Mutyw of Asia, suggesting that Kamose's 2nd Cataract frontier had been maintained without serious problems, and that the new viceregal administration was strongly in control of Lower Nubia,
allowing Ahmose to direct his attention towards the north. Vandersleyen suggests that the Ahmose campaign against Kush took place around his 15th year.

After the Nubian campaign Ahmose was confronted with the "rebellion" of 33t3 (or 33tyw?) [18], possibly a Nubian chieftain active somewhere in Lower Nubia or Upper Egypt. Later came the campaign against Teti-an (Tti-an). Whether these "rebellions" indicate serious internal difficulties and opposition to the new regime towards the end of Ahmose's reign is presently impossible to determine, "rebellion" being equally applicable to Nubian or Levantine territories. If Ahmose and Amenhotep I had to consolidate their rule in Egypt this may have led to a cessation in foreign campaigns thereby establishing the necessity for Thutmose I to make a major display of strength in Nubia and Asia. There is insufficient surviving evidence, and much has doubtless been destroyed through the dismantling and re-use of many royal monuments of the early-18th Dynasty by later rulers.

That the Egyptians regarded Lower Nubia as part of Egypt is revealed by the Kamose texts [19] and other documentary material [20]. This is significant when considering the attitude displayed towards Nubia. Kamose and Ahmose may have had no intention beyond the reclamation of the territories ruled by the Middle Kingdom Pharaohs. Indeed, there seems to be no indication that more southerly expansion was considered before the reigns of Thutmose I or II. Even the establishment of the fortresses of Sai [21] and Tumbos may have been related to the defence of the frontier against the power of the Kerma rulers, or their suppression, rather than the beginning of a positive expansion programme. The subjection of Kerma does not necessarily signify incorporation of its territory, and the Egyptians may have preferred to establish vassalage in the region. The collapse of the Kerma kingdom, and the apparent cessation of large burials in the south cemetery (dated by Bonnet [22] to ca 1450 BC) may have seen the rise of a new kingdom in Upper Nubia, or a
struggle for power amongst Kushite chiefs who had formerly been vassals of Kerma.

It may have been the very power of Kerma which dictated the aggressive southern policy of the Egyptian rulers: with little hope of maintaining an unchallenged control of Lower Nubia, suppression may have seemed the only alternative.

Thutmose I campaigned in Nubia in the 2nd year of his reign [23] recorded by a number of inscriptions at Tumbos [24], Tangur and Sai [25]. The return to Aswan was documented by three texts of year 3, 3rd season, 1st month day 22 (the new regnal year having begun on 2nd season, 3rd month day 21). During the expedition a Kushite chief, possibly the ruler of Kerma, was captured and his body hung upside down from the prow of the king's warship for his triumphant return to Thebes [26]. Despite the apparent success of the campaigns, it appears that the Kushite princes remained a formidable opposition and Thutmose I established his riverine frontier at Tumbos, to the north of Kerma. A fortress may have been built on Tumbos [27] although Sai, further to the north, was the major garrison in Upper Nubia. There is no indication of a wider colonisation programme in Upper Nubia beginning this early.

Although the rock inscription of Thutmose I at Hagar el-Merwa (Kurgus) [28], and the reported fortress near the same place, attests the presence of the Egyptian army in this region, this should rather be associated with the Korosko Road and gold mines than with control of riverine Upper Nubia (ie the 2nd-4th Cataracts). Whilst this Egyptian presence in the Kurgus region should probably be considered as a means of controlling the desert routes, it did establish Egypt's claimed area of interest relative to the Berber-Shendi reach. The official boundary of Egypt along the Nile in the populated regions of Upper and Lower Nubia, was, from the time of Thutmose III, set at Napata and the 4th Cataract. The Kurgus boundary seems to be serving the same function relative to the desert routes and gold-mining regions over which the Egyptians had control. Both boundaries
delimited Egypt's claimed area of domination in Kush, and were oriented towards the princedoms of the Berber-Shendi reach and central Sudan.

If, as seems possible, the latter years of Ahmose and part of the reign of Amenhotep I had been occupied with internal politics a major show of strength in Nubia would have been necessary at this time. The boundary stelae of Thutmose I at Hagar el-Merwa and on the Euphrates mark a sphere of Egyptian influence not extended by any later rulers.

At Thutmose II's accession, an offensive was launched by the sons of the Kushite (Kerma?) ruler against the Egyptian presence in the 3rd Cataract region [29]. This attack may have been inspired by the news of Thutmose I's death, as the record of the campaign combines the bringing of the news of the "rebellion" with the announcement of the coronation. Thutmose II took one of the captured Kushite princes to Egypt, which is the earliest direct evidence of the policy of creating vassals in the region. Indeed, this could be the actual turning point in Egyptian policy. Until now, the Egyptians appear to have observed a boundary at Tumbos, on the Nile (the Wadi Allaqi/Gabgaba routes being unconnected with the policy towards the Dongola Reach). However, the repeated revival of a Kushite offensive may have led to the concerted attempt to suppress Kerma (or its successor) once and for all.

The Egyptian offensive initiated by Thutmose II against Kush continued during the co-regency of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, resulting in the defeat of the Kushite princes. That there was at least one Nubian campaign in the reign of Hatshepsut has been known ever since Labib Habachi published the graffito of the imy-r sd3wty, Tiy, at Sehel [30]. Habachi also drew attention to texts in the tomb of Senmut [31] and on the stela of Djehuty [32], which allude to Nubian campaigns. D.B. Redford [33] cites further evidence of military activities during the co-regency; a badly preserved text at Deir el-Bahari [34] which directly connects Hatshepsut's campaign
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with that of Thutmose I. The texts of Tiy and Djehuty are quite explicit that the expedition was led by Hatshepsut in person [35], but, unfortunately, neither these, nor the Deir el-Bahari texts are year-dated. Redford, in conclusion, suggests two certain campaigns during the co-regency; the first, early, being led by the king herself, and the second dated by the Tumbos inscription of Thutmose III [36] to his year 20. Redford suggests the possibility of two further expeditions; if the Deir el-Bahari text is taken as referring to a different campaign to that in the Tiy graffito, and the Armant pylon texts [37] and stela [38] relate to an expedition different from that recorded in the Tumbos inscription [39]. Indeed the Armant stela, as Redford argues [40], states that a Nubian campaign took place not long before the first Asiatic campaign of year 23.

A further historical inscription at Tangur, overlooked by Redford, attests a campaign in year 12 [41] of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. Reineke [42] re-published the graffito, with a discussion of all of the expeditions to Nubia during the co-regency, which comprised three or four campaigns. The first, led by Hatshepsut in person and soon after her seizing of the kingship, is, probably, the campaign referred to in the Deir el-Bahari inscription. This appears to have been a direct reaction to the Kushite response to the expeditions of Thutmose I and Thutmose II. The second campaign, of unknown extent, in year 12 recorded by the Tangur graffito was probably led by Thutmose III. The third campaign in year 20, possibly followed by a campaign in year 21 or 22 (shortly before the death of Hatshepsut), which, if the suggestion of Kemp [43] that Miu is to be located as far south as the Berber-Shendi reach, was a major and far-ranging expedition. This military activity at the end of the co-regency surely marks the final crushing of resistance by the Kushite princes.

Egyptian interests in the regions to the south were particularly strong at this time, and the expeditions to Punt should be considered within the same context. It is uncertain whether Hatshepsut's expedition was the first in the 18th Dynasty [44], but it was certainly followed by others in the reigns of Thutmose III [45] and
Amenhotep II [46] and contacts continued into the 20th Dynasty [47]. Punt, accessible from the Red Sea, is almost certainly to be located in the more easterly region of the Central Sudan, extending into, or close to, the Ethiopian highlands [48]. Since many of the commodities brought from Punt were identical to those acquired through Nubia, Egyptian motivation for the expeditions becomes a major issue. It seems unlikely that the transfer of incense trees, depicted at Deir el-Bahari, can be seen as an attempt to undermine the incense (frankincense and myrrh) trade as Dixon proposed [49]: the quantities used in Egyptian ritual and cleansing must have far exceeded those which could have been produced by the trees imported [50]. Liverani [51] emphasises the ideological aspect, that the creation of a Punt within the temple of Amun was a means of controlling a country from afar which was, practically, difficult to reach. Irrespective of this, doubtless rightly stressed, ideological angle, expeditions to Punt may have had economic advantage, as a means of weakening the monopolies of the Kushite princes of the Middle Nile. Alternatively, prolonged military conflict between Egypt and the Kushite rulers may have caused disturbance to the transit of products, or at least inflated the 'cost'. The question of Egyptian contacts with Punt and how this relates to their activities in Nubia remains elusive, despite the recent archaeological work in the eastern Sudan and Ethiopia which suggests a possible equation of the historical Punt with the cultures of the Gash Delta [52]. The issue is further complicated by analyses which suggest that the importance of frankincense and myrrh - thought the main commodities brought from Punt - has been exaggerated [53].

The years 22/3-31 of his sole reign were dominated by Thutmose III's Asiatic expeditions. Upper Nubian resistance may have been completely suppressed by the campaigns of years 20-22, although O'Connor [54] suggests that year 31 may be the significant date for the secure establishment of Egyptian dominance, since this is the first year that the b3kw of both Wawat and Kush are recorded. The implication is that some sort of civil administration had been imposed on Kush.
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The boundary inscription of Thutmose I at Hagar el-Merwa was duplicated, probably in year 35 [55], although the royal presence is not a corollary of Egyptian activity in the region. The last recorded campaign in Nubia led by the king in person occurred in year 47, when the fortress of sm3 ḥ3swt was founded near Gebel Barkal [56]. This suggests an expedition covering the 3rd Cataract to Dongola Reach and the 4th Cataract, although whether it was militarily active, or a display of strength following the king's prolonged Asiatic campaigns, is unclear. It is noteworthy that Thutmose III emphasises that his is the first Egyptian army to visit Barkal - surely confirming that earlier activities in the Abu Hamed region had been via the desert roads.

Amenhotep II's sole reign began with a campaign in Asia in year 3, after which one of the slain Asiatic princes was hung from the walls of Napata [57]. Both events are reflected in an inscription of an Overseer of Works, Minmose, at Tura [58], dated to year 4, which mentions the setting up of stelae in Naharin and in Karoy. Egypt's limits were thus defined as they had been established by Thutmose I, consolidated by Thutmose III and were later expressed, in a less dramatic fashion, by Thutmose IV [59] and Amenhotep III [60]. The shrine of Usersatet at Ibrim [61] depicts the presentation of Kushite 'tribute' to Amenhotep II, which Der Manuelian [62] has taken as indicative of a successful campaign. He argues that since chariots are infrequently depicted in the tribute-scenes, the number implied here [63] suggests the spoil of battle: indeed, that manufactures are not indicated by such texts until the later 18th Dynasty [64] and as no others are mentioned in the list, or depicted in the scene, adds weight to this interpretation [65]. If the scene does commemorate a campaign, it is the only one in Nubia so-far known during this reign. The Viceroy, Usersatet, left a large number of monuments [66] and the tenor of the 'letter' of Amenhotep II apart, there are no indications of further hostilities [67].

A campaign of Thutmose IV is indicated by the Konosso inscription of the king's 8th regnal year [68]. This, however, seems to have
been directed against an enemy in the eastern desert of Wawat, and was not led by the king in person. As O'Connor [69] observed, the "(presumably nomadic) inhabitants of these regions did not welcome Egyptian expansion, and perhaps interfered with Egyptian efforts to exploit the gold". Whilst the Eastern Desert remained the major focus of military activities in Nubia in the later 18th Dynasty, the riverine domains were, apparently, mainly peaceful, increasingly acculturated and developed.

Amenhotep III is generally accredited with only one Nubian campaign, in year 5 [70], but Topozada [71] has argued that there were two; the first in the southern part of Kush, the Nile valley (or central Sudan) and the second in the Eastern Desert.

The earlier expedition was directed against the territories of Wnšk, Trk and Wrt, with a detour towards Miu, before returning north. As such, it may conform to early campaigns, either a display of the power of new king, or to suppress the rebellions which frequently occurred at such times. Contacts with the central Sudan at the time of his accession might be inferred from the "Marriage Scarab" discovered at Meroe [72], but, as an unstratified find, the possibility that it was taken to the site at a later date cannot be excluded.

Ibhet [73], focus of the second campaign is, like the toponym Ikayta, which also now occurs in the topographical lists, to be located in the gold mining regions of the Eastern desert [74]. O'Connor [75] views this campaign (attributed to year 5) as part of a "comprehensive plan to expand and improve the exploitation of the gold mining areas as a whole"; a plan which included the extension of viceregal authority as far north as Nekhen, thus embracing the gold mining regions of southern Egypt.

There are no records of further military activities in the reign, and there is good reason to see this a period of some peace, at least in the Nile valley. From quite early in the reign, there was "urban"
development in the Abri-Delgo Reach, at Soleb and Sedeinga (discussed below), also indicative of more organised use of agricultural land in that region.

Akhenaten's campaign has been known since the publication of the Buhen stela fragment in 1911 [76], and a fragment of a parallel text from Amada by M. Sandman [77]; but, as Smith [78] has noted, this received relatively little attention. Smith's re-publication [79] of the Buhen fragments with the beginning of the text discovered during the EES excavations, allows a date of between years 10 and 12 to be given to the campaign. Smith suggested year 12 as best fitting the traces. The expedition was directed against Ik3yt3, which is to be located in the region between the Wadi Allaqi and Red Sea, and it seems to have been a reaction to attacks on the mining stations. Any connection between the campaign and the display of 'tribute' at the durbar held in the same year, and depicted in the tomb of Meryre at Amarna [80] is speculative.

Although there are, as yet, no specifically dated historical inscriptions, it seems probable that there was a military campaign in Nubia during the reign of Tutankhamun. Relief blocks from the king's temple at Karnak depict both an Asiatic and Kushite campaign [81]. Whilst these might be regarded as typical of the ritualised domination scenes exemplified by the king's painted box [82], there is supporting evidence in the large scene of Kushite captives in the tomb of Horemheb at Sakkara [83]. It is also possible that the speos of Horemheb at Gebel Silsila was constructed and decorated in Tutankhamun's reign, and later altered [84]. If this is the case, the large, and unusual, scene of a campaign against Kushites would relate to that depicted at Karnak, the aftermath being represented by the Sakkara relief.

The events of the reigns of Ay and Horemheb are not well known, although their Viceroy's, Paser and his son Amenemopet, left many inscriptions. Schulman's theory that a Viceroy Nakhtmin attempted to seize power at the death of Tutankhamun has little to support it
[85], and there seems to have been no interruption in the building works and policy.

If O'Connor [86] is correct in locating Irem in the central Sudan, rather than riverine Upper Nubia or the adjoining desert region, Egyptian military activities in Nubia during the early 19th Dynasty were far wider ranging than they had been for a considerable time. Sety I's campaign against Irem, in his 8th year, is attested by two stelae, from Sai [87] and Amara [88]. Possibly also to be associated with this campaign are the inscriptions of the Viceroy Amenemopet on the military road at Aswan [89] and at Qasr Ibrim [90]. Spalinger [91] identifies this expedition with the Nubian war of Ramesses II depicted at Beit el-Wali [92], and argues that the other military activities recorded in the temple all occurred in the reign of Sety I (some of which are also depicted at Abu Simbel, as well as Karnak). Spalinger proposes that Ramesses was involved as crown prince, and hence his kingship in the scenes is retrospective. In support of this, Spalinger [93] cites the figure of the Ramesses II added to reliefs at Karnak. Further corroboration is to be found in the inclusion of the Viceroy Amenemopet in the Beit el-Wali scenes. Well-attested as a subordinate of his father, the Viceroy Paser, in the reigns of Ay and Horemheb, Amenemopet probably held office until about year 10 of Sety I, when he was succeeded by Iuny whose relatively brief tenure had ended by year 3 of Ramesses II [94]. The campaign of Sety I marks the beginning of difficulties with Irem which recurred during the reign of Ramesses II.

The early years of Ramesses II were dominated by campaigns in Syria-Palestine, and the conflict with the Hittites. Although there was a considerable amount of building activity in Nubia during this time [95], there is no evidence for further military actions until the campaign against Irem, probably between years 15-20 [96], which took 7000 prisoners. Tribute from Irem, along with Irm-people and Trk-people, are listed in Papyrus Koller [97], a letter addressed to a certain Paser, whom Spalinger [98] identifies with the Viceroy Paser II. The titles are not those of a Viceroy, but a hry pdt,
although there is a possibility that this could be the same Paser before he became Viceroy [99]. With this identification Spalinger attributes the campaign to the second decade of the reign, and suggests that it is perhaps related to reliefs at Derr and Amara. Conflict appears to have recurred during the Viceroyalty of Setau [100], before year 44. Setau also campaigned in the western desert of Lower Nubia, perhaps Selima, capturing numbers of Libyans who were then put to work on the building of el-Sebua temple [101]. There is little other evidence of military activity during the reign, and even in the early years it was Western Asia which preoccupied the king in person [102].

Merneptah continued the reclamation of the Egyptian sphere of influence in Palestine, already advanced by Ramesses II, with the extension of authority along the whole of the route from Gaza to Jaffa [103]. The king was successful in repelling an invasion of the Libu in year 5, which, Kitchen suggests, was connected with a revolt in Wawat [104]: he proposes that contact between Libyan and Kushite leaders was maintained through the oases. The rebellion came too late to distract the king from the Libyan front, and both attacks were crushed, numbers of Libyans being impaled. An inscription on the road from Aswan to Shellal, used by troops [105] and the lunette from a stela [106] depicting the king smiting enemies might support the assertion; although Smith notes that the only distinguishable face in the lunette scene is Asiatic, and suggests [107] that the stela may have been a record of the king's Libyan campaign. Possibly related to this action, the Viceroy Messuy left several inscriptions dated to year 4, at Beit el-Wali [108], Wadi el-Sebua [109], Amada [110], Aksha [111] and Amara [112].

The destruction of the "Egyptian buildings" at Aphek, Tell Mor and Beth Shan, allied with a number of other factors, indicate a decline in Egyptian prestige and activity in the Western Asia, during the later 19th Dynasty [113]. This is not, however, paralleled by the available evidence from Nubia, although many of the inscriptions of the later 19th Dynasty from Nubia do reveal more of the workings of
than specifically royal activities: this particularly applies to the group of texts from the reign of Siptah. Egypt may have suffered a number of internal problems, notably the 'usurpation' of Amenmesse, although rulers continue to be attested at Sinai and Timna, indicating no cessation of activities abroad.

The Nubian battle scene of Ramesses III, at Medinet Habu [114], has usually been interpreted as symbolic rather than historical [115]. Unlike the campaigns against the Libyans and the Sea Peoples also depicted at Medinet Habu, the Nubian campaign has no year date, but O'Connor argues that the contemporary details, whilst circumstantial, at least suggest the possibility that it is the record of an actual event. It is similarly difficult to know how to interpret the figures of the subject wrw of Ta-Seti and of Kush "whom his majesty slew", depicted on the bases of the king's colossi in the first court [116]. Ramesses III certainly emulated Ramesses II in many ways, but there is no justification for believing this was an entirely passive emulation, restricted to temple decoration. The external pressures of the reign ensured that Ramesses III had to fight very real battles with Libyans and the forces of the Sea Peoples, and it is fairly certain that he re-established much of the Egyptian empire in Western Asia [117], and continued mining activities at Timna and Serabit el-Khadim [118]. The Nubian campaign, apparently against Irem, which had already posed a threat to the stability of the viceregal domains in the 19th Dynasty, would have consolidated his restoration of the empire, after the setback during the late 19th Dynasty. The Egyptians seem to have maintained their control of Western Asia until the reign of Ramesses VI [119], at which time they still retained firm control over Nubia. The end of direct Egyptian control of Nubia came in the reign of Ramesses XI, although its power in the south (beyond the 2nd Cataract) may have been eroded somewhat earlier.

The older literature tended to portray Egyptian control of Nubia as relatively unopposed after the early-18th Dynasty. It also
emphasised the viceregal control of the Nile valley as far as Napata and 4th Cataract, perceived to be the frontier. The persistence of princedoms in Lower Nubia has been amply recognised, but far less attention has been paid to Upper Nubia. This has, to a certain extent, been a recognition of the lack of archaeological work in the region, and that consequently much would be argument \textit{ex silentio}. A closer examination of the material we do possess and an application of centre-periphery models permits an alternative proposition: that the Egyptians did not 'colonise' the region of the 3rd to 4th Cataract, but left it as a buffer-zone.

Kemp and O'Connor have allowed the possibility of significant territorial units outside of the Egyptian sphere of control, in the Berber-Shendi reach. The problems of Nubian topography somewhat obscure the later Egyptian campaigns, but whether in the Butana or Upper Nubia, they were certainly important, and it is clear that Nubian princes remained extremely powerful and capable of military aggression throughout the New Kingdom.
The Political Geography of New Kingdom Nubia.

Literature has, understandably, concentrated very largely upon the Nile Valley during the New Kingdom. Although textual references to the deserts and their populations are not uncommon, little has, until recently, been known of the archaeology of these regions. Whilst the Egyptian texts of the late Old Kingdom demonstrate that the Nubian rulers were active to the west of the Nile Valley, there was little to support the idea that a similar situation persisted into the New Kingdom. Consequently Nubia in the New Kingdom has been treated rather as a riverine phenomenon. Recent survey work in the Wadi Howar has suggested connections with C-Group and Kerma cultures, and, even more strikingly, work in the Gash Delta has shown close relations with the Pan-Grave cultures. The suggestion of D. Colombot [1] that Meluhha of the Akkadian texts should be located in the Eastern Desert of Egypt and northern Nubia raises fundamental questions about the Egyptian control of that region. In the Western Deserts, the major Oases may have been under Egyptian control, but their populations were probably largely Libyan in the New Kingdom, although there are indications of Nubian presence earlier. Although there is virtually no archaeological material of this period from the more southerly, Nubian, oases, they have not been thoroughly surveyed. Recent work has emphasised that Egypt's relations with its southern neighbours were far from being confined to the river valley, and that the cultural complexity of Nubia was far greater than was previously apparent.

Nevertheless, the major activities of the Egyptians were in the valley, and it was here that they faced most resistance from the indigenous populations.

Egypt defined its southern frontiers by use of natural features, originally the 1st Cataract, and later, with the Middle Kingdom occupation, the natural barrier of the 2nd Cataract. The 18th-
dynasty expansion south of the 2nd Cataract limited itself firstly at Tumbos, and ultimately in the locality of Karoy. Most writers have identified Karoy with the 4th Cataract region [2], some [3] associating the name with the root **KUR/KAR** and with the modern Kareima and Kurru. Vercoutter [4] suggested that Karoy covered a large area, most probably including the 4th Cataract and the gold mines east of Abu Hamed. Many of these writers cite the texts in the tomb of Huy [5] where, at his investiture as Viceroy, Huy is given control of the regions "from Nekhen to Karoy" and "from Nekhen to Nesut-tawy"; but, rather than poetic variants, these may reflect two different spheres of authority: Nekhen to Nesut-tawy (Gebel Barkal) indicating riverine Nubia, and Nekhen to Karoy the deserts and wadis as far as Kurgus.

The southernmost Egyptian fortress was established at the 4th Cataract by Thutmos III who was, apparently, the first Egyptian ruler to reach Gebel Barkal, as recorded in a stela of his year 47 from there [6]. The fortress, called **m3 b3wt**, contained a chapel dedicated to Amun [7], although neither structure has yet been located. After the campaign of his 3rd year, Amenhotep II had an Asiatic prince hung from the walls of the fortress, which is now called Napata in Egyptian texts. Later New Kingdom references to the fortress are few, and no archaeological remains have yet been located [8].

Knowledge of this southernmost area of Egyptian control is limited. The usual assumption made is that the border was established at the 4th Cataract, north of which, in riverine terms, all was in control of the viceregal administration [9]. This may not, however, be an accurate interpretation of the situation, but this southern frontier has never been examined in the light of models explaining the way in which different empires have controlled their frontier zones.

Quirke [10], discussing the north-eastern border in the Middle Kingdom, emphasises the distinctions to be made between, and
implications of, modern terms such as boundary ("the periphery of a polity"), frontier ("an indefinite zone where the polity comes to an end") and border ("a fixed line").

The study of centre and periphery in the ancient world has been developed considerably since Owen Lattimore [11], discussing Chinese imperial expansion, established a model for other old world expansions. Lattimore indicated three radii:—unification by military action; centralization under uniform civil administration, and economic integration. These radii will, of course, be governed and modified by a number of factors: the physical nature of the country; its population, political structure and economic resources; its proximity to militarily powerful states and other spheres of influence.

Military action itself comprised inner and outer radii, over territories that could be added to the state and those which could be invaded with 'profit' in plunder or tribute, or to prevent the growth of powerful military strength. The outer radius comprised territories which could not be permanently annexed. In Nubia these radii are clear, being defined by the Bayuda Desert and 4th/5th Cataract region. Beyond this, the Berber-Shendi Reach could have been invaded (as O'Connor has proposed), but not easily annexed.

Lattimore's model postulates that similar administrative structures, all derived from the central type, were introduced into each newly acquired region. Within Nubia this is abundantly documented, with the gradual acquisition of further territories in the early 18th Dynasty, followed by a total re-organization of the province's administration directly modelled upon that of Egypt, once consolidation was achieved.

Economic integration, with the shortest range, was, in Lattimore's model, dictated by the transport of bulk goods (especially food) at a profit. This, in the ancient Near East, is a rather more complex issue [12].
The military expeditions recorded in Nubia after the reign of Thutmose III were directed against two different regions: the Eastern Desert (the toponyms of Ibhet and Ikayta) and Irem. In the former, nomadic tribes presented a constant threat to the gold-mining stations, and perhaps also to the riverine settlements. The location of the second region, Irem, has been the subject of some controversy, but is fundamentally important for our understanding of Egyptian activities in the Nile valley and Central Sudan.

Whilst the Egyptians may have patrolled the 4th cataract region as far as Kurgus, and even campaigned further south, the sphere of control, although not necessarily influence (which may have ranged much farther) certainly ended at Napata. The natural frontiers are too formidable for easy integration, military or administrative, of the region beyond. The later Kushite states did achieve control over the whole region from Aswan to the Central Sudan, but it has been frequently argued that during the later Meroitic period (1st century BC onwards) the two parts of Nubia were in many ways distinct, culturally and administratively [13].

The lack of Egyptian activity between Kawa and the 4th Cataract suggests the possibility that this area may have been in the control of local princes who owed allegiance to the Pharaoh. Such local chieftains would doubtless have found many advantages in an alliance with a powerful Egyptian state, although they probably tried to establish their own hegemonies when that authority ultimately weakened. Such a situation would also account for the extensive building works of the Egyptians in the region immediately to the north, the Abri-Delgo Reach. The Dongola Reach is the most fertile stretch of the Nile Valley south of Silsila, which led Kemp [14] to question why the Egyptian settlement was in the more northerly Abri-Delgo Reach:

The apparently non-ecologically based distribution of temple towns .... looks suspiciously like the result of an over assessment of agricultural potential based on a false understanding of the processes of nature.
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Since these towns were established in the Abri-Delgo Reach over a period of some 150 years (Amenhotep III – Ramesses II), and not all at the same time, a political, rather than ecological motivation for their siting, seems more convincing. There are reasons for thinking that, if not totally abandoned, the earlier foundations ceded much of their importance to the later centres. Consequently, there may not have been the density of population Kemp assumes [15].

Kemp [16] has argued very plausibly that the Kerma-Letti basin might have been given over to cattle grazing; whilst very fertile, irrigation of the basins is necessary for high arable production.

The role of the frontier fortress of Napata is very unclear. Although some have thought that Napata functioned as a viceregal seat and the major administrative centre for Upper Nubia, there is no direct evidence to support this. Indeed the evidence currently available, and theoretical considerations, seem rather to indicate the contrary. It has also been suggested that Napata served as both the frontier fortress and major depot for the transfer of products from the central Sudan [16], but an alternative model for the method of "trade" (argued below) assumes that that was more directly controlled by the Kushite elites. Napata in the 18th Dynasty may have been not a major city, but a relatively small frontier fortress marking Egypt's official boundary. Such religious significance that it had was due to the association of Gebel Barkal with the 'Throne of the Two Lands' and consequently a dwelling place of Amun. A sacred site in a remote place does not, however, predicate either a large temple and town, or a major cult and pilgrimage centre [18]. The popularity, and hence wealth and importance, of centres such as the Amun oracle at Siwa seem to belong to a later phase of religious development. Whilst we know very little of Napata in the 18th Dynasty, the 25th-dynasty transference of the sculptures from Amenhotep III's temple at Soleb to adorn the enlarged Amun temple (B 500) [19], surely indicates that there had been no monumental buildings at Barkal to re-use. A small temple (B 600) probably dates from the reign of Thutmose IV [20] and the first larger temple, the
eventual core of B 500, was begun by Horemheb or Sety I, and completed by Ramesses II [21]. However, as has been argued for Lower Nubia, Ramesside temples, whatever their size, do not necessarily indicate large town sites or population centres. Ramesses II's temple at Gebel Barkal is similar in size to the temple of Gerf Hussein.

The major New Kingdom building work was in Lower Nubia and the Abri-Delgo reach. It is, in any case, hardly likely that the Egyptians would have built their major administrative centre at the frontier.

The evidence surviving (excavated and published), indicates that Soleb and Amara were successively the seats of the idaw from the late 18th Dynasty to 20th, and in consequence should be regarded as the most important. It is significant that such documentary sources as the tomb of Huy refer to Napata only as the limit of Viceregal authority, and to the officials of Soleb and Faras as the leading towns of the regions. It should also be noted that no specifically Napatan officials are recorded in any known surviving New Kingdom source [22].

No archaeological evidence for a town or fortress has yet been discovered at Gebel Barkal. The site of Sanam, a little way to the west of Barkal, on the south side of the river, has been suggested to have been the town site of Napata during the 25th Dynasty [23]. However, during the New Kingdom such a location for Napata is clearly impossible. While Sanam controlled the Bayuda road to Meroe and thus during the Napatan-Meroitic period would have been in an important position, as an Egyptian garrison it would have been extremely vulnerable.

It is possible that the frontier fortress founded by Thutmose III was located on one of the large islands in the river, near Gebel Barkal and at the foot of the Cataract. Lepsius found some New Kingdom fragments on Omm Oscher [24], although these could have been
taken there at a later date. The Egyptians would doubtless have chosen as the position of their frontier fortress a site which was both easily defensible and had some controlling position. Island or west bank fortresses had been favoured at the 2nd Cataract, because the major military threat came from the Eastern Desert. The early-mid-18th dynasty fortress in Upper Nubia was on the island of Sai, and there was possibly a fortress founded by Thutmose I on the island of Tumbos [25]. The early-19th dynasty town site of Amara was also apparently situated on an island [26]. Indeed, the only east bank site with New Kingdom monuments is Kawa [27]. At Napata the situation was complicated by the direction of the river, here running in a great double bend. Military threat from the Berber-Shendi Reach would thus have come directly from the south along the desert routes which strike the Nile again at Sanam and Nuri. Attack from desert dwellers would have been possible along the whole north bank of the river. An island fortress is a logical possibility. As an historical reality it can only be verified by exploration of the islands in the Gebel Barkal region.

The border inscriptions at Kurgus are more easily explicable in relation to Egyptian control of the Wadis Allaqi and Cabgaba, and the Korosko road, than with control of riverine Upper Nubia. They delimit Egyptian interest relative to the Berber-Shendi Reach.

The area of direct control may, at least for much of the 18th Dynasty, have ended at the 3rd Cataract, with the Dongola Reach left in the hands of local rulers. Kawa, and perhaps Sanam, might have been seats of such princes who, like their northern counterparts, would have been raised at the Egyptian court. They would have acted as the intermediaries in the cross-frontier trade and transfer of goods from the central Sudan. The Egyptian presence in Nubia over such a long period would inevitably have resulted in changes during the 19th and 20th Dynasties.

The location of Irem has been much debated, most recently by O'Connor [28] whose new interpretation conflicts with the view, most
cogently argued by Priese [29], and which had gained wide acceptance, that Irem was to be equated with the Old Kingdom Yam and Meroitic Arme/Armi, both perhaps to be located in the Kerma region. Acceptance of O'Connor's theory would require a complete re-evaluation of Egyptian military activity in the 3rd to 6th Cataract region.

In the narrative of Sety I's year 8 campaign, Irem is characterised as a desert locale, away from the Nile valley, by the use of chariotry and capture of wells, and the bringing of prisoners and cattle to the river bank [30]. Kitchen [31] suggests that the army went from the 3rd Cataract south-west to the Wadi el Qa'ab region (towards Selima oasis). O'Connor [32] presents two further alternatives: starting in Upper Nubia, the army moved south into the Wadi Melh, and thence towards, but not into, Kordofan and Darfur; or, from Napata, it went south-east towards Meroe or Berber. O'Connor's preference is for a location somewhere in the Berber-Shendi Reach, and he makes a strong argument in favour of this.

Sety I's action was provoked by an offensive by Irem against Egyptian territory, and, as O'Connor emphasises, the location of the toponym is therefore of crucial importance to our understanding of Egyptian control of Upper Nubia. If Irem is to be identified with part of riverine Upper Nubia, the Egyptian control of the region is found to be considerably less secure than usually accepted. Indeed the Egyptians would have faced sporadic rebellions in the region throughout the 18th and 19th Dynasties. If Irem is to be located in the central Sudan, the Pharaonic military activities were more wide ranging and aggressive than previously thought, indeed, comparable with those in Asia. Significantly, this alternative view posits a more aggressive reaction by the "princedoms" of the Central Sudan towards Egypt and its Nubian possessions.

In the model advocated here, in which the region between the 3rd and 4th Cataracts was left largely in the control of indigenous rulers, Irem could still be located in the Kerma region (although the
factors of the Sety I campaign have to be considered). Kemp [33] has, independently, located Miu, another important Kushite chiefdom during the New Kingdom, in the Shendi Reach, and it is certain that there were important political units within the central Sudan at this time, whether, or not, they should be identified with Irem and Miu. These chiefdoms must have been the main suppliers of the "luxury" commodities which formed a considerable part of the inw and b3kw of Kush.

In the New Kingdom tomb scenes depicting the presentation of foreign products, or the rewarding of officials, representatives of both the Asiatic and African states are shown. The interpretation of such scenes, and the extent to which they can be read literally as records of events is, of course, problematic. Some might argue that this is another example of the symbolic duality found so frequently, and that it does not necessarily mean that there were Kushite or other African ambassadors. There is no justification for maintaining such an idea, which derives largely, if not entirely, from the prejudices of earlier scholarship. The Kamose texts quite clearly record letter exchange between the Hyksos and the Kushite princes. The African, just as the Western Asiatic states, sent representatives and communicated with the Pharaonic court. Admittedly, the Kushite and other African states were very differently organised to the highly structured city-states of the Levant and Mesopotamia, and in consequence the nature of their relationship with Egypt must have been different. However, it was mutually advantageous for the Egyptian and Kushite elites to establish and maintain contacts, and, it should be emphasised, diplomatic exchange is between the representatives of ruling elites/princes/chiefs, and thus within discussion of Kush is not necessarily indicative of political cohesion, but of the existence of important individual rulers. There is a considerable amount of evidence from other periods indicating or suggesting such diplomatic contacts and gift-exchange.

There are reasons for believing that direct Egyptian control extended only as far as the 3rd Cataract, and that the region to the
south may have been controlled by indigenous Kushite princes. A certain amount of textual evidence can be adduced in support of this, and the settlement pattern in the Abri-Delgo Reach is most easily explicable within this model. Further theoretical considerations make it likely that the Egyptians would have established a buffer zone between their 'colonised' territory and the actual frontier at Napata. The parallelism of texts relating to Nubia and Asia demonstrates clearly that the Egyptians did not view their relationship with the two regions as essentially different. Both were suppliers of both inw and b3kw, both had wrw-rulers. This suggests very strongly that the Asiatic and African peripheries of the Egyptian centre functioned in similar ways.

The continued existence of powerful Kushite princes later than the early-18th Dynasty is not accepted by all scholars, who believe them to have been little more than village headmen of only local and moderate importance. However, there is ample evidence for Kushite chiefs in the early 18th Dynasty leading resistance against the Egyptians, and any total disappearance of them, not paralleled in other imperialist expansions, needs to be accounted for. A valuable comparison may be found by examining the role of elites and chiefs in more generalised models of frontier expansion, in which one 'weaker' people retreats before a stronger culture. Here it can be seen that retreat (physical) or resistance emphasises the power of local chiefs. Indeed, in societies which are loosely structured during peaceful times (eg due to the agricultural capabilities of the land) a former village headman may increase his power and become a chief because of a tightening in the society's structure. If they are recognised as representatives of the communities by the invading power in order to impose the institutions of that power, or to establish a framework for co-existence of the two communities, the power of chieftains over their own people is increased even further. The hereditary principle is also strengthened, and a family of chiefs may have a vested interest in perpetuating the subordination of the people as a whole. This situation is quite compatible with tribal insurrections against the dominant people [34]. Emergent elites who
control the economic wealth may come to rely on the continuance of 'trade' to maintain their privileged positions within the society. Instances where a stronger culture has come under the authority of a greater military power, such as Asia Minor under Roman rule, show quite clearly that certain practices of that controlling power will be adopted by individuals or groups within the elite, as a strategy in the constant struggles within the elite itself for prestige and status [35]. Similarly, when Ife came into contact with Islam seeking 'luxury' commodities, the power and prestige of the local ruler who already had a local network at his disposal was emphasised. Early New Kingdom Nubia, in which the invading power was both militarily and culturally dominant, may thus have seen the affirmation of, or increase in, the power of certain local princes for whom the adoption of Egyptian manners and practices was a means of increasing their status within their community through their links with the new rulers.

Egyptianisation of the indigenous elite in Wawat was rapid, as the example of the princes of Th-ht, buried at Debeira, illustrates [36]. By the co-reign of Thutmose III and Hatshepsut, they had adopted additional, Egyptian, names, and were employed within the Viceregal administration, whilst retaining their Kushite titles. They were buried in Egyptian style tombs with graves goods and statuary manufactured in the royal workshops (in Nubia, if not directly from Egypt). Junior members of the family were also employed in the administration, one being buried at Aswan.

Thutmose II took a Kushite prince as hostage/for education, four sons of the prince of Irem were sent to Egypt in year 34 of Thutmose III [37], and the msw wrw of Hnt-hn-mfr, and of Kush continue to be referred to, or depicted in texts and scenes until the reign of Tutankhamun [38]. Whilst this practice of sending elite children to the Egyptian court is usually seen as a way by which the Egyptians were able to control the Kushite (and indeed Asiatic) princes, it was probably also highly desired by the elites themselves, as a means of
distinguishing themselves, increasing their status, and consolidating their political power.

The princedoms of Lower Nubia in the 18th Dynasty are well-attested [39]. It is assumed that each chiefdom was more or less equivalent to the major areas of settlement and agriculturally productive land. The northernmost, although not attested from inscriptive material, would have had Kubban at its centre. No local rulers have been identified for this region, although the Chief Steward of the Queen's House, Nakhtmin, buried at Dehmit, might be a candidate [40]. The middle princedom, Miam, was based on Aniba, although the princes were buried a little to the south at Toshka. The best-documented of these chiefs, Heqa-nefer, is attested by graffiti, his tomb and funerary objects, and from the scenes in the tomb of the Viceroy Huy [41]. The southernmost of the princedoms Th-ht, is represented by a family of chiefs, buried at Debeira and further attested by statuary and inscriptions. A wr of Th-ht is known from the reign of Ramesses II [42], showing that these princedoms are not specifically an early-colonial phenomenon.

The evidence from the southern region is far scantier, although the scene of the presentation of the Nubian tribute in the tomb of Huy depicts only three wrw of Wawat, but six of Kush. Similarly, an obscure passage in the inscription of Thutmose II, describes the 'rebellion' at the king's accession and how the sons of the ruler of Kush had divided the land into five pieces [43]. This was a temporary development, but there were probably several different principalities in Upper Nubia. It is difficult to identify such princes in the historical record, and the limits of their individual rule are less easily defined than those of Lower Nubia, since the region does not fall naturally into agricultural zones. Nevertheless, some of these local rulers might be identifiable amongst the "Overseers of Southern Foreign Lands" [44].

It is a commonplace of Egyptological discussions of Nubia and the Viceregal administration to regard Egypt's attitude to the southern
country as totally different from its attitude to the Western Asiatic dominions. This attitude can probably be derived solely from the pre-, or mis-conceptions of the discipline. Inherent is the attitude that the Egyptians thought like 'us' in relation to the south. It is equally necessary to be wary of imposing upon Egypto-Kushite relations the diplomatic machinery of the Western Asiatic states, but at the same time recognise that some sort of contracts must have been mutually agreed. Whilst this is accepted between the Pharaoh and Western Asiatic rulers, the idea seems to be prevalent that in Nubia the Egyptian king could set up an inscription (NB in Egyptian) effectively saying 'keep out', and he was obeyed. The Nubian boundary inscriptions are analogous with those in Naharin and at the Nahr el-Kalb: there is no good reason to believe that they lacked the contractual background of the Asiatic texts [45].

Similarly, it has become accepted that the New Kingdom pharaohs exploited Nubia for its gold and other "luxury" commodities which then entered a gift-exchange system with the rulers of Western Asia, but not with those of Nubia itself. The subject of the Egyptian economic exploitation of Nubia is complex and discussed in detail below. The terms inw and b3kw, the two elements usually categorised as "tribute", are well-recognised as difficult of interpretation, but it is simplistic to view them entirely as commodities disappearing from Nubia, to lump them together and then represent the situation as purely exploitative. The role of both within the economy needs to be assessed, and whilst the commodities represented by inw and b3kw are frequently the same, they are two separate economic categories, deriving from different relationships. It should be stressed that transference of goods by gift is not principally, or essentially, with the idea of receiving a profit or economic advantage [46], and it is also vital to remember that objects received as gift can be reused only in certain ways, as, for example, gift to a temple, an official, or a foreign ruler.

The "luxury" products acquired as inw and b3kw possessed a particularly important role within the society. The use of some
products, such as gold, incense, ivory and ebony, can be relatively easily accounted for. Their value in the redistributive economy as gifts to officials, and within the diplomatic sphere of gift-exchange, was not purely economic, it also cemented social relationships, and emphasised the position of the king, both within the Egyptian hierarchy and in the wider geo-political context.

To recognise inw as indicative of a social relationship introduces the issue of reciprocal obligation, with its corollary that a reciprocal and social relationship cannot be wholly exploitative. Since inw was presented by the Kushite rulers to the pharaoh, we must acknowledge that the pharaoh gave gifts to the Kushite rulers in return. Past studies have usually seen the pharaoh as depleting Nubia of its gold resources and luxury goods, either directly, or as "tax" or "tribute" which then entered a reciprocal exchange cycle with the other Near Eastern potentates [Fig 1].

Fig 1

However, reconsidering the nature of inw must involve a radical reassessment of the perceived Kushite-Egyptian relationship: the pharaoh was involved in mutual gift-exchange with both Kushite and Near Eastern rulers, and Libyan and Puntite chiefs, and probably the chiefs of the Eastern desert [Fig 2].
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Literature may have over-simplified the relationship between Egypt and Nubia during the New Kingdom, based on a series of prejudices. Unequivocal 'proof' for the model proposed here is impossible to adduce without extensive excavation of major sites in Upper Nubia and the Central Sudan, and even such work could not guarantee that such proof would be found. This model assumes that the Egyptians reacted to the south in very much the same way that they did to the Asiatics and Libyans. The number and extent of the campaigns and 'rebellions' against Egyptian expansion in the early 18th Dynasty, show that the Kushites were a formidable military opponent. The Egyptians certainly faced opposition later also. The pattern of Egyptian settlement in Upper Nubia is more easily explained within the context of this model, by which the administration retained a buffer zone between its actual (the 3rd Cataract) and technical (4th-5th Cataracts) frontiers. The continuance of indigenous regimes, supported by the Egyptian administration might ultimately have contributed to the end of the Egyptian empire in Nubia, resulting in the emergence of a powerful independent Kushite state.
Ruling Nubia: the Viceregal administration

The Egyptian Elite.

A large and immensely important prosopographical literature forms the foundation for any study of the Egyptian ruling class; but prosopography, whether of an office [1], of a single reign [2] or a whole period [3], or related to a single monument [4] or an archaeological site [5], although fundamental to any understanding of the subject, has taken precedence over more generalised analytical studies. There has been little examination of the Egyptian elite in a broader context, and there is nothing in the literature of the subject which ranks alongside Gelzer's Die Nobilität der römischen Republik [6].

For Nubian studies the situation is unfortunately similar. Although excavation reports have included detailed information on all of the officials attested at the sites [7], and numerous individual monuments have been recorded, a full prosopography of the Nubian administration still awaits publication [8]. Despite the distinguished work of Habachi and others, Reisner's (1920) study of the Viceroys remains the only published survey of these most important officials [9].

Although a number of writers, such as Wilson [10] have characterised the New Kingdom elite as an hereditary aristocracy, Egyptological literature is still pervaded by the belief that it was possible to rise to the highest offices although born into the humblest classes of society. This attitude, which has been expressed in the publications of numerous inscriptions of the highest officials of the New Kingdom [11] is allied with an indiscriminate and undefined terminology. Even in the most recent works it is possible to read that Akhenaten appointed "new men" [12], and that the founders of the 19th Dynasty were "plebeian in origin" [13], despite
the very definite meanings of both terms in Roman politics and society, whence they originate.

This situation derives both from the attitudes which have dominated Egyptology and the difficulties imposed by the ancient material. At the most general level it is difficult to assess the implications of certain terms related to social status [14]; and within the hierarchy there is no clear understanding of the many 'honorifics' held by officials, and whether they should be seen as 'ranking titles' [15] or merely 'decorations'.

A further contributory factor in Egyptological interpretation may derive from the tendency of Western historiography to place great emphasis on the growth of institutions and to play down the role of aristocracies [16]. Aristocracies have been allied with decadence and feudal anarchy, or have been regarded as a marginal force [17], contrasted with an enlightened Middle Class. Such a stance would seem to lie behind the idea of the institutional power of the Amun priesthood, with the resulting Akhenaten 'heresy', and its eventual triumph with the 'Priest kings' of the 21st Dynasty [18]. This view, although challenged by some writers [19], is firmly rooted in the discipline. Greater emphasis on the elites, their relationship to the king and to their own dependants, would dispute the concept of institutional independence. Hopkins [20] emphasises the importance of the Roman nobility in palace politics, and the emperor's limited capacity to ensure execution of his orders: the power of high officials could, for example, effect the failure of embassies to secure an audience. Discussions of palace politics in Egyptology have erred towards the Orientalist, with emphasis on phenomena such as 'Harim conspiracy' or the influence of foreigners (usually seen as malign).

During the New Kingdom, O'Connor [21] proposes, there was a stratified society headed by an elite comprising the royal family and most important officials, and, of lesser status and economic importance, the "provincial nobility". The 'middle class' was made
up of lesser bureaucrats, priests, wealthy farmers, artisans and military officers. The lower class included soldiers, minor officials and priests, tenant-farmers, peasants and soldiers. This division is unsatisfactory for a number of reasons, and claims that the elite "does not seem to have been a strongly entrenched hereditary aristocracy" should be treated with some scepticism [22].

Power in Egypt was in the hands of the literate, and, equally, the powerful controlled literacy. Texts such as "be a scribe" [23] which laud the occupation of a scribe above all others, are documents which would have been read only by those who were in fact scribes, or were training to become scribes. Any study of the Egyptian elite must acknowledge that literacy was the access to power, and that literacy was limited to possibly as little as 1% of the population [24].

Great emphasis has been placed on the rise of the military in the New Kingdom, the importance of chariots, and the possibility of a 'Maryannu' class in Egypt [25]. In the Old and Middle Kingdoms military commanders were members of the elite seconded for specific purposes. In the New Kingdom there are indications of a more structured and professionalised hierarchy, with a tendency to specialise in one of the institutions, but all had the same elite education with its emphasis on writing. Whilst the elite doubtless kept the new art of chariots as their own preserve - chariots and horses were "expensive" and presumably only came as gift from the king - literacy remained the basis of elite education. Indeed, military commanders are frequently depicted as scribes [26] and the Bakenkhons cursus suggests that the "stable" was a type of military academy where writing was learnt alongside the equestrian arts.

The expansion of the Egyptian empire in the early 18th Dynasty must have led to a rapid expansion of the bureaucracy, and possibly necessitated drawing in new members to the elite [27]. At the same time, the larger bureaucracy required to administer the foreign possessions and the royal and temple domains must have magnified the importance of the highest officials. Symbols of prestige thus became
important to distinguish the ranks of bureaucrats: a king with a small attendant nobility preserves his remoteness, but an increased elite group must ultimately necessitate elevated status for the king. The social structure did not change, but the elite grew.

The relationship of the king to the elite is emphasised through gift of prestige goods, which, whilst being a transfer of 'luxury' commodities, was part of a complex of mutual obligations. Although significant, the economic aspects of gift-exchange, were not the most important of the transaction. Prestige and status are recognised as denominators in societies in which capital is a limited concept [28]. The public presentation of gift, as at Amarna, also emphasises the importance of the official to the crown vis à vis the other officials - but also, of course, the reliance of the official upon the king. Similarly, public execution emphasises the supremacy of state power over the individual, however exalted his or her rank [29].

The elite themselves emphasise the importance of the king in the tomb decoration where the relationship is depicted, notably in 'kiosk' and reward scenes. The culmination of this genre are the sed-festival scenes of Amenhotep III's reign and the complete dominance by the king in the tombs of Akhenaten's reign [30]. The development from kiosk scenes to Window of Appearance also includes changes in the scale and attitude of officials in relation to the king. In the Amarna tombs the officials appear on a much smaller scale than the king, a late development since, even in the tomb of Ramose, the official is of equal size. An increasingly deferential attitude is also found; in the reigns of Thutmose III [31] and Amenhotep II [32] and into that of Amenhotep III [33] the official is depicted as the same size as the king, standing before the kiosk, but with the introduction of the Window of Appearances in the reign of Akhenaten [34] the official prostrates himself before the sovereign. Signs of deference can be found in the reign of Amenhotep III, in the tomb of Khaemhat and at Luxor temple, but this does not extend to complete prostration [35]. A complete change in tomb decoration is
found after the Amarna phase, with family and religious scenes supplanting the old royal-official relationship [36].

This deference to the importance of the king as the fount of all honour obscures any conflict between the king and the elite, either as factions or individuals. The sole surviving instances are smashed or unfinished tombs, or the erasure of officials' names and figures. The connotations of the fall from power, which can be so graphically accounted in other ancient societies, remain elusive [37]. What happened to an official and his family - whether he was executed or exiled and whether disgrace meant the end of a family's opportunity - is, simply, an unanswerable question. The evidence for execution of opponents, whether foreigners or Egyptians, has, until recently been underplayed. The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon records the burning and impalement of, apparently, quite a large number of officials [38]. The executions, relating to offences carried out against temple property, were almost certainly highly ritualised, as Willems [39] has argued for other instances.

Whilst the Egyptian elite probably comprised an hereditary aristocracy of a small number of families, there must have been input from the 'lower' strata, particularly in the period of early-18th dynasty expansion, but the extent and nature of this is indeterminable.

Further difficulties complicate the interpretation of the material. The selective nature of ancient genealogical materials, the "imprecision" of their terminology [40], and the accident of survival have prejudiced our interpretation. Monuments of Third Intermediate Period date carry genealogies extending back for up to fourteen generations, and also include lines of female descent [41]. Evidence such as the marriage contracts of the reign of Takeloth II [42], and the frequent claims to offices both through the male and female lines [43] indicate family archives and a concern with ancestry (for very practical reasons), although there is no evidence for official agencies regulating documentary claims [44]. That
families kept archives at earlier periods is obvious from the Mose
dispute, which must have detailed the family as recipients of produce
from the jointly held estate, from the beginning of the 18th Dynasty
to year 18 of Ramesses II, some three hundred years [45]. While the
genealogies of official families of the 19th and 20th Dynasties and
of the Third Intermediate Period are extensive, those of the 18th
Dynasty are much more abbreviated. This has perhaps underemphasised
the potential significance of the elite as a political force.

Habachi [46], discussing a monument recording the descendants of the
early Viceroy's, assumed that the family had declined in importance.
This may have been the case, but the evidence does not necessarily
indicate that, since this monument may record only one line of the
descendants of this family. Indeed, depiction of the Viceroy Turo in
the Silsila shrine of Rekhmire's father, has suggested a possible
connection with another highly influential family [47].

The responsibilities of an extended family, and the limited number of
high positions must be considered before subjective interpretations
are made.

That the most powerful officials were those closest to throne is
manifest. This can be demonstrated by the scale of the tombs of the
Royal Stewards at Thebes, which are amongst the biggest in the
necropolis. It is also notable that many of these officials seem to
have fallen from grace [48].

Power conflict amongst the nobility may have manifested itself
most obviously in the desire for influence within the palace, and
hence the control of access to the king [49]. The importance of the
Royal Nurses and Tutors, and other palace officials, such as the
Royal Stewards is evidenced by the size and splendour of their tombs
and by their familial connections [50]. A large number of the most
important officials were sons of women who bore the title *hkrt nswt,*
and although this cannot be defined with any precision was clearly a
denominator of great significance [51]. Such elite families may have
wished to see their daughters become Great Royal Wives, and, as
Robins [52], has tentatively suggested, this may have led to conflict
between the families of the King's Mother and of the King's Chief Wife.

The Career Structure.

It may be assumed that an official would not be appointed to a major office without some years service elsewhere. Bierbrier [53] cites the evidence of the career of Bakenkhons as 1st Prophet of Amun, who achieved his first religious position after 4 years at school, and 11 years in the stable of Sety I. He then served 4 years as a minor priest before being appointed as a prophet, a position which he held for 12 years before becoming 3rd Prophet of Amun, and eventually rising to be 2nd and 1st Prophets. This official was educated within the temple of Amun, where his father was 2nd Prophet. The Viceroy Setau, also of the reign of Ramesses II, was educated within the palace. His first position was in the office of the vizier, from which (according to his auto-biographical text [54]) he was appointed to be Steward of Amun at Thebes, and Leader of the Festival, and then to be Viceroy. The idnw Amenemopet's three stage career [55] likewise suggests a system in which ability was important. However, the apparent restriction of literacy to a small percentage of the population must indicate that birth was the most significant factor in gaining access to education and the bureaucracy. Even if patronage did play an important part, for very obvious reasons patrons "were not necessarily indifferent to the competence of those whose careers they advanced" [56].

The generalisation may be safely made that an official was the son of an official, whose own rank (major or minor office holder) was only one factor affecting the ultimate success of his children. A cursory examination of families known over two or three generations shows that 'major' officeholders (eg high priesthoods, overseer titles, vizier, stewards etc) may have a large number of relatives who are only 'minor' officeholders (eg scribal positions, lesser priestly titles) [57]. Of course, the Egyptian bureaucracy was actually very small - especially when the most powerful positions are
considered. A number of factors may have affected the appointment to office. The hereditary principle becomes more obvious in the 19th Dynasty, but it was doubtless dominant in the 18th, and indeed, earlier literature shows that it was regarded as the ideal in the Old and Middle Kingdoms. The emphasis on heredity in the 19th Dynasty is related to a decline in the emphasis (on funerary monuments) on the relationship of the officials to the king, and their dependency upon him, which reaches its peak in the 18th dynasty with the reigns of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. [58]

Education [59], in one of the palace or temple schools, was, in the late 18th and 19th Dynasties, apparently followed by a period in the royal stables. Since Bakenkhons records only 4 years at school compared with 11 in the stables, this was surely a place where education was continued, but where chariotry was also learned. Chariotry and horsemanship were important new skills in the 18th Dynasty, and as such they were doubtless kept by the nobility as a preserve. It is possible that the chariotry corps was formed from the younger members of the elite - those who had completed their education but had not yet been appointed to their first offices. Whether there was any form of 'military service' is speculative. The titles hry ihw, hry ssawt and 'charioteer of his majesty' are common at this time, and might apply to such young officials. Schulman [60] cites some evidence that the chariotry was drawn from the young elite and the nfrw with whom Amenhotep II surrounded himself [61] may also have belonged to this category. The autobiographical text of Anhurmose [62], indicates that after schooling he served on a ship and as scribe of the army and chariotry. Accompanying the king on military campaigns he acted as an interpreter, and was elevated to the position of Companion, and then appointed as High Priest of Anhur, with a number of other benefices. Discussing this text, Ockinga and al-Masri assume that Anhurmose was appointed to the priestly office having retired from a military career and cite Kees [63] for other examples of retired military officials being granted prebends. The military activities, they argue, must belong to the early years of Merneptah. A different interpretation of the text
might be justified: that Anhurmose, having completed his schooling, was attached to the navy and army for a period of military service, before his appointment to priestly office. This text, unfortunately, does not indicate how many years were spent in each occupation.

The Development and structure of the viceregal bureaucracy.

The Egyptian expansion into Lower Nubia in the reigns of Kamose and Ahmose was against territories which had been controlled by the Kushite kingdom of Kerma throughout the 2nd Intermediate Period [64]. The Kushite rulers had installed Egyptian overseers in the fortress of Buhen, and possibly in others [65], and there was an Egyptian or Egypto-Kushite population in these centres. Nothing further is known of the local socio-political composition at this date, although it seems probable that the three princedoms which are attested later, already existed, perhaps as vassals of the Kerma chiefs [66]. The changing power configurations of the princedoms of Lower Nubia during the late-Old Kingdom [67] should serve as an indicator of the dynamic nature of Nubian society, even though the supporting documentary evidence is invariably absent. The continued existence of a 'chiefdom' as a territorial unit does not, of course mean that the chiefs were not replaced by others more amenable to the Egyptian administration [68]. Since Lower Nubia had a fairly substantial population the imposition of some sort of civil administration at an early date was clearly imperative, and there is a strong likelihood that a Viceroy, Tety, was appointed by Kamose [69].

The activities of the early 18th Dynasty were essentially military, and centred upon the re-occupied, or newly-constructed fortresses. The relationship between the Egyptian administration and the indigenous population in Lower Nubia outside of the fortresses, is, during this period, elusive. There was doubtless an increasing involvement, and by the co-reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, members of the indigenous elite families were employed in the administration.
The reign of Amenhotep II or Thutmose IV saw the emergence of the mature Viceregal bureaucracy, when the idnw were defined as "of Kush" and "of Wawat", and a dual system was established for the two parts of Nubia. This was almost certainly a conscious re-organisation rather than simply a development. At about this time also the Viceregal title became s3 nsw n K3s [70]. This presumably reflects some change within the Egyptian administration; at about the same time the highest officials are grouped with the title t3y hw hr wny nswt [71]. No major changes can be seen in the later phases of the Egyptian domination. The viceregal bureaucracy was almost certainly controlled very largely by Nubian families, whether of indigenous, Egyptian, or mixed origin, with only the highest officials being appointed directly from Egypt.

It was argued by Alt and others that the Egyptians imposed different types of administration in their imperial territories of Nubia and Western Asia. Israelit-Groll opposed this view, stressing that the administration of the two regions was very much the same: the ruling class stayed in power, although not necessarily the same individuals, and there were Egyptian garrisons and an Overseer of Northern, or Southern, Foreign Lands [72]. As argued above, there was no fundamental difference in the way that the Egyptians viewed their Nubian and Asiatic 'empires' and it may be assumed that, allowing for variations dictated by local circumstances, the administrative machinery employed would have been much the same in the two regions.

In its reorganised form the Viceregal bureaucracy seems to have deliberately paralleled Egypt's dual administration. As in Egypt there were several distinct, but interdependent, branches [Table 1 on p 62]:

1. The civil administration, under the idnw and Mayors of towns. In the later period some fortresses (e.g. Buhen) formerly under a Commandant were placed under a h3ty-.
2. The indigenous princedoms.
3. The religious foundations, controlled by the Overseer of
Table 1: the administration of Nubia.
Prophets of all the gods of Nubia.

4. The military, under the hry pd t n K3s.

5. The Treasury.

6. The gold mines, which would have been under the Viceroy's direct authority

The Viceroy himself had a large personal staff which comprised the household officials commensurate with his rank, along with the scribes and deputies (the rwdw and the sdw c3) who could be delegated for specific jobs. There is evidence that a number of Viceroys were accompanied in their official duties by their sons, either with a specific rank, or office, or simply as deputies.

The administration maintained direct contact with the palace, its principal agents probably being the wpwty nsw [73], from whose ranks several viceroys were drawn. A number of inscriptions of the reign of Siptah are particularly illuminating as to the activities of the wpwty nsw and their relationship to the Viceregal administration.

The Viceroy Sety was conducted on his first tour of duty by the royal envoy Neferhor, and in year 3 of the same reign a delegation, led by Pyiay, arrived to receive the bSkw of Kush [74]. The Chancellor Bay accompanied the progress [75], which may have been met by the Viceroy Sety at Aswan [76]. The dignitaries included Pyiay's son, Amennakht [77], and the royal envoy, Hori son of Kema (himself later Viceroy) [78].

The Officials of the administration.

The Viceroy.

Reisner (1920) published a list of Viceroys and their monuments, which has been considerably expanded by the survey and excavation work in Nubia, and the better publications of many inscriptions. It is unlikely that many additions will be made to the list of known New Kingdom Viceroys [79], although excavations at Elephantine have shown
that the title continued in use throughout the Third Intermediate Period [80].

The Viceroy was a royal official, as the title demonstrates, and he was doubtless directly responsible to the king. Thus, although his duties in many ways paralleled those of the Viziers, the implication is that Nubia fell into the sphere of royal possessions.

In his tomb, the Viceroy Huy is shown being appointed to office in the presence of Tutankhamun [81]. He is invested with the seal of office, perhaps by the Vizier [82] and the Treasurer announces his sphere of jurisdiction. Huy also receives the rolled-up sash and the ḫwī-fan, indicative of his elevation to the rank of a ḫ3y ḫw ḫr wumy nswt. During the investiture Huy has also been decorated with the ṣbyw-collars and wstkw-bracelets, indicating his elevated status, and has received floral bouquets. This gift is also noted in the greeting of Huy by the idnw on his arrival in Nubia: "you are come loaded with the many ḥsw-rewards of the ḫ33-ruler" [83]. The appointment to a new office was thus a time when an official would receive largesse from the king which would then be passed on to the local officials. After his installation Huy proceeds to the temple with his family, where he makes offerings, and then departs for Nubia in the Viceregal barge. The accompanying texts [84] make it certain that the ceremony has taken place in Thebes and the royal presence at the installation of an official of this rank is to be expected. Huy is greeted on his arrival in Nubia by the chief officials of the administration and of the Viceregal capital, Faras [85].

Further light is shed on the events surrounding the accession of a Viceroy by inscriptions of the reign of Siptah. Those of year 1, at Abu Simbel [86], and at Buhen [87], mark the installation of Sety as Viceroy. Sety was conducted on this first tour of duty by the royal envoy Neferhor, who also brought ḥsw-rewards for the ḫw3tyw of Ta-Seti; doubtless some form of accession largesse. A second group of texts from Siptah's reign probably record the installation of Hori as Viceroy, by Aipy, son of Nayebo [88] in year 6. It was in that year
that Hori's son, the royal envoy Webekhsenu left an ex voto in the South Temple at Buhen [89]. A graffito on Seheil [90], depicting both father and son, may have been carved whilst travelling south to take up his appointment.

By the late 18th Dynasty the Viceroy's jurisdiction extended from Hierakonpolis to the 4th Cataract. This may, as O'Connor suggested, have been to include the gold-mining regions of Upper Egypt under Viceregal control [91]. The extent to which the Viceroy had any authority in the valley-towns of Upper Egypt, and how that authority related to that of the Vizier, is undocumented.

Many Egyptologists have regarded the Viceroys as primarily military officials. Kadry [92], for example, commented that their responsibilities "being mainly of military nature ... left no room for civil officials of the Theban families to occupy this office". There are no texts which specify the duties of the Viceroy, but these seem, contrary to Kadry and others, to have been predominantly civil; particularly the collection of the revenues, and control of the gold production. They were also responsible for the building of temples. Viceroys were not, after the early 18th Dynasty, specifically military officials, although they are found leading campaigns; as part of an elite which combined military and bureaucratic education, this is not in any way contradictory. The militia appears to have been directly under the hry pdt, and there may have been a division of authority for very practical reasons.

Priestly titles were rarely held by Viceroys during the 18th Dynasty, it ntr mry ntr, being the most usual. In the 19th and 20th Dynasties more Viceroys held specific priesthoods, but even then it was far from regular [93]. As in Egypt, it was the High Priests of the temples who deputised for the king.

Viceroys were presumably in constant progress throughout their domains, but must have regularly visited the court to present the inw and to report to the king. Huy apparently possessed a house at
Thebes [94] and similarly, the presence of the Viceroy at the head of the funeral procession of the Vizier Ramose, indicates his importance amongst the Upper Egyptian officials [95]. Royal visits to Thebes to celebrate such major festivals as the Opet, may have been a time when the Viceroy reported on affairs in Nubia, and received royal directives. The evidence for royal visits to Kush is limited to reports of military activities, although they may have been more frequent. An accession tour might be expected, although this was usually accompanied by a display of military strength to quell the 'rebellion' which is often reported. Nubia lacked the ancient festivals, such as Opet, which were usually celebrated by the king in person and royal religious visits were more likely to have related to the sed-festival.

Family and previous careers of Viceroys

As is usual for elite families throughout the 18th Dynasty, information about the families of Viceroys is extremely limited. There can be little doubt, however, that they were invariably appointed from the elite families, and probably those most closely connected with the palace. Usersatet was son of a s3b and a hkrt nswt, Nenwenhirmentes [96], and himself bore the title hrd n k3p, indicating an upbringing in the royal palace [97]. In Shrine 11 at Silsila he is associated with a Royal Nurse and with an Overseer of the King's Apartments in Thebes [98]. All of these factors emphasise Usersatet's close connections with the palace from his childhood onwards. The title s3b doubtless indicates little more than that his father was a dead official, and suggestions that this epithet was given to men 'of humble origins' can probably be discounted [99]. Usersatet seems to have functioned as a royal steward [100] and of other Viceroys with close palace connections, Amenhotep-Huy 1 was probably related to the Steward of Tiye at Amarna and may have been a wpwty nsw [101]; Setau was educated within the palace and may have been related to one of the most influential family groups of the reign of Ramesses II, which also included the Viceroy Paser 2 [102]; Hori was appointed from the ranks of the wpwty nswt[103].
With the increased emphasis on the family, rather than upon the
king, after the Amarna period, there is a consequent increase in
information on the families of some later Viceroys. Whereas some
Viceroys of the 18th Dynasty, such as Nehi, are well-attested by
monuments and inscriptions in Nubia their families remain virtually
unknown [104], the inverse happens for some later officiants. Paser
2, who served Ramesses II, left few monuments in Nubia, but is named
on the family monument of the Chief of the Madjoy, Amenemone,
revealing his connection with a family which held important
priesthoods in Middle Egypt as well as those of Amun at Karnak, and
Re at Heliopolis, and which retained the position of ḫry pdt of Kush
for three generations, as well as being allied by marriage with
Viziers [105].

Our knowledge of wives of viceroys is minimal and it is difficult
even to cite examples, much less to make generalisations. One of few
known is Mutnofret, the wife of Setau, of the middle years of the
reign of Ramesses II [106]. Mutnofret bore the titles Chief of the
Harim of Nekhbet, Chantress of Amun and Chief of the Harim of Amun.
The last two titles derive from her husband's office of Steward of
Amun, which he held before his appointment as Viceroy [107]. Setau
is not, so far, recorded as possessing a priestly title associating
him with Nekhbet, although he did dedicate a chapel at El Kab [108].
Mutnofret's position as Chief of the Harim of Nekhbet is not to be
connected with her husband's viceregal function, and may reflect a
family association with El Kab [109]. Setau's tomb is at Thebes, but
this, along with some of his burial equipment [110] was made whilst
he served in the city as Chief Steward of Amun and Leader of the
Festival.

Much more difficult to interpret is the evidence relating to
Tæmaways, variously suggested to have been the wife of Huy 1, of
the ḫry pdt Khaemwaset or of the Viceroy Paser 1 [111]. She carries
the titles Chief of the Harim of Amun and Chief of the Harim of
Nebkheperure in Faras. Although the evidence is equivocal, the
simplest reading of the material would make her wife of the Viceroy
Huy 1, and mother of the Viceroy Paser 1, and perhaps also of the hry pdt Khaemwaset.

Both Mutnofret and Taemwadjsy seem to have set up monuments in their own right [112], and the importance of such women would seem to be confirmed by the occurrence of the, otherwise extremely rare, name, Taemwadjsy, at Aniba in the early-19th Dynasty [113].

Some relatives of Viceroys are known to have held offices in Nubia, the clearest example being the three generations of hry pdt who were cousins of the Viceroy Paser 2. Amongst the officials who greet Huy on his arrival in Nubia is the Second Prophet of Nb-hprw-R® in Faras, Merymose [114]. This priest is described as 'his brother' (sn.f), and as Gardiner pointed out, this must refer to Huy as the most significant person in the tomb and the scene. Gardiner was cautious as to whether actual brotherhood was meant, but did suggest that this man was named after the viceroy of Amenhotep III: indeed it is possible that there was a family relationship between the two Viceroys [115]. Sons of Viceroys may have acted as deputies for their fathers, or accompanied them in an official capacity: Amenemhab, son of the Viceroy Sety, served as idmw [116], although more usually sons held their own offices such as wpwty nsw [117] or bore chariots titles [118].

A number of Viceroys [119] and Chief Bowmen of Kush [120] were buried at Thebes, but this does not necessarily indicate that it was their town of origin. The concentration of 18th-dynasty tombs in the necropoleis of Thebes and Memphis has somewhat obscured the role of 'lesser' and 'provincial' centres, and the importance of elite families within them. The late New Kingdom furnishes more examples of such families, most notably the Hori family which, serving from the reign of Siptah into the 20th Dynasty, originated in Bubastis. There the family tomb has been excavated [121], and an unusual group of graffiti at Nag Abidis [122] apparently records the procession taking the body of the elder Hori to his home-town for burial. The family's association with Bubastis, and devotion to its patron deity,
are affirmed by their numerous graffiti and ex votos which include the city's eponymous goddess [123]. Priestly titles of the family of Wentawat suggest that Asyut was their home town [124]. The Vicerows Messuy and Sety were both buried at Aniba [125], which, although not conclusive evidence, suggests that they may have belonged to elite Nubian families.

It is difficult, without specific autobiographical texts, to reconstruct the careers of officials. Some Vicerows from the late-18th Dynasty onwards, had served as deputies under their fathers (possibly Paser 1, Amenemopet, Hori 2 etc.), or were drawn from the ranks of the *wpwy nsw* (Hori 1 and probably Huy 1). Setau, having been educated in the palace, began his ascent in the office of the Vizier, and from there was promoted to be Steward of Amun: this major office was usually the summit of an official's career, and Setau had his Theban tomb, and some of its furniture made at this time, but he was elevated still further, to become Viceroy.

The Chief of Bowmen of Kush.

Whilst the Chief of Bowmen was undoubtedly the head of the Nubian militia, it is unclear whether he was subordinate to the Viceroy or directly to the pharaoh. As the Viceregal office was essentially civil, the latter may have been the case. Most Chief of Bowmen were also Overseers of the Southern Foreign Lands - the officials who had jurisdiction in the Nubian Marches. The importance of the office of Chief of Bowmen is emphasised by the use of rank of *t3y hwy hr wmy nswt*. The office is not well-documented before the reign of Amenhotep III, and may have been a creation of the re-structuring of the bureaucracy suggested to have occurred around the time of Amenhotep II-Thutmose IV.

Our knowledge of the Chief of Bowmen of Kush and their families is scant, and it is difficult to make generalisations about titles they might have held. Khaemwaset, known from a dyad discovered at Kawa, was holder of the office in the late 18th Dynasty. He is accompanied
by a woman who holds the offices of \textit{wrt hmr} of Amun and \textit{wrt hmr n Mb-}\textit{hpwr-rc} at Faras, called Taemwadjisy [126]. Bell identified this Khaemwaset with the First Prophet of Nebkheperure at Faras, Kha, depicted in the tomb of Huy [127], assuming an hypochoristic form of the name. It seems unlikely that a Chief of Bowmen would hold important priestly offices concurrent with his military duties [128]. Taemwadjisy is, perhaps more probably, to be identified as wife of the Viceroy Huy, and possibly mother of the Chief of Bowmen, Khaemwaset [129].

Khaemwaset was certainly a relative of the Viceroy Huy 1, Paser 1 and Amenemopet, and in the reign of Ramesses II a similar situation occurred, when cousins of the Viceroy Paser 2 held the office for three generations. A close connection between one \textit{hry pdt} and the palace is recorded in the "Harim Conspiracy Papyrus" [130]. The "great criminal Binemwese (Bin-*Wbst) formerly Captain of Archers in Nubia" [131] had received a letter from his sister, who was in the harim, telling him: "Incite the people to hostility! And you come to begin hostility against your lord". The true identity of this \textit{hry pdt} is unknown, unless he is the official who added the \textit{ex voto} to Buhen ST 15 beneath the band of cartouches of Ramesses III [132].

The Harim Papyrus emphasises the close connections between the palace and the senior officials of the viceregal administration, and the inherent dangers. Although such palace intrigues are well-attested in other ancient Near Eastern monarchies, the Turin Papyrus is an almost unique record from Egypt, and it remains impossible to judge how unusual an event this was. The involvement of this senior member of the Nubian militia in palace politics was due as much to his personal, as official, connections, but indicates just how close the family connections between these officials and the palace was.

The Overseers of Southern Foreign Lands.

The "Overseers of Southern Foreign Lands" included the Viceroy and the Overseer of Bowmen of Kush. The title is usual for Viceroys, but has generally been regarded as little more than a variant upon
"King's son of Kush". That it was, however, a more specific, and meaningful, appellation is indicated by the other holders. It is not attested for any of the princes of Lower Nubia, but only for officials who had some jurisdiction over Upper Nubia. Therefore its connection with Nubia must have been specific. "Overseer of Foreign Lands" and the variant "Overseer of Northern Foreign Lands", is a title held by officials at Zawiyat Umm el Rakham [133], the westernmost of the Libyan frontier fortresses, and at Beth Shan [134] and Megiddo [135]. The most plausible explanation is that "Overseers of Foreign Lands" were those officials responsible for the frontier zones: in Nubia these included the Viceroy as chief of the administration of the Egyptian dominions in Nubia, the Overseer of Bowmen, as chief of the militia, and, almost certainly, various of the Upper Nubian Princes as rulers of the Marches [below].

The idnw.

Originally designated simply idnw or idnw n s3 nsw, these offices were later specified geographically as idnw n K3s and idnw n W3w3t. From the later 18th Dynasty onwards they appear to have been resident in the two chief centres: at Aniba in Lower Nubia, and at Soleb, later at Amara, in Upper Nubia [136].

The idnw appear to have been drawn from the hierarchy within Nubia and not appointed from Egypt. The best-attested holder of the office, Amenemopet, worked entirely within the Kushite administration: beginning as a letter-writer to Merymose, he was advanced to be Comptroller of works for Dhutmose, and ended his career as idnw of Kush under Huy. Amenemopet left the record of advancement at the temple of Ellesiya near Aniba, and he may have belonged to the elite of that town [137]. His ultimate position saw him in control of Upper Nubia, and it was in the administrative capital at Soleb that he was buried [138]. Pennut, idnw of Wawat in the reign of Ramesses VI, was the son of an earlier idnw, although there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate he was descended from Pennut who served as idnw of Wawat under Ay [139]. Pennut's
relatives held a number of priestly and scribal offices, and
certainly constituted the most important family in Miam in the 20th
Dynasty.

The Indigenous elites.

Older literature suggested that the administration comprised largely
Egyptian "colonials", and, with the exception of the local princes,
indigenous elites were of little significance [140].

The princedoms of Lower Nubia are well-attested and the case for
local princes in the 3rd–4th Cataract region has been argued above
[141]. Egyptianisation of the Kushite elite in Wawat was rapid from
the reign of Thutmose I onwards, its effects appearing particularly
clearly during the co-regency of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. The
local princes adopted Egyptian names, they and their relatives worked
within the viceregal administration, and were buried in Egyptian
style tombs. They received Egyptian funerary objects and their
statues were the product of the royal workshops in Nubia [142]. The
Aniba cemetery similarly demonstrates the numbers and ranks of
Nubians within the administration.

Four sons of the prince of Irem were sent to Egypt along with the
b3kw of year 34. This may be part of the Egyptianisation policy,
although O'Connor [143] argues that they were prisoners of war from a
campaign in the central Sudan.

Kushite princes were accorded high honours at the Egyptian court,
demonstrated by the burial of one such, Maiherpri, in KV 36 [144].
His burial furniture carries only the titles šrd n k3p and t3y hw hr
wmmy nswt; both exalted ranks but not offices. His age at death,
estimated as about 20 years, suggests that he was a foreign prince
who had not yet been given any specific office. That he was a
Kushite (perhaps Medja) is certain from his mummy and funerary
papyrus. He was probably a contemporary of Thutmose IV [145].
Whilst it is self-evident that not all nobles with the title hr3 n k3p were sons of foreign rulers, the k3p was where such msrw wrw would have been educated. Heqa-nefer carries the title hr3 n k3p along with such 'honourifics' as "King's sandal-maker" and "Bearer of the folding chair of the Lord of the Two Lands". Frandsen [146] has already argued that the Kushite youths were educated to be members of the ruling class within Egypt as well as in Nubia. He suggests that names compounded with bik3, as Heqa-nefer, were, in fact, such Kushites [147]. It should be noted that others [148] have regarded such bik3-names as more generally indicative of foreigners, Asiatics as well as Kushites [149].

Using titles and names such as this, it might be possible to identify some of the princes of Upper Nubia. Dewachter [150] discussed the monuments of (Pa)-Heqa-em-sasen, attested by a statue discovered at Gebel Barkal, a double inscription at Tumbos, funerary cones and a double-statue from Thebes. The statue and cones indicate that Heqa-em-sasen had a tomb at Thebes, but his titles that he had authority in Upper Nubia. He was r-p3 h3ty-c and t3y lw hr wmy nswt, denoting his high rank, and also mr rwyit "Director of the Antechamber" which emphasises his relationship with the king (Amenhotep II). He was also an "Overseer of Southern Foreign Lands", a title which, allied with the large inscription at Tumbos, suggests he may have been a prince from the Kerma-Kawa region. A second "Overseer of Southern Foreign Lands", Khay, may also have been a Kushite prince. Known by a relief from Kawa Temple A second court [151] dated to the reign Tutankhamun, he carried the additional titles hr3 n k3p and t3y lw hr wmy nswt, but no specific office. There is no evidence to indicate whether Heqa-ro-neheh and Heqa-reshu were of Kushite or Asiatic origin [152].

Apart from the princes given court titles, other members of the Kushite elite were quite probably employed in Egypt itself, although it is difficult to identify them. The common name Panehesy can hardly be used as a criterion, especially as many so-named are demonstrably Egyptian [153]. That the activities of the Kushite
princes were not confined to the Nubian valley is demonstrated by the rock inscriptions of Heqa-nefer in the Wadi Barramiya, some 88 kms east of Edfu [154] and the recently noted inscriptions on the road east of Buhen [155].

Whilst the importance of the Kushite elite is clearly demonstrable, there is considerable dispute as to whether Kushite women were married to the Pharaoh [156]. There is abundant evidence for Egyptian kings marrying Mitannian, Babylonian, Syrian or Hittite princesses, but this is due largely to the survival of unusual source materials in the form of the Amarna letters and the Marriage stela of Ramesses II and its related Hittite correspondence [157]. We accept without demur that the male children of foreign princes were brought up at the Egyptian court as hr dw n k3p yet, seem reticent to believe that the Pharaoh married Kushite women. To say that the Egyptians did not marry Kushites is to impose upon them an attitude for which there is no evidence. However, knowledge of the origins of royal wives is extremely limited. Whilst the king, for political reasons, may have avoided choosing a foreign princess as hmt nsw wrt, it is hardly likely that such unions were always childless. The greater number of 18th Dynasty kings were sons of 'minor' wives, and the accession was probably sometimes disputed. It cannot certainly be said that there was no foreign blood, Asiatic or Kushite, in the royal family.

Without direct evidence, it is, of course, impossible to establish that Kushite princesses were married to Egyptian rulers. Schulman [158] points out the possibility that a daughter of the chief of Irem was sent as wife to Thutmose III. The scene in the tomb of Huy [159] showing the arrival of the ms w wrw from Kush, includes two princesses, who might be destined for the harim, but again, this has been disputed [160]. Diplomatic marriages often sealed treaties, particularly after military campaigns. It is quite possible, therefore, that, certainly in the early 18th dynasty, such marriages were negotiated between the pharaohs and Kushite princesses.
Lower down the social scale, there is evidence for marriage between Egyptians and Kushites [161], as well as Asiatics: although it is always possible that these were contracted whilst a man was absent from Egypt.

The elite of New Kingdom Nubia.

The elite of New Kingdom Nubia was part of the Egyptian system by education, employment and by culture. If the indigenous elites played a significant role in the administration of the country, this raises questions about what happened with withdrawal of Viceregal system. It has often been assumed that members of the elite went to Egypt, but how would they have been absorbed into the Egyptian administration? The late New Kingdom was a time when the Egyptian elite families were increasingly pressing their hereditary claims to offices. There has been no attempt to examine Nubia in the light of other post-imperial societies and ask, how do elites respond to the end of imperial rule?

There was periodic opposition to Egyptian rule by indigenous power-holders, primarily in Upper Nubia (or the Berber-Shendi reach), but also, in the reign of Merneptah, apparently in Lower Nubia too. The removal of Egyptian military power may have led the local elites to re-assert their own positions.
Exploiting Nubia? the economy.

As with so many aspects of its society and culture, the economy of pharaonic Egypt has remained firmly within the sphere of Egyptologists. Until recently study of the economy has been very largely confined to editions of, and commentaries on, economic texts. Whilst these are of fundamental importance, the view of the economy presented in more general Egyptological literature, as Janssen [1] observes, "largely consists of vague and unfounded theories, based on too little evidence, or actually deals with technology rather than economy proper". General studies of the ancient economy have, necessarily, relied on Egyptological opinion, and, perforce, such fundamental works as Max Weber's *Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum* [2] and F.M. Heichelheim's (1958-1970) *An Ancient economic history* are, for Egypt, almost useless. Although the works of Karl Polanyi [3] have little specific to say about Egypt, as with most discussions of the ancient economy it is his influence which is now most pervasive, albeit increasingly revised [4]. Polanyi's theories, derived from his personal political convictions, were enormously influential, notably in Assyriology and studies of the Greek and Roman economy. Polanyi's emphasis on the social aspects and uses of economic features have not been without influence in Egyptology either, the most significant result being Siegfried Morenz's *Prestige-Wirtschaft*. In more recent years Polanyi's work has been the focus of an extensive and considered critique, notably by Zaccagnini and Liverani [5]. For Egyptology, Janssen's fundamental (1975a) study remedied the lack of analytical writing at a broader level (as opposed to the detailed discussions of specific phenomena found in the texts) but the Egyptian economy in the Pharaonic period [6], unlike that of the rest of the ancient world [7], remains a rather neglected subject.

An extensive collection of documents relevant to the study of the economy was published by Helck [8]. Recently some of the most important economic terms, *inw* and *b3kw* have become the focus of
discussion, by Bleiberg [9], Muller-Wollermer [10], and Boochs [11]. Specific features, such as land tenure in [12] have also been treated in some detail.

For Nubia contemporary with the Old, Middle and New Kingdoms, commentaries have focussed largely on the political implications [13], and on the individual commodities [14], rather than broader considerations of the economic structure. The most general assumption has been of an active, progressive, centre - Egypt - exploiting a passive and backward periphery - Nubia. A Eurocentric evolutionist interpretation dropped in studies of other premodern economies, this view has been largely rejected by Trigger [15], Kemp [16] and Frandsen [17] who all argue that a redistributive economy was of greater importance in New Kingdom Nubia than had been previously acknowledged.

There has been no major attempt at analysing the rather scanty evidence for the economy of the early Kushite period (Kurru Kingdom-25th Dynasty-Napatan period), and the economic base which enabled the expansion of Kushite power remains elusive [18].

The evidence for the later, Meroitic, phases has been treated more synthetically, and there are discussions of the economy by Endesfelder [19] and, based largely on the archaeological evidence, by Adams [20], and evaluating the written sources, by Török [21]. Trigger [22] discusses the material from Christian Nubia. Studies of one economic feature, trade, have been written by Shinnie [23], focussing on the Mediaeval period, and, much more detailed, by Walz, for the period AD 1700-1820 [24].

Whilst, as for Egypt, it is necessary to examine the economy in different periods, a number of factors, such as ecology, have remained fairly constant. Most writers, indeed, have noted considerable continuity in economic features through different phases. This has, in part, doubtless been aided by the lack of a monetary economy in Nubia, even in late phases.
Our knowledge of the economy of Nubia in pre-New Kingdom times is extremely limited, and it is thus difficult to assess the impact that the viceregal administration had, for example, on the ownership of land. A number of important questions pose themselves for which no answering evidence survives; nevertheless, enquiries into the economy cannot be divorced from the broader context. For example, Janssen [25] rightly stresses the connection between the economy and historical events, something inadequately considered in Egyptological history writing, although difficult to illustrate. The importance of Nubia to the Egyptian economy is well-recognised, in terms of 'luxury' commodities, but this has led to the view that the New Kingdom pharaohs simply plundered Nubia. Literature has little to say, beyond the the most generalised statements, of the use made of these 'luxuries', and hence their economic and social importance. As already argued this is an overly simplistic interpretation: the economy of Nubia, and Egypt's attitude towards the country, was far more complex. That the Egyptian and Nubian economies were integrated under the viceregal administration has already been stressed by Frandsen [26]; the ways in which this actually worked on a number of different levels are discussed below.

Geography and ecology.

The riverine lands of Egypt and Nubia as far as the Fourth Cataract were largely dependent upon agriculture made possible by irrigation and the annual inundation: there are, however, major differences between the two countries which have considerably affected their demography, agricultural production, social stratification and political make-up. The central Sudan is again a different ecological category, in ancient times a savanna land, and this will have had a similarly strong influence on all facets of its society, as David Edwards has recently argued [27].

Janssen [28] emphasises the need to establish the nature and extent of agricultural production as a basis for understanding the economy. Indications of such agricultural potential can be found in
the detailed writings of Burckhardt and other European visitors of
the 19th century AD. Whilst these cannot be simply projected back
onto the past, the archaeological material, as analysed in Trigger's
fundamental (1965) study, shows that the same areas have been
important throughout much of Nubia's history. Trigger [29] notes
that the changing course of the Nile has created broader flood plains
in some areas at different times, but also that these movements have
been much more limited than in Egypt.

Nubia differs from Egypt in a number of respects: the flood-plain
is less broad due to the high banks and narrower valley, and
therefore cultivation is pocketed at the mouths of wadis, or bends in
the river. Agriculturally productive land was always much more
limited than in the broad flood plain of Egypt [30], there probably
being only one or two fields-width between the river and desert, as
suggested by the Pennut donation text [31] and the example of Wadi
el-Sebua [32]. Amelia Edwards [33] observed that for the most part
of the way between Philae and Wady Halfa, the cultivable strip
averaged from six to sixty yards. This would have necessitated a
rather spread-out settlement pattern, and even if the land was
intensively cultivated must have been of limited agricultural
potential. It is often claimed that it was the introduction of the
saqia which revolutionised agriculture permitting the 'Meroitic
Renaissance' [34].

Trigger [35] identifies the three most productive agricultural
regions of Lower Nubia as Koshtamna-Qurta, Derr-Arminna and Abu
Simbel to the 2nd Cataract. The three indigenous princedoms of the
New Kingdom seem to have conformed to these areas [36]. Of the
three, the most productive, in Christian times, was the central Derr-
Toshka region, which had Aniba at its heart [37].

Both political and ecological changes have affected the wealth of
some regions: Burckhardt [38] observed that although the plain of
Gyrshe (Gerf Hussein) was broader than any he had seen south of
Aswan, it was poorly inhabited, and most of the houses abandoned due
to ravaging by the Mamelukes as they retreated before the Turkish troops of Mohammed Ali. Burckhardt found that the richest region was Shalub Batta, where, Trigger [39] suggests, the Nile had moved, creating a broad flood plain. There are no Early or Middle Nubian sites, at Shalub Batta, but these are especially numerous at Gerf Hussein. Such changes were relatively rare, and Trigger has amply demonstrated the continuity throughout the Nubian phases.

Knowledge of the archaeology of Upper Nubia is much more limited than that of Lower Nubia, only the Dal-Amara reach having been surveyed intensively [40]. The excavation of some large New Kingdom sites, and fragmentary evidence from others, has given the impression of Egyptian domination and colonisation as far as the 4th Cataract already criticised above. As argued there, the nature of the settlement may have been very different.

The region south of the 2nd Cataract is barren, but the Abri-Delgo Reach fertile. Burckhardt [41] found the region was the most populous south of Ibrim. The island of Sai he found well-cultivated on its eastern side, where the principal branch of the stream ran, and thick groves of date-trees, from Sai to Sesebi, produced fruit which were considered the best along the whole length of the Nile. Kemp [42] argued that the Egyptians over-estimated the agricultural potential of this region, a view contested above. The Dongola Reach, although more fertile than the Abri-Delgo Reach, indeed the most fertile area south of Silsila, requires irrigation of the basins for high arable production: its potential wealth is thus of a different nature and Kemp [43] has argued, very plausibly, that the Kerma-Letti basin was given over to cattle grazing. The stela of Thutmose II seems to indicate that the Egyptian garrison at Tumbos or Sai had grazed cattle in the Kushite territory farther south [44].

Outside of the valley itself, the deserts may have been more important than has been previously considered. Burckhardt noted the possibilities for grazing in some of the Wadis, and places where water could be acquired [45]. Even slightly wetter conditions in
antiquity may have considerably altered the potential for pasturing, and eased travel. It is certain that the desert roads were being used in the Old Kingdom, and without camels this must imply a considerably less hostile environment. There is some evidence that parts of Nubia, possibly both the valley and the wadis, were more densely wooded in the Old Kingdom [46].

Recent work in the Wadi Hawar has found archaeological evidence from many phases, and indicating strong connections with the Nile valley cultures [47]. Similarly, survey and excavation in the Eastern Desert and the Eastern Sudan have demonstrated the wide-range of the Pan Grave assemblages, and raise many questions about the seasonal movements of populations, and connections between different regions [48]. Altogether, the new material forces a reconsideration of our perceptions of Nubian cultures and their geographical range.

From fortress to temple-town: the development of 'urbanism'.

Trigger [49] comments that "the geography of Nubia is hostile to the spontaneous emergence of urban centres which give the society an organic unit in the Durkheimian sense. The natural tendency is for the farming population to disperse itself along the river in order to exploit what land is available". Although ecology is the major factor, there are further determinants of settlement pattern, categorised and discussed by Trigger [50].

The building activities during the early phases of Egyptian expansion into Nubia were concerned primarily with the consolidation and renewal of the fortresses at the 2nd Cataract. With expansion into the region to the south, new fortress were constructed; that on Sai dates perhaps to the reign of Ahmose or Amenhotep I [51], and there was a fortress near Tumbos by the reign of Thutmose I. The 3rd Cataract remained the southern frontier until a fortress, near Barkal, was built in the time of Thutmose III.
In the co-reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III there was much building work throughout Lower Nubia, but relatively small-scale, and within the fortresses. The earliest works outside of the fortresses were the speoi at Ibrim [52], one dating from the co-reign, and the rock-cut chapel at Ellesiya [53]. All three are within the district of Aniba and doubtless had a cultic and economic relationship to the main temple there. Only one chapel, at Gebel Dosha [54], is so-far known outside the fortresses in Upper Nubia and the evidence is slender for supposing that the building programme in the Abri-Delgo Reach dates back to this period [55]. Thutmose III's fortress of Sm3-h3swt at the 4th Cataract contained a chapel dedicated to Amun, but there is no evidence that there was building activity by the king at Gebel Barkal itself, despite the significance accorded the site in the king's stela actually discovered there [56] and a second stela [57].

The short co-regency of Thutmose III and Amenhotep II [58] saw the construction of the temple at Amada, altered by Thutmose IV [59]. There is little other work attributable to this period of the 18th Dynasty, which is remarkable, since it was apparently peaceful and prosperous, and perhaps as long as sixty years [60]. It is quite likely that many of the features of kingship ideology, and the phenomena which derive from them, were being developed at this time, and possibly the plans for the temple-town of Soleb were being made, even if work was not begun. The viceregal bureaucracy now appears in its full form [61], and this centralization of the administration is probably directly related to the new building policy which begins in the reign of Amenhotep III.

Lower Nubia was almost certainly re-organised along the Egyptian pattern of land distribution, although when and how this was achieved is impossible to determine; whether as a gradual development over a longer period, or a single decisive action. Estates must have been granted to the new religious foundations and administrative offices. The few extant documents relating to land-holdings in Lower Nubia are of 19th- and 20th-dynasty date, but reveal a situation closely
corresponding to that of Egypt. In Upper Nubia the land redistribution possibly developed alongside increasing Egyptian interest in the region.

Administratively, Nubia was not divided into nomoi: in Egypt this ancient division had been replaced in the 12th Dynasty and New Kingdom Nubia was administered according to the dual system current in Egypt [62]. Torok proposed that the 25th Dynasty imposed a nome-system on Upper Nubia [63], although references to nomoi in the Kawa texts may be an archaism of language rather than an indicator of an administrative system. Similarly, the Meroitic nomoi listed at Philae, although interpreted as administrative districts [64], cannot be more than a list of important towns [65]. The New Kingdom administration divided Nubia into two civil regions, Wawat and Kush, with perhaps a frontier zone under control of the militia and local rulers. The cities were governed by h3ty-3-mayors, and the office of Overseer of the towns of Kush [66] is also known.

In Upper Nubia Amenhotep III established a new temple and town which became the major administrative centre for the region until the early 19th Dynasty: this was at Soleb, and called after the king's Horus name H3-m3³t. The date of the town's foundation is not so far known, but a jar label from Sesebi records wine of the "House of Nb-3³t-R³ in H3-m3³t" dated to year 7 of Amenhotep III [67]. The temple of Soleb was one of the major works of the reign of Amenhotep III and in many ways resembles his two major Theban monuments, the temple of Luxor and the "mortuary" temple (Kom el-Heitan), and probably also the temple in Memphis. Indeed, it belongs to a scheme of building work in which the king emphasised particular aspects of his divine nature [68].

A second town built by Amenhotep III in the Abri-Delgo Reach, at Sedeinga, had as its centre a temple dedicated to Queen Tiye associated with the goddesses Hathor, Tefnut, Isis and Weret-Hekau. She was called "Mistress of Foreign Lands", thereby forming a counterpart to the king's role as "Lord of Nubia". Unfortunately our
knowledge of Sedeinga is presently even less than that of Soleb, although the cultic relationship between the two temples was clearly very close [69]. Nothing of the settlements at these two sites has yet been uncovered.

The expansion within the Abri-Delgo Reach was perhaps motivated by a number of practical factors: this part of Upper Nubia was now no longer considered hostile, was reasonably fertile, and was within a gold-producing region. Whether it was also the accomodate an expanding population from Egypt remains questionable. Having made a decision to absorb this area the Egyptians may have needed settlements which would establish an integrated local economy, something a fortress did not do. With the expansion of the Lower Nubian system, land may have been needed to settle, if not Egyptians, Nubians or Egypto-Nubians. The continued building works within the region suggest political, rather than agricultural, factors were the motivation for its development [70]. An ideological motive for the building of the new towns is, however, also apparent. The main administrative centre of Sai was associated with the cult of Horus "the Bull, Lord of Nubia". Amenhotep III developed and personalized this cult, the whole temple and town functioning as one of the "Houses of millions of years" built at various towns throughout Egypt, and which played an increasingly important role from the late 18th Dynasty to the 20th. This can been seen as a parallel to the situation of peripheries in the Neo-Assyrian Empire, discussed by Liverani [71]; with the duty of the virtuous king to extend cosmic order, irrigate arid land and build towns. The cultic emphases and associations with rebirth in the Nubian temples might go some way to supporting this interpretation [see Chapter 6].

The fortress of Sai, which was still occupied in the 19th Dynasty [72], was superseded as the Upper Nubian administrative centre by Soleb. However, Sai doubtless retained, as many Lower Nubian towns and fortresses did, an important role as a staging post and population centre.
The establishment of vineyards at Soleb indicates that the programme initiated included intensive and long-term agricultural planning. It is from this time also that manufactured goods appear in the b3kw of Kush, indicating that the towns were also functioning as production centres, largely for objects made from the 'luxury' materials, or specifically Kushite products such as leather or giraffe-hide.

Akhenaten continued the development of the Abri-Delgo region with the construction of a large walled town at Sesebi, over half the area of which was taken up by the temple precinct. Founded early in the reign, Sesebi was connected by road with Soleb [73] where Akhenaten had the decoration of his father's temple completed.

With the accession of Tutankhamun the focus of attention, at least in terms of major monumental work, seems to have moved to Lower Nubia, with the building of a new temple-town and administrative centre for Wawat at Faras (called after the king's Golden Horus name Sḥtp-ntrw) [74]. However, this does not mean that there was a decrease in activity in Upper Nubia. Soleb was retained as the major administrative centre and some minor work continued in the temple [75]. This could be an example of the "devotion" displayed by Tutankhamun to Amenhotep III allied with the desire to build his own monument promoting the royal cult within Lower Nubia, and with the practical advantage of maintaining Soleb, conveniently situated and splendidly endowed, as the Upper Nubian centre. The role of Kawa is unclear, since it has been only partly excavated, but there are no good grounds for seeing it as a major viceregal centre.

Faras, was the first new town in Wawat to have a large temple dedicated to the royal cult at its centre. It is possible that Tutankhamun was building Faras as a Lower Nubian parallel to Soleb. Faras was a large temple, whereas the only known building of Tutankhamun in Upper Nubia is the relatively small Temple A at Kawa [76]. The royal cult in Lower Nubia had previously been promoted through those of Horus and Senusret I and III: the cult of
Tutankhamun at Faras established the more direct personalised royal cult of the later 18th Dynasty using the king's throne name ḫfrw-RE. A practical advantage of the site was its position at the centre of a region of agriculturally productive land. Buhen, at the foot of the Cataract, was part of the fortress network, and remained important in communications and river transport, but was less advantageously situated for the requirements of the late 18th Dynasty. The central region of Lower Nubia already had Aniba at its centre; it would have been impractical to have replaced a large town and fortress, administrative capital and cult centre which was centrally positioned for its agricultural block and for the whole of Lower Nubia. The evidence from Buhen indicates that it was not a major centre during the Tutankhamun-Horemheb period [77], although it doubtless remained important in the communication and transportation network. Faras retained its importance until the reign of Sety I, its temple apparently completed and dedicated by Horemheb [78].

Kawa, the most southerly of the New Kingdom Egyptian towns so-far identified (excepting the frontier fortress at Napata), has been only partially excavated, and consequently the extent and nature of the New Kingdom levels are, as yet, unknown [79]. The earliest dated remains are of the reign of Amenhotep III, but these are small-scale and could be later introductions [80]. The ancient name, Gem-Aten, suggests the later years of the reign of Amenhotep III or that of Akhenaten as the time of its foundation [81]. The complete rebuilding of the temple by Taharqo may have replaced an 18th Dynasty structure [82], but the earliest standing monument is the small temple of Tutankhamun. A mayor (Mty-) of Kawa is attested under Tutankhamun [83], but the status of the town within the Viceregal domain remains uncertain.

Kawa's position, in the Dongola Reach, and at the southern end of the Kerma, would, if it were indeed an Egyptian 'colonial' settlement, require reconsideration of the models of settlement and political geography proposed above. Kawa stands at one end of the Meheila Road leading to Napata, and this position, emphasised by
Adams [84], provided one explanation for the presence of the town so far to the south of the other major centres [85].

An alternative may be suggested: that Kawa was actually the seat of one of the Egyptianised Kushite princedoms, and that the Tutankhamun temple is actually a parallel to the temples and the royal statue-cults found at Beth-Shan and other centres in Syria-Palestine. If, as here postulated, the Egyptians left the acquisition of Sudanese commodities in the hands of the Kushite princes, Kawa may well have served as a depot, its rulers receiving the fullest support of the administration. The role of Kerma, close to Kawa, and the extensive employment of Egyptian craftsmen there, provides a striking earlier parallel. Kerma itself may have remained the centre of a princedom and there is an increasing quantity of New Kingdom evidence from the site [86].

Until the early 19th Dynasty, Soleb remained the most important viceregal town in Upper Nubia, although no significant building work was undertaken. There are some indications that Horemheb commenced the earlier part of B500 at Gebel Barkal [87].

Adams [88] and others [89], following Firth [90], have proposed that after the expansion of Egyptian power in Nubia in the early 18th Dynasty there was a rapid recession, and because of hydraulic crisis a decline in the population, throughout the later-18th and 19th Dynasties [91]. The apparent disappearance of a large proportion of the indigenous population in the 18th Dynasty, suggested to have been retreating into Upper Nubia, may in fact be due to a rapid acculturation [92], and a reorganisation of the agrarian economy around the Egyptian "towns" rather than the scattered settlement prevalent before. The considerable evidence available from the New Kingdom, and continuing well into the 20th Dynasty, suggests that contrary to a rapid recession, Nubia under the Egyptian Viceregal administration maintained an at least moderate prosperity. It should be remembered that throughout history Lower Nubia has, agriculturally, never been much more than a subsistence economy.
The brief reign of Ramesses I is marked by restorations and endowments in the fortresses of the 2nd Cataract. Two stelae from the North Temple at Buhen, actually dedicated by Sety I, record Ramesses I's benefactions to the cult of Min-Amun [93]. Fragments of another dedicatory stela were found in the South Temple [94]. This marks the beginning of a renewed importance of Buhen, and belonged to a wider programme of activity in the fortresses at the foot of the Cataract, as can be inferred from further excavated fragments from Dabnarti and Mirgissa [95]. A column base from Dorginarti must have been transferred there later as this site is now recognised as Late Period [96]. There is nothing which suggests a major defensive programme, and Buhen seems to have developed as a walled town comparable to Aniba, the military being replaced by civil officials.

Sety I founded new temple-towns at Amara West (if this had not been begun by Horemheb) in Upper Nubia, and at Aksha in Lower Nubia. It is significant that these are close to Soleb and Faras respectively, indicating that the areas were controlled in much the same way, and also that the foundation of these new towns was an ideologically, rather than politically or economically, motivated change. The land holdings of the Soleb and Faras institutions and officials were probably transferred largely, if not entirely, to the successors at Amara and Aksha.

Amenhotep III had built at Soleb and at es-Sebua, but these do not in any way seem to have been equal foundations. Nor is there any evidence that Faras and Kawa constituted a pair. However, with the reign of Sety I it is clearly Aksha and Amara which serve as parallel administrative centres for Lower and Upper Nubia, each with a temple for the royal cult. The two foundations are roughly similar in size, and both considerably smaller than Soleb or Sesebi.

The Nauri decree of year 4 of Sety I presents a number of problems of interpretation [97]. Whether it records land and property owned by an Egyptian or Nubian foundation of the king is considered further below [98]. What is clear, however, is that the varied and probably
intensive agricultural system initiated by Amenhotep III in the Abri-Delgo reach continued during the early-19th Dynasty. Indeed, when Soleb ceased to be used as a major centre, the estates would have been transferred to the new foundations and restorations of Sety I at Amara and Sesebi, as happened with the estates of the Houses of Millions of Years within Egypt. There is a possibility that the Nauri decree refers to Sesebi as a renewed foundation of Sety I [99], or possibly even, to the earliest buildings at Amara West [100].

Building activities during the reign were extensive and continuous, and there can be no real justification for the view that Nubia "had become a sort of no man's land ruled by the gods and peopled by the ghosts of the dead" [101]. The earliest works were the temple of Beit el-Wali [102], begun during the co-regency, and the completion of the towns of Amara West [103] and Aksha [104], and of the temple at Gebel Barkal [105]. Abu Simbel was commenced early in Ramesses II's sole reign, and completed, probably by year 25 [106]. Spalinger [107] proposes that Derr belongs to late in the second decade, since an inscription published by Habachi [108] uses the early form of the royal name, suggesting that the temple may have been begun before, although decorated after, the name change around year 18. Derr is more usually considered the latest of the temples, and the cultic associations would seem to support this [109]. The middle years of the reign saw the construction of the temples of Wadi es-Sebua [110] and Gerf Hussein [111].

Wadi es-Sebua, Gerf Hussein and ed-Derr, were attached to the pr-domains of Amun, Ptah and Re, although whether these domains are to be identified with the major Egyptian centres of Thebes, Memphis and Heliopolis, is far from clear [112]. At some, as yet unknown point, in the 19th or 20th Dynasty, Amara was apparently renamed Ḥmt W3st [113], the name also of the Ramesseum to which it may have had some spiritual relationship.

The Ramesside temples have been treated as something of a problem, since they have been viewed against a background of supposedly
dwindling population, or even a deserted land. Habachi [114] noted their positions as staging posts relative to river travel, and Kemp [115] has examined the available evidence for them as centres of settled, albeit small, population. Rather than regarding the temple-building as some sort of bizarre anomaly, its causes may be found in the religious developments of the period, amply paralleled in Egypt itself.

Although a decline in the number of burials has often been noted, later New Kingdom material from Lower Nubia is plentiful; but it is frequently difficult to date 19th and 20th Dynasty officials precisely without detailed prosopographical information, and attached royal names.

Ramesses III inaugurated a vast building programme in Egypt, and established at least one new temple in Nubia also [116]. Although there are no surviving monuments on the scale of Ramesses II's temples, a number of smaller works attest royal dedications and constructions throughout Nubia [117]. At Buhen, bands of cartouches were added around the shafts of columns in the South Temple [118] and there were additions to the temple at Semna [119]. Elsewhere, votive inscriptions record the minor works carried out by the royal officials [120]. In Egypt itself, the chief Nubian deities head the procession of Upper Egyptian gods on the roof terrace at Medinet Habu [121], indicating that Nubia was viewed as an extension of Egypt itself.

Although Egypt under the rule of the heirs of Ramesses III's is usually portrayed as a monarchy in decline [122], the evidence of economic problems may have been overestimated [123] and Egypt's influence abroad may not have declined until after the reign of Ramesses VI [124]. The dedication of royal statues, some specifically cult-images, with all that that implies, continued in both Nubian [125] and Asiatic [126] dominions until the time of Ramesses VI.
The major centres of Aniba and Buhen have yielded a large number of 20th-dynasty private monuments, as well as some minor royal works. Aniba continued to be the major Lower Nubian town until the end of the 20th Dynasty, the Viceroy Panehesy being buried there in the reign of Ramesses XI. Statuary of 20th-dynasty date (and earlier New Kingdom material) has found at Qasr Ibrim, opposite Aniba, on the east bank of the Nile, but was almost certainly taken there at a later date. Although rock-cut chapels had been carved in the hill during the New Kingdom, there is, so-far, no evidence that Qasr Ibrim was fortified during the 18th or 19th Dynasties [128].

Evidence from Upper Nubia is, as for the whole of the New Kingdom, far more difficult to identify, due to a lack of excavation, or publication, of the major sites. Amara was certainly in constant occupation, and functioned as the administrative centre for Upper Nubia, throughout the dynasty until the reign of Ramesses IX [130]. Inscriptions of Ramessesnakht, Viceroy of Ramesses VI, were carved on the columns of the Temple A at Kawa [131], hence a degree of Viceregal control at that time can be inferred. A statue of an official named Bekenwer [132], dated to the reign of Ramesses IX was discovered at Gebel Barkal, but this statue was probably taken there at a later date, perhaps from Amara. At Amara itself, an inscription in the temple is dated to year 6 of Ramesses IX [133].

There is no substantial evidence that the Egyptian dominions in Nubia went into a slow decline beginning in the 18th Dynasty. On the contrary, the collapse of the administration is a phenomenon which can be dated, quite closely, to the latter years of the 20th dynasty.

The nature of 'urbanism' and 'colonial' settlement in Nubia.

It is almost impossible to establish whether Nubia had a constant or expanding population during the New Kingdom, or whether, as more often argued, declining. Yet this is important to the question of Egyptian colonisation of the Abri-Delgo Reach. Was this settlement to provide land for an expanding Egyptian population in the later
18th Dynasty? The model of settlement advocated here would actually discount this, believing that it is more likely to be have been peopled by indigenous Kushites than large numbers of transplanted Egyptians.

Kemp [134], discussing the postulated decline in population in the 18th Dynasty, suggested the possibility of demographic revision in which the population was "attracted" to the "urban centres". This might reflect a policy by the administration of moving the people in order to re-organise the land, and whilst Kemp's idea of demographic revision may account for the 'population decline' advocated by earlier scholars, there must have been small settlements throughout the cultivable area due to the intensely linear distribution of the agriculturally productive land.

The nature of the 'urban' centres themselves must also be considered [135]. In Nubia, as very largely in Egypt, these were limited in number and functioned as elite residential, administrative and cult centres, rather than - as in Western Asia and Mesopotamia - as residential centres for the agricultural workers. Some of them also served as production centres, and would consequently have had artisan populations, although much of this production would have been for the state and elite and not for 'sale' to the people cultivating the land. Other centres would have had a role as depots for the supply of the military installations. The system of temple-town economies proposed by Trigger [136], Kemp [137] and Frandsen [138], and advocated here remains largely unsubstantiated. It does, however, provide a model for the integration of the towns and hinterland, and also for the acculturation of the indigenous population. The 'towns' were thus largely centres of consumption, if not-quite Weber's "parasitic city" [139].

The population of Nubia in the pre-New Kingdom phases had doubtless been spread thinly throughout the cultivable land. While it seems likely that a specialised form of 'urbanism' did develop in Nubia during the New Kingdom, it is likely that much of the agrarian
population continued to live in smaller settlements, the very nature of the valley dictated this.

'Acculturation' has been suggested for what earlier archaeologists saw as the 'disappearance' of the indigenous population in the New Kingdom. In the case of the elites, there is ample evidence for their adoption of Egyptian names, styles of dress, and burial practices [140], but the evidence for other strata is less clear. With the imposition of a redistributive economy the products which were handed out, and therefore the objects recovered, would have been typically Egyptian in style. It remains difficult to assess to what extent the basic features of indigenous cultures may have survived, masked by Egyptian material culture. The Scandanavian Joint Expedition found graves of relatively late New Kingdom date which continued typical Nubian burial traditions but contained entirely Egyptian objects [141].

Whilst the evidence for an expanding population in Egypt, and the consequent settlement of Egyptians in Nubia is inconclusive, there are indications that there was a state controlled manipulation of the Nubian population. Forcible removal of people out of Nubia, and settlement of foreigners in the country, is indicated by some texts: but it is impossible to assess the frequency, and numbers involved, and consequently the total impact of such actions. These transplantations, as paralleled in other ancient societies [142] are usually associated with military action, but at least suggests that the Egyptians were not averse to a forcible movement of population if they had cause.

An Abu Simbel text [143] states that king removed Nubians to the north, Asiatics to the south, Shasu to the west and Libyans to the hilltops. Spalinger [144] takes this as an historical record, although it is clearly also an inversion of the world, and like similar texts should be treated with a degree of circumspection. Ward [145] is sceptical of most texts of this date which might be construed as evidence for mass deportation. There were undoubtedly
large numbers of foreigners in Egypt itself in the late New Kingdom [146], and there is some evidence that people, especially those considered "rebellious", might be moved. More direct evidence can be found from the el-Sebua inscription of Ramose [147] which reports that in year 44 of Ramesses II, the Viceroy Setau was ordered to raid the Tjemehu land for people to be used as construction workers. A private stela, also from es-Sebua, was dedicated to a local form of Amun, to Seth and to Reshep, by Matybaal, presumably of Asiatic origin [148], but doubtless of the official class, and hence a rather different case [149].

More significant, as Kemp noted, are the letters from Kamid el-Loz which record the transfer of captives to Nubian towns, whose inhabitants had been removed by the king [150]. One letter is to Zalaia king of Damascus and a second to Abdi-milki of the town of Sazaena. The pharaoh orders the foreign rulers to send a group of Hapiru to Egypt, these are to be sent to the cities of Kush (KUR Kaa-sa) "in place of those which I have taken away". Edzard concluded that they were from the same scribal school as EA 162 and 163, letters from Pharaoh [151]. The date, as with all EA letters is problematic [152], but perhaps after the Nubian campaigns of year 5 of Amenhotep III or year 12 of Akhenaten.

At all times people were removed from Nubia as slaves: whether acquired as prisoners of war, or as part of the 'tribute' sent by Kushite rulers from much farther south, and thus captured beyond the frontier of Viceregal control [153]. However acquired, slaves actually constituted a relatively small group in Egypt, which did not possess the necessary conditions for large-scale slavery. Janssen [154] considers that slaves were "economically irrelevant" within the Egyptian system, usually being employed in domestic or temple service [155]. A fundamental distinction has to be drawn between the form of slavery in ancient Egypt (or Asia Minor and Syria) and Graeco-Roman and industrial slavery, as has been stressed by Anderson [156] and Finlay [157]. Slaves in Egypt were employed in households, temples,
or in the production of luxury goods, but not as the largest group of agricultural labourers. The ruler of Ugarit requested two Nubian servants to be sent [158], and the context implies they were 'exotic' and hence for display in a court context. Indeed, even in Ptolemaic times, the import of slaves from Nubia and their use in Egypt was severely limited [159], and increase in the slave traffic from farther south probably belongs to the early Roman Empire.

At all periods Kushites served in the Egyptian army, some perhaps coming from the Aswan region, but most probably from Nubia proper. As mercenary troops they are well-documented in the armies of local rulers of the 1st Intermediate Period at Gebelein in Theban territory [160], at Mo'alla [161], Asyut [162] and elsewhere in Middle Egypt [163]. More regular battalions were doubtless formed during the period of Viceregal control, but these are seen more frequently in processions [164] than in military actions. Some of these Kushite troops were sent to garrisons in Western Asia, attested in the Amarna letters. Several requests ask for Kushite troops and men from Meluhha to be sent to Amurru [165] and Gubla [166], but Abdi-Heba of Jerusalem complained that the Kushite garrison had broken into his palace and nearly killed him [167].

Town and country.

The model advocated here, of a redistributive economy based upon the 'temple-towns', argues against the simple plundering of Nubia's resources. The land was held by the religious foundations and administrative offices of the Viceregal dominion, and therefore predominantly for the use of people and institutions within Nubia. The issue does however arise of whether there was direct involvement by Egyptian institutions within Nubia.

It is possible that some Egyptian temple foundations held land in Nubia, although the evidence for this is difficult to interpret [168]. How such land-holding would have operated is hard to assess, unless it was to provide food for the use of those employed elsewhere
in Nubia, for example, the gold mines. However, land-holding immediately creates an elaborate system which cannot be wholly exploitative, since it is necessary to feed, even at subsistence level, the local workers, and also to provide administrative staffs. Any involvement of the Egyptian temples within Nubia may therefore have been ideologically motivated. The king was the founder of the temples, and donor of land: if the Nubian temples were attached to their respective pr-domains in Egypt this may have been to embrace Nubia more closely within Egypt.

The Nauri decree [169], one of the most informative, but difficult, donation texts from Nubia, records a temple of Sety I "Heart's-ease in Abydos", but whether this temple was actually the famous Abydos-temple of the king (an identification usually accepted [170]) is far from certain. A Nubian shrine is probably more likely, and, given the extreme southerly location of the decree, it might be identifiable with Sety I's renewal and rededication of Sesebi [171]. The Nubian temple would thus have been spiritually attached to the Abydos temple, and possibly contributed some revenue, perhaps mineral rather than agricultural, to it.

The Nauri decree enumerates the agricultural possessions and products of the temple, indicating a wide-ranging exploitation of resources and agricultural potential. The temple owned bird trapping and fishing rights, fish pools, cattle, asses, dogs and goats. The agricultural employees mentioned include bee-keepers, gardeners and vintners, whilst other employees were involved in gold-washing and with foreign "trade". The temple possessed its own fleet. The inw brought to the temple is characteristically Nubian: gold, ivory, ebony, leopard-skins and animal tails. The tenor and location of the inscription suggest that these activities were carried out largely in Upper Nubia.

As in Egypt, land was held by, or dedicated to, various cult-images and objects, not just major temples [172]. Fields of the šntr 'śps are known from the time of Ramesses II [173], and the Pennut
Donation text attests images of Ramesses VI and Queen Nefertari. A number of different terms are employed for the fields, some of which are problematic [174].

Apart from the religious institutions and images, the evidence for the ownership of land in Nubia is scanty, although much of it must have been held by the offices of state, as is assumed for Egypt. Doubtless the indigenous princes continued to possess estates, and the Pennut donation text indicates that the elites held estates privately as well as by virtue of their offices. Land owned directly by the king or royal family is less-easily accounted for, although the title of Steward of the Queen's House, held by Nakhtmin at Bogga [175], might refer to Nubian estates. The presentation of "gold of Kush" to Sitamun daughter of Amenhotep III, on the arm panels of her chair, might also suggest estates and their revenues owned by the princess [176]. It is impossible to know whether the dedication of the Sedeinga temple to Tiye also involved grants of land from which she was able to draw revenue.

The economic production must have been almost entirely controlled by the institutions of the urban centres. The Nauri decree indicates exploitation of the natural resources, with bird trapping and fishing rights, and controlled exploitation through fish pools, domesticated animals (cattle and goats), and bee-keeping. Arable production is not referred to in the Nauri text, but gardeners and vintners are.

There is little evidence for the extent and nature of arable production in Nubia during the New Kingdom. The limited size of fields, and the evidence which suggests that large tracts of Upper Nubia were given over to cattle-pasturing, would suggest that the arable yield was limited, and perhaps primarily for local consumption. The scenes in the tomb of Huy do, however, show ships apparently laden with corn (unless this is fodder for the cattle). The Annals of Thutmose III also refer to arable produce. Date-production, so important in more recent times, was also emphasised by the Graeco-Roman writers, and was perhaps significant in more ancient
times. Products of the various palm trees, date, argun and dom, occur frequently in texts, as leaves, fans, basketry, date-paste as well as fruit.

Wine production is attested from the reigns of Amenhotep III and Sety I, and continuity may be assumed, the vineyards being renamed. Although the precise locations of the vineyards are unknown, the estates were attached to the temple foundation of Amenhotep III at Soleb, and to the estates donated by Sety I in the Nauri decree thereby suggesting an Upper Nubian provenance. Wine was also imported from Egypt, probably as part of the food allocations of the higher ranking officials. Smith [177] discusses all the jar sealings and vintages from Buhen, which include Nubian products from the Soleb estates as well as imports. Frandsen [178] gives further references to wine in Nubia, apparently brought from the Delta vineyards. The material from Amara West is, as yet unpublished [179].

The use of the temple-towns as production centres is suggested by the inw-scenes of the later 18th Dynasty onwards, when manufactures are shown alongside the raw-materials [180]. This change occurs with the reigns of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten, coinciding with the development of Abri-Delgo Reach, and the diplomatic correspondence detailing the royal gift-exchange, much of which relied on Nubian products. The large storage areas at Sesebi may well be associated with this type of production [181].

Exports from Nubia, both agricultural and livestock, are well-attested, but must have been largely compensated by the importation of other commodities. The movement of products between Nubia and Egypt may perhaps reflect the similar movements within Egypt, most areas being largely self-sufficient in basic agricultural terms and perhaps manufactures, but with some types of food and other goods being transported and exchanged. It is unknown whether long-range trade within Egypt was exceptional or common, and whether it was usually of luxury goods or also commodities for daily use, also to
what extent the population was dependent upon local production and to what extent upon commodities from other regions [182].

Janssen [183] notes the possibility of privately owned transport barges or ships for the Nile traffic, but that the evidence is unclear. The temples were certainly important in transporting commodities [184] and 'merchants or 'traders' (in Nauri Decree 40: $\text{swtyw n h3st}$) often appear to be attached to temples [185]. There is no clear evidence for dues and levies, although some form is implied by both the Nauri and Elephantine decrees [186]. Pharaoh controlled foreign trade but not internal trade. Presumably transport and management of commodities in Nubia worked in much the same way as in Egypt, the agricultural produce falling into the same categories as Egypt, but mining and cross-frontier 'luxury' traffic in the domain of Pharaoh. The rather equivocal evidence for the numbers and role of merchants in the New Kingdom economy has, to an extent, supported the view of Polanyi, that mercantile activity was severely limited by the strong early states: but this supposed antagonism between reciprocal and commercial commodity exchange is now sensed to be an overgeneralisation [187]. How exactly the two systems related to each other remains, at present, obscure.

The river in Nubia is not as easily navigable as in Egypt, with a number of minor cataracts and rapids affecting ease of transport. Despite the difficulties, the Egyptians moved large-scale granite sculptures from Aswan into Nubia [188], just as they did to other parts of Egypt, which suggests that transport of goods from Nubia would have presented relatively little problem.

Ancient use of the desert roads is another subject for which there is insufficient information. The desert road from Aswan to Toshka avoided the large bends in the Lower Nubian Nile and in the Old Kingdom this road seems to have been used in preference to the river. Major military campaigns probably used fleets sailing from the area of Shellal [189], but some of the inscriptions on Gebel Tingar, which marks the beginning of the desert road from Aswan, are of 18th
Dynasty date [190] suggesting that the road was still used. There is a possibility that the roads to Abu Hamed and the 4th Cataract region, along the Wadis Allaqi and Cabgaba, and from Korosko, were in use in ancient times. The feasibility of using these desert routes before the introduction of the camel has been doubted, but Burckhardt considered the possibility that these were ancient, now confirmed by the discovery of New kingdom graffiti at some wells [191]. The local form of Amun at Wadi es-Sebua was called "Lord of the Roads", suggesting one desert route starting in that region [192]. The inscriptions marking the cattle road of Taharqo also suggest that long desert routes from the 4th Cataract were being used in the 25th Dynasty [193]. Most significantly is the recent identification of a road running eastwards from Buhen, marked by New Kingdom graffiti, including one of Heqa-nefer of Mi'am [194]. The Wadi Howar project has demonstrated the enormous effect of a very minor ecological change (such as rainfall) and the possibility that the Nubian desert was significantly different in the New Kingdom phase cannot be ignored.

Consumption.

The model of the redistributive economy centred upon the temples is detailed by Janssen [195], and it was almost certainly introduced into Nubia. As Janssen emphasises [196], the temples must be seen as a part of the state-machine, and in no way independent of it. The temples were, however, only one part of the economy. Doubtless the officials derived their incomes from the estates attached to their offices, and were responsible for their subordinates.

Janssen [197] discusses the material from the, possibly exceptional, village of Deir el-Medina and establishes the extremely complex nature of the economy with rations paid from a number of different institutions and individuals [198]. The same mentality [199] would have prevailed in Nubia, and it might reasonably be supposed that the majority of basic requirements were supplied from the 'Egyptian' 'towns', which were, at the same time, supported (ie
the administrators, militia, artisans etc) by the hinterland. Indeed the 'acculturation' or 'disappearance' of the indigenous population can be seen in this demographic revision: if, for example, pottery was paid as part of the rations a decline in the production of local forms is likely. Such a situation does appear to be the explanation of the evidence from a number of cemeteries where typical C-Group tombs contained "not a single sherd of Nubian ware among the Egyptian pottery" [200]. Säve-Söderbergh noted the late persistence of C-Group grave-types in the 2nd Cataract region, but without the expected funerary assemblages.

Luxuries for the elites, administrative officials and indigenous rulers, would have been produced in the Viceregal centres, and also imported. It is almost impossible to distinguish the imported objects from those locally made, and to use criteria of 'quality' is totally inadequate. Kohl [201] has emphasised that the technologies of the Late Bronze Age were easily transferrable and could not be monopolized by the centres. Indeed, important technologies might develop, or be further refined, in peripheral regions which were closer to natural sources. The development of centres in Nubia certainly involved the use of craftsmen from Egypt, and doubtless the training of local workers. The production of furniture in ebony and ivory in Nubia from the time of Amenhotep III onwards is suggested by the tribute scenes, although must remain uncertain.

Many examples of private sculpture [202], shabti figures [203], gesso masks [204] and other funerary objects [205], faience jewellery [206] and stone unguent vessels [207] are purely Egyptian in style, and of high quality. Whilst some may have been imported [208], most were probably made in the workshops of the administration. Sculpture of extremely high quality was produced in Nubia in the New Kingdom by Egyptian or indigenous artisans. The decoration of the many temples is indistinguishable both in style and quality with contemporaneous Egyptian work. Any apparent inferiority can often be seen to result from the poor quality of the Nubian sandstone, rather than lack of skill on the part of the sculptors.
The evidence for commodities imported to Buhen in the New Kingdom has been discussed by Smith [209]. Wine predominated, perhaps because local production was either insufficient in quantity, or inferior in quality. Commodities not yet attested by dockets from Nubian sites may have included textiles, especially linen, and clothing.

More obvious imports are the non-Egyptian products such as the Mycenaean pottery, which has attracted much comment. The biggest single group was excavated at Sesebi [210], but this was not large and the types represented, largely stirrup-jars of LH III A2 late, led Hankey [211] to propose that it constituted a single group acquired by an official, in Greece. Since stirrup-jars formed a high percentage of the exports from the Mycenaean world, their presence at a major Nubian administrative centre is not unexpected. Sherds of LH III A 2 are identical in type, fabric and decoration with pottery from Amarna [212]. Although stirrup-jars predominate, the Sesebi group contained fragments of other types of Mycenaean vessels. Further, as yet unpublished, Mycenaean fragments are reported from a grave at Bedier, near Buhen [213] and as far south as Tumbos [214] and Kerma [215]. Imitations of Mycenaean wares are also known: from Soleb [216] came a faience stirrup jar with decorated body band imitating LH/LM IIIA 2 late or III B 1 [217], from Kubban a faience rhyton [218], and from Arminna one in clay [219]. Spindle-bottles of Syro-Palestinian types are also known [220], but whether they, and the Mycenaean wares, were sent to Nubia with their original contents, or were refilled in Egypt first, is impossible to know.

In Egypt 'luxury' commodities were often (if not usually) given to officials as part the 'reward' ceremony [221], and similar circumstances saw extra provisions for the artisans of Deir el-Medina. There is some evidence which demonstrates that the system also operated in Nubia.

The Viceroy could deputise for the king in the reward ceremony: so Pennut is rewarded in his presence in return for his donations of
land to a statue-cult of Ramesses VI [222]. The appointment of a new Viceroy seems to have involved the presentation of hsw-rewards to the mayors of Nubia [223], and doubtless all new officials gave similar donations as a means of establishing the social obligations between themselves and their subordinates. It was perhaps one point when the Nubian officials received 'luxuries' of Egyptian origin. Royal and religious festivals were also times of reward and it is likely that the reward was of broader significance than the majority of the scenes imply: reward to an official was doubtless followed by a corresponding redistribution of the gifts to the official's retainers [224].

The 'reward' given, on certain occasions, notably religious festivals, directly to groups of 'lower' social status, such as the artisans of Deir el-Medina (although they constitute a special group directly employed by the palace), gives an idea of the sort of supplements to the regular wages which might have been distributed. At the time of the Opet festival officials came to "reward" the workmen with mkw-provisions [225]: these included loaves from the temple offerings, sesame oil, fish, beans, beer, garments and 10 oxen. Some of these items feature as a regular part of the rations, but others, such as the oxen, were less usual.

Reward was thus a powerful economic feature allowing control of the 'luxuries', particularly those of cross-frontier origin, by the central authority but allowing them to spread downwards through society.

An integrated economy: the importance of Kush to Egypt.

Trade and Profit

Frandsen [226] argues the case for the integration of the Egyptian and Nubian economies during the New Kingdom against the view of simple exploitation. Kemp [227] suggests two ways in which the
Egyptians may have derived advantage in terms of economic return from their expansion into Nubia, particularly Upper Nubia. This was achieved, firstly, through exploitation of available resources, both mineral and agricultural, and secondly through trade, since products were encountered closer to their sources and therefore were diminished less by customs dues levied upon them by a succession of local rulers. This analysis of 'trade' may be valid, although it does raise the extremely difficult and complex issues of whether customs dues were actually levied, and whether profit is really a consideration within the terms of the pre-capitalist economies. In any case, it should be considered whether, if the Egyptians maintained an actual limit of occupation in the Abri-Delgo Reach, they actually controlled the trade with the central Sudan. Whilst it is a common assumption that they did, and that to an extent it was a motivation for their activity in the region, can we really be certain that 'control' of trade was desired by the Egyptians? They may, in fact, have found it more convenient to leave trade in the hands of the local princes of the Dongola Reach, and receive the commodities directly from them. There is no evidence that the Egyptians were directly involved in trade expeditions in Nubia at this time, in any way comparable to those of the late Old Kingdom.

Foreign trade was probably less for 'profit' than for the acquisition of luxury or desirable commodities which could not be produced in Egypt. The agricultural production of Egypt was used largely within Egypt, as were many of the manufactures. Lattimore \[228\] raises the important point that in China the justification for commodities passing over the frontier was political rather than economic. For this reason the economic categories 'trade', _imw_ and _b3kw_, may be difficult to distinguish; trade being an exchange of commodities of equal value at one time, whereas gift-exchange was part of an extended cycle of events. In terms of types of products exchanged there may have been no distinction. The evidence for Nubian goods certainly seems to attest the same commodities being exchanged under the three different categories. The distinction derives from the social relationship implicit in gift exchange: trade
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presumably not involving such complex social obligations. It can, of course, be argued that almost all cross-frontier trade was conducted by means of gift exchange.

Kemp [229], suggests direct exploitation of the resources of Nubia, both mineral and agricultural, as a way in which the Egyptians could have derived economic return from their domination of Nubia. The mineral, particularly gold, exploitation of Nubia has for long been regarded as the prime factor in the Egyptian expansion. Janssen [230] raised some doubts about this interpretation, which have been pursued by Frandsen [231] with some fundamental, if unanswerable, questions. There is inadequate evidence to compare the production of the Egyptian and Nubian gold-fields and any changes during the New Kingdom. Kemp points out that economic exploitation as a prime motive in imperialism has been doubted in the history of more recent colonial empires, and the agricultural production of Nubia is unlikely ever to have been so great as to have made it particularly 'profitable' for the Egyptians in a strictly economic sense. The investment in term of people, administration, and ultimately temple-building, as Kemp [232] points out, must have been a "loss". The benefit was extension of the very state itself.

Trade and taxation: the tribute of Kush.

The two elements which constitute what is usually designated "tribute", inw and b3kw, are recognised as different economic categories, but opinion is divided as to their interpretation, and there has recently been considerable discussion as to the meanings to be applied. It is possible, following Helck [233], that b3kw indicates produce of a non-agricultural nature, perhaps paid as an annual tax to the central government. Lorton [234] regards b3kw as designating trade goods, whilst inw had a more general application. Bleiberg [235] analyses both terms, and argues a different attitude: that both terms refer to the type of transaction involved, and its ultimate destination. Bleiberg [236] sees inw as the products exchanged between foreign princes and the pharaoh in gift-giving, and
as such indicating a social relationship rather than the taxation or levies of an imperialist or political hegemony. The produce or commodities represented by inw became part of the king’s privy purse. B3kw, he argues [237] is a transaction between professional groups or institutions and the king, and is passed by the king to the temples. Liverani [238], in the most recent discussion, relates to the economic categories to the ideological perspective.

Liverani interprets the economic categories from centre to periphery: b3k is part of the redistributive economy, derived from lands under direct control, and with no more local rulers; inw is international gift-exchange from the wrw-rulers to the pharaoh; b3k-booty is the inverse of inw and from the same regions; bi3t comes from outside of the civilized world (eg Punt). The three main categories can also be categorised temporally: b3k is regular, inw irregular but not rare, bi3t so rare as to be exceptional.

The economic terms applied to Nubia are the same as those applied to the Asiatic domain, and indeed, the texts frequently parallel each other. There is nothing in the ancient sources which indicates that the Egyptians viewed the two regions as different: it is modern scholarship which has chosen to impose a division of attitude on the ancient Egyptians. Inw and b3kw are supplied by both regions; it seems reasonable, therefore, to assume that the economic conditions which caused these categories existed in both regions. In some texts b3kw is further defined as a htrw-obligation, to be supplied annually [239]. One may conclude that Wawat, and certainly part of Kush were integrated into the b3kw-payment system, with their wrw bringing inw on appropriate occasions. The Nubian peripheries paid only inw.

The constituent elements of inw and b3kw are depicted in scenes in New Kingdom tombs and temples, and listed in a variety of documentary sources [240]. The commodities [241] can be divided into a number of categories, the most emphasised, in both ancient sources and modern literature being the "luxuries". In the early 18th Dynasty these were raw materials: gold, ivory, ebony, incense, animal skins and
ostrich-feathers being characteristic, along with various types of live animals. People too are nearly always included, and might be either prisoners of war, or people captured much further south by other Kushite rulers and sent as slaves along with the other commodities. From the time of Amenhotep III, manufactured goods appear, made from the typical raw materials, for example chairs, shields and fans.

Categories rarely depicted, but which appear, from the lists, to have been exported from Nubia in large quantities, are the lesser minerals, and non-luxury products [242]. These have received relatively little attention, but were doubtless significant. Some of them are specified as coming from the imw in pTurin where they form "the annual htri-wages from the imw of Kush" [243], these are various kinds of plants and fruit including 2000 oipe of ḫkī-fruits and 200 bundles of ḫ3w-palm leaves, with 20 ḫḫ-fans of the same material [244].

The luxury materials, and objects manufactured from them were essential to the gift-exchange system between the Pharaoh, his nobles, and the foreign potentates. The gift-exchange system was, however, extremely complex, and also involved the relationship between the elites and their subordinates. Within the gift-exchange system, and hence within the Egyptian economy, the produce of Nubia was of major importance.

Some of the social implications and obligations of gift exchange have already been discussed above within the political context of Nubia. The Egyptians, it is argued, did not regard their relationship to the Kushites as in any way different to that with the Western Asiatic rulers, and consequently the commodities presented by the Kushite princes to the pharaoh must have been reciprocated. How far commodities received as 'gift' could be disposed of only as 'gift', as the model derived from Mauss would postulate, remains debateable. It is certain that gifts received by foreign rulers from the pharaoh did pass to other rulers in a dual circulation of
prestige goods, and some of the letters from the Amarna archive specify that gifts were for use in the building of new temples [245].

Gift-exchange and the commodities of Nubia were also integral to the relationship between the pharaoh and the Egyptian elite. A significant element, if not the bulk, of goods which make up reward to officials can be classified as 'luxuries', and thus have a close relationship to those goods which are brought as inw and b3kw.

Nubia's economic importance to New Kingdom Egypt, as has long been recognised, depended largely upon its supply of these luxury products: but, the relationship was much closer, whether initially established for political motives - the suppression of Kerma and defence of the southern frontier; or for ideological motives - the extension of divine order. The acquisition of Nubia as a territory necessitated a degree of economic integration.

The collapse of the economy in Nubia.

The end of the Viceregal administration is one of the most obscure phases of Nubian history. The most frequently advocated model envisages a slow decline in agricultural production throughout the later New Kingdom, with the final dissolution, perhaps brought about by the campaigns of Herihor and Piankh, in the latter years of Ramesses XI. After this breakdown of the administration the Egyptian centres and temples were abandoned and the population disappeared from the record, possibly taking up a nomadic lifestyle.

Fattovich has suggested that the Gash Delta cultures suffered some disruption around the end of the Egyptian New Kingdom, which, if this is indeed the location of Punt, would imply a long-range economic effect of Egyptian decline.

The historical reconstruction of late New Kingdom events in Nubia has been based more on the archaeological material recovered (or rather, lack of it) in the Surveys of Nubia, than on any broader
considerations. Internally, Nubia doubtless possessed a largely self-sufficient agricultural economy. The 'towns' functioned primarily as administrative centres with most of the agrarian population probably living in smaller settlements. However, it is almost impossible to estimate population density and any increase or decrease in population throughout the Viceregal period.

A number of external factors are also relevant: the apparent depopulation of Nubia and the end of the Viceregal administration is part of the end of Late Bronze Age civilization, based upon the centralized palace economies. Whilst the decline of Egypt under the successors of Ramesses III may have been over-emphasised, there were certainly fundamental problems. Whether a cause, or a result, of the collapse of Egyptian power and prestige in Near East, the rise of conflicting trade routes (Solomonic interests in the Red Sea and Arabia and Phoenician expansion) must have been intimately connected with the Nubian trade. The increased importance of Near Eastern states such as Israel may have had a detrimental effect on some aspects of commodity exchange, possibly in relation to specific commodities (such as gold and incense) rather than generally. Any significant change of power configurations within Egypt would have had enormous impact in Nubia, as they had in the post-Middle Kingdom when Kerma appears to have dealt directly with the Hyksos. A series of necessities had been created within Nubia - and the elites would have wished to continue acquiring those. While the ecological collapse of Nubia has been suggested - and discussed above, the Kushites still controlled the Sudanese commodities and doubtless would have sought to exchange them with powers in Egypt - or, if Egypt was closed to them, have sought other 'markets'.
Binding Nubia to Egypt: the royal cult.

The presence of the Egyptians in Nubia in the New Kingdom is seen most obviously in the temple building of the late 18th and early 19th Dynasties. Yet the very size and number of these edifices has, in the past, posed a problem for historians of Nubia, especially when allied with presumptions about the country's history. So the temples have been regarded less as centres of religious belief, than as massive structures of limited function, built to overawe the indigenous population, or to promulgate a particular form of the royal cult amongst "credulous barbarians" [1].

More recently it has been recognised that many temples served as the focus of administrative centres and had an important role in the economy. Emphasis upon the temples as part of the state machine should not deny their cultic and theological role.

The Nubian temples offer important perspectives on Egyptian religion during the New Kingdom because temple buildings were not altered as much as temples in Egypt. Understanding of the temples is made more difficult by the lack of complete publications of many of them, despite the studies and epigraphic work related to the Nubian campaigns. Even Abu Simbel, probably the most famous of Egyptian temples, is not completely published, and some temples, notably Soleb and Sedeinga, are known only through the works of early epigraphic expeditions.

The most significant of religious practices in the New Kingdom was the development of the royal cult, which is particularly visible in Nubia, in two important phases, the reigns of Amenhotep III and Ramesses II. Although the temples of Ramesses II have received considerable attention, the 'Living Image (hnty Cnh) of Nb-MCt-Rc' at Soleb has, until recently, remained relatively unresearched in either Nubian studies or Egyptology [2]. This is due, to a certain
extent, to the remoteness of the Soleb temple itself, the lack of a publication and also to the greater Egyptological interest in Akhenaten and Ramesses II [3].

Whilst there are peculiarly local features apparent in the iconography and associations of the kings in the Nubian temples, the function of the temples reflects current trends within Egypt itself. The worship of Ramesses II in Nubia was studied by Habachi [4] who demonstrated its close relationship with that of the king in Egypt and Bell [5] has discussed Tutankhamun as 'Lion over the South Country' at Kawa, also adding considerably to our understanding of Ramesside royal divinity.

The development of Egyptian religion, and particularly of the royal cult, in Nubia is important because, most obviously, it reflects the ideology which the Egyptians wished to impose on their dependencies, but it is also significant when the later phases of Kushite history are examined. The 'Egyptianisation' of the Napatan and Meroitic periods has been seen as a residue of the years of occupation, gradually dissipated through the dominance of indigenous phenomena. The importance of the Amun cult in the Meroitic period is an obvious example of Egyptian influence. Indeed, the dominance of Amun led earlier writers to suggest a direct contact between Thebes and Napata, and that the Amun priesthood was influential in the formation and ideology of the Kushite state. Some writers even suggested that the ancestors of the 25th Dynasty royal family were emigre Theban priests [6]. Many of these ideas have recently been recast and elaborated upon by Kendall [7]. It is only through close analysis of the kingship of the New kingdom and that of the Kushite periods that we can form any clear view of 'legacy', or whether the Egyptian features of the Kushite kingship are related more closely to contemporaneous Egypt.

Habachi [8], followed by Kemp [9], Trigger [10] and others, urged that the Nubian temples should be looked at within the context of New Kingdom Egypt and not in isolation. Habachi's fundamental study of
the deification of Ramesses II showed it to be only another manifestation of a phenomenon to be found throughout Egypt. Habachi, however, as many scholars, adopted a conventional Western approach to the royal cult. He argued that the Egyptians did not worship the king himself, but the concept of kingship. Posener also stressed the multiplicity of ways in which the royal ka and persona were worshipped [11].

Similar attitudes were observed by Price [12] in his discussion of the relationship between religion and politics in interpretations of the Roman imperial cult. He emphasises the role in historiography of the christianizing view that the imperial cult was a form of political power lacking religious content. The organisation and exploitation of the imperial cult by local elites and its political exploitation for propaganda purposes, allied with the hostility of the early christian writers to the phenomenon and more general opinions about the ancient mentality, has led to a general view that the subjects of the empire did not believe it: it was a form, not a legitimate religious experience.

Price [13] does not deny the obvious political aspects of the Roman imperial cult, but emphasises that initiatives could come "from below", and were not all imposed by central authority. This can be paralleled in New Kingdom Egypt where private inscriptions invoke living and dead rulers [14]. The endowment of royal cult images by members of the elite doubtless guaranteed prestige and may have had economic benefits, but discussions of these have tended to emphasise the economic rather than religious aspects. In establishing these cults, the nobles may have actually believed in them.

Another parallel between the Roman and Egyptian royal cults may be noted. Price comments that [15]:

In fact, neither the Emperor nor his individual cults endured in perpetuity. The imperial cult was far from being a static monolithic structure, erected once and for all. Cults were constantly being invented and revised.
As in Egypt, the imperial cults did not endure long after the Emperor's death: deceased emperors and pharaohs joined the ranks of the gods, but the most potent form of cult was that of the living ruler.

**The development of the royal cult.**

The following analysis of the royal cult [16] proposes a development from the Horus cults of Middle Kingdom Nubia which were adapted and then fused with the Amun cult in the mid-18th Dynasty. There are obvious dangers in interpreting material in a linear "evolutionary" progression. It is certain that a phenomenon such as the royal cult did not develop in a homogeneous predictable way. Many factors, historical and ideological would have affected the changes.

The royal cult has recently been the focus of much research. Grimal's monumental study of the terminology has catalogued the numerous associations of the kingship [17]. Bell's detailed analysis of worship of the royal ka in Luxor temple [18], and his study of the cult of Tutankhamun at Kawa [19] have clarified the ways in which the king and deity were assimilated. Bryan [20] recently presented an interpretation of some aspects of the worship of Amenhotep III at Soleb temple. Her work closely relates the cult to religious developments in Egypt during this reign. The interpretation here concentrates on the evidence from Nubia. Yet the theories are not mutually exclusive: the complex nature of Egyptian religion often makes it difficult to present one single valid interpretation.

Comparisons have frequently been made between Egyptian activity in Western Asia and in Nubia, usually to highlight differences. From the Old Kingdom onwards pharaohs sent gifts to Asiatic deities who had become Egyptianised, such as Hathor Lady of Byblos, and during the New Kingdom Asiatic deities, notably Reshep and Astarte, were absorbed into the Egyptian pantheon. Openness to Asiatic cults is further demonstrated by the evidence for a statue of Ishtar being sent to Amenhotep III from Mitanni to cure illness [21]. No Nubian
parallels are noted for this and the general verdict has been that
the Nubians had no deities who could be found Egyptian counterparts,
and that the Egyptians looked down on Nubian religion [22]. It is
quite probable that Nubian culture lacked the range of
anthropomorphic deities to be found in Egypt and Western Asia, but
the nature and practice of religion in early Nubia is still an
obscure subject [23].

The main Egyptian cults celebrated in Nubia in the early 18th
Dynasty were those of Horus, originating in the Middle Kingdom
fortresses. The political element in the propagation of the cults
was discussed by Säve-Söderbergh [24]. The gods of the First
Cataract, Khnum, Anuket and Satet, were also prominent, especially in
the region of the 2nd Cataract, where Buhen became 'the Southern
Elephantine' [25]. It is, at present, unclear whether the cults of
the Elephantine gods became important at the more southerly Upper
Nubian cataracts also, but the triad of Kawa in the 25th Dynasty was
a ram-headed form of Amun, associated with Anuket and Satet.

The 'Horus gods, Lords of Wawat' [26], as they were later called
(appearing as a triad), were the deities which presided over the
Middle Kingdom fortresses; B3ki(Kubban), Mc (Aniba), and Bhn
(Buhen). In the late 18th Dynasty a fourth regional Horus god of
Lower Nubia was added to the others; Horus of Nh3, the region of Abu
Simbel [27]. As well as the local forms, a more generalised aspect
of Horus, 'the lord of foreign lands' [28] was worshipped during the
2nd Intermediate Period. With the expansion of Egyptian power south
of the 2nd Cataract a new form, "Horus the Bull, Lord of Ta-Seti" was
introduced. Horus, as a manifestation of the conquering king, was a
deity frequently associated with foreign countries, and there is some
evidence that during the Middle Kingdom Monthu as an aspect of the
Horus-king was particularly venerated in the fortresses.

Senusret I and III were venerated at the southern frontier,
certainly during the Second Intermediate Period [29], and probably
during the Middle Kingdom. The Semna and Uronarti stelae of Senusret
III explicitly state that the king set up a twt-image at the border "in order that you fight for it" [30]. The cult of Senusret III at Semna was promoted by Thutmose III and is significant, since it particularly emphasised the relationship between the ḫḫ-ṣḏ and the divinity of Senusret III. The temple reliefs depict Senusret III in his bark wearing the ṣḏ-robe, and a statue, possibly the cult image, also showed the king in the ṣḏ-robe [31]. Also of the reign of Thutmose III, the Gebel Dosha speos was probably dedicated to Senusret III and to Horus the Bull [32].

The co-reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III was a time of consolidation in Lower Nubia, and many of the fortresses received new temples. Whilst the Horus gods retained their importance, the Egyptian state-gods, Amun-Re and Re-Harakhty, now figured prominently in the new shrines.

Horus the Bull, Lord of Nubia.

The evidence seems to be clear that 'Horus the Bull, Lord of T3-Sty' was a new tutelary deity created to preside over the new Nubian territories south of the 2nd Cataract as far as Tumbos. The earliest monuments attesting the god are from Sai [33], and he appears with the other Nubian deities in the temples at Semna, Ellesiya and Amada. Horus the Bull and Senusret III were the chief gods of the shrine at Gebel Dosha. The god was certainly most important during the early and mid-18th Dynasty, but, unfortunately, there are no excavated Upper Nubian sites (Sai excepted) of the reigns of Thutmose III - Thutmose IV, so that later developments of the cult are undocumented.

The god is iconographically identical to the other Horus gods of Nubia, human in form with a falcon's head, wearing the double-crown [34].

It is notable that although the god's domain is called T3-sty, he is found mainly in Upper Nubia, primarily at Sai, suggesting that he was considered as an Upper Nubian deity. Horus nb T3-Sty is referred
to in the Akh-Menu of Thutmose III, in a speech of Sopd [35], who presents the eastern lands to the king. The text suggests that this form of Horus was regarded as the presider over the southern border lands of Nubia.

This form of Horus is not, so far, attested later than the reign of Amenhotep III, and the procession of Nubian deities depicted on the roof terrace of Medinet Habu indicates that by the late New Kingdom Amun-Re was considered the chief deity of Upper Nubia, with the triad of Horus gods presiding over Lower Nubia. This scheme probably dates back to the reign of Tutankhamun, if not to that of Amenhotep III.

The mid-18th Dynasty emphasis on the cults of Amun-Re and Re-Harakhty in Nubia, is reflected in the assimilation of Horus and Amun-Re in Upper Nubia, who now appears as 'Amun-Re-Horus the Bull, Lord of T3-Sty' [36] and 'Horus the Bull, Lord of T3-Sty, ḫry ib W3st' [37]. A text of the reign of Thutmose IV at Amada refers to 'the Bull, Lord of T3-Sty ḫry ib W3st', without any name [38].

The names and epithets of this god indicate a connection with the king, since all rulers of the New Kingdom, with the exception of the female pharaohs, took as their srḥ-name "Horus the (mighty) Bull ḫnsw". Hatshepsut, assumed as her srḥ- name 'the Horus mighty of ḫnw', itself an obvious allusion to the usual form. The king as the earthly manifestation of Horus is well-documented textually and iconographically [39]. The Horus name itself is identified with the royal ḫs, and, as Varille [40] has suggested, may be directly associated with the Monthu aspect of Horus. This is clearly demonstrated at a later date, in the 'cryptic' writing of the Horus name of Ramesses II on the southern jamb of the main entrance to the great Temple at Abu Simbel [41], where 'Horus the Mighty Bull' is written with images of the falcon-headed king with double-crown, Amun-Re-Kamutef and Monthu [42].
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This cult of 'Horus Lord of Nubia', like those of Lower Nubia, was a cult of kingship in which the ruler appeared as an hypostasis of Horus and was revered as a conqueror. The solar and warrior characteristics also indicate an association with Monthu [43].

Part of a lintel discovered at Sai might come from an early chapel in which Thutmose III was identified as Horus the Bull [44]. Of conventional type, with cartouche at the centre, resting on a nb-sign, and flanked by two uraei, and with the figure of an official, in this case the Viceroy Nehy. The end of a text is preserved, ...sm t3 m nb T3-Sti, the first hieroglyph of which appears to be a bull. The lintel, from the temple of Horus which Thutmose III rebuilt about years 25-27, thus seems to associate the king and god. A pillar from the same temple has a relief of the king in front of a falcon-headed god with double crown, almost certainly Horus. Beneath are the remains of an inscription dated to year 27 of Thutmose III, which, after a lengthy titulary begins: 'His majesty ordered to fashion a statue ...'. The fragment recorded by Vercoutter could perhaps be restored as smw hwi, but whether of the king or god is uncertain. Possibly this was the cult image for the barque shrine of the newly completed temple, but may suggest an already close relationship between Horus and the king at Sai.

The Living Image of Nebmaetre.

The reign of Amenhotep III was a time of change in the royal cult in Nubia, just as it was in Egypt. Amenhotep III's major Nubian foundation was at Soleb, where the cult of Horus the Lord of T3-Sty took a new form. The king made this temple town his major new administrative centre for Upper Nubia, and called it after his srb-name, ḫm-M3št. Soleb was the first of several towns founded in Nubia in the late 18th and early 19th Dynasties, each of which now centred upon a royal ka-chapel.

Soleb must have been founded early in the reign, as were the king's Memphite and Theban temples [45]. The temple underwent
several stages in its development from a peripteral chapel into a complex multi-roomed structure [46]. The final form seems to have been established by the time of the first $hb\dash sd$ in the king's 30th year, elements of which are depicted in the first courtyard [47]. The temple was dedicated to the $hnty\ Cnh$, 'Living Image of $Nb\dash m3ct\dash rC$' and to 'Amun-Re, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, $hry\ ib\ H^{C}\dash m\dash m3Ct$' [48].

Whether the cult developed directly from that of 'Amun-Re-Horus the Bull', or whether it marks a change of policy, is obscured by the lack of material dateable to the early years of the reign of Amenhotep III in Nubia. In the chapel at Wadi es-Sebua [49] Amenhotep III was depicted with falcon's head [50], but it is impossible to define the divine associations of the king here due to the alterations to this temple made during the reign of Ramesses II.

At Soleb the king is described as "beloved" ($mry$) of Amun-Re. This indicates a relationship in which the king appears as an hypostasis of a god and has been discussed by Bell [51] and Wildung [52]. Amenhotep III is himself depicted in statue form as Amun-Re [53] and as Ptah [54] and described as $mry$ the god. Likewise, the four colossi at Hermopolis show the king as a baboon and describe him as $mry\ Dhwyty$ [55]. At Soleb itself the dromos was lined with rams protecting the king; ie Amenhotep beloved of Amun.

The divine form of Amenhotep III at Soleb is called the 'Living Image of $Nb\dash m3Ct\dash rC$', or 'his living image upon earth' and this is qualified by the titles and epithets, 'great god' ($ntr\ c3$) 'lord of heaven' ($nb\ pt$), 'Lord of $Hnt\-hn\-nfr$' and 'Lord of Nubia ($T3\-Sty$)'.

The description of a king as the 'living image' of a god is well attested, and usually refers to the king in relation to one of the solar deities [56].

The territorial designations 'Lord of $Hnt\-hn\-nfr$' and 'Lord of Nubia ($T3\-Sty$)' are not, however, usually applied to the king as an
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indicator of temporal authority. Lorton [57] discusses the epithet nb T3-Sty and its application to deities: he believes however, that the Soleb cult was that of the deceased Amenhotep III, a view clearly untenable. Although it might appear to parallel Nb t3wy, 'Lord of Nubia' does not occur as part of the titulary except when related to the divine form of the king [58].

The god is depicted as human in form, wearing the śndyt-kilt with sd-tail: sometimes the corselet is also indicated. His headdress comprises the mms-headcloth or a wig, with curving ram's horn and uraeus attached, and is surmounted by a modius with lunar crescent and disk. He wears the curled or square beard and carries the w3s-sceptre and the ḫḫ [59]. The corselet is sometimes indicated and sometimes not [60]. The modius and crescent also vary in shape [61].

The iconography thus combines the lunar attributes of crescent and disk with the curled ram's horn usually associated with Amun, or the solar deities. The ram's horn as an indicator of royal divinity is discussed by Wildung [62] and Bell [63]. Goedicke [64] maintains that there is no evidence for its association with Amun within the context of royal iconography, but Leclant [65] assumes a connection with Amun in this instance.

The divine form of Amenhotep III at Soleb was discussed by Save-Soderbergh [66], and also by Varille [67], who interpreted the title and the representations as being those of a statue analogous with depictions of the statues of Amenhotep III ḫk3 ḫk3w and of Amenhotep I. However, it is the deity, and not the cult image which is depicted at Soleb, since there are scenes in which the figure is seated [68] and the standing figures are not shown as on a base. It may be reasonably assumed that the cult image in Soleb temple had the same iconography.

The lunar aspect of the king has been associated with the magic of the eye of Horus represented as the moon [69], but the issue may be far more complex. The lunar element of the iconography of the
'Living Image of $\text{Nb-\text{H3t-\text{Rc}}}$' associates the king with $\text{IcH}$, the personified moon-disk and there is the possibility that the promotion of $\text{IcH}$ exhibits a parallelism with the promotion of the $\text{Itm}$ and the king as the $\text{Itm}$ by Amenhotep III. This, however, depends upon the interpretation of $\text{IcH}$ as the personification of the lunar disk rather than the lunar light (in which case he would be a parallel of Shu).

Leclant [70] suggested that the Living Image cult may be associated with Khonsu, a view also held by Bryan, who has elaborated the thesis considerably. Bryan views the lunar form of the king at Soleb as closely connected with the ideology expressed in the Luxor temple, where the king becomes the son of Amun, hence being identified with Khonsu [71]. A king may be described as the son of a deity without necessarily taking the attributes of that deity's divine child, although the potential for assimilation is obvious.

The undoubted $\text{hb-sd}$ associations of the cult at Soleb point to an identification with Iah. The king and Khonsu seem to become explicitly identified only with the reign of Tutankhamun. Texts, both earlier and later than the reign of Amenhotep III relate the lunar manifestation of the king, described as $\text{IcH}$, with rejuvenation, repetition of $\text{hbw-sd}$ and the rising of the Nile flood [72]. A scarab issued at the death of Thutmose III describes the king as "in heaven like Iah, the Nile flood is at his command" [73]. A block from Heliopolis depicts Ramesses VI receiving $\text{hbw-sd}$: he is wearing a child's heavy side-lock, and crowned with the uraeus, lunar-disk and crescent [74].

The celebration of the $\text{hb-sd}$ is given especial prominence in the decoration of Soleb temple. The festival had both solar and lunar associations and was a time when the king's position as intermediary between gods and mortals was emphasised. At Soleb this intermediary function is revealed through the name of the main gateway leading through the pylon to the first court [75]:-
The great gateway of Amenhotep the Ruler of Thebes, [the name of which is] 'Nb-M3t-Rc-who-hears-suppliants'.

It is not clear what associations, if any, are to be made between the divine form of Amenhotep III at Soleb and Osiris, a deity associated with the moon, rejuvenation and the rise of the Nile flood, and whose characteristic ritual, the raising of the djed-pillar was performed on the opening day of the hb-sd. The hb-sd certainly included rituals of burial and rebirth, and the dead solar god reborn as the moon would have been an appropriate aspect.

Parallel with the lunar manifestation of the king, there is a strong emphasis upon the king as a lion. The lion and the sphinx are specifically solar manifestations, and form the celestial parallel to the images of the king as terrestrial conqueror. Recently reassembled fragments in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts have proved to be parts of a large sphinx of Amenhotep II, but shown with paws resting on the shoulders of a kneeling captive. Found by Reisner at Gebel Barkal, the sculpture may have been taken there from a site further north in the 25th Dynasty [76].

Smith suggested that the frequent occurrences of a type of jar sealing at Buhen which show Amenhotep III as a lion attacking enemies might be the form taken by the king as conqueror of Nubia [77]. Kings are frequently depicted or described as lions in relation to Nubia; Thutmose I and Thutmose III being so shown on the boundary inscriptions at Hagar el-Merwa [78]. However, the epithets are also applied to the king in relation to the Asiatic states. It thus becomes difficult to generalise, although it is quite possible, as Smith suggested and the evidence seems to indicate, that in the reign of Amenhotep III the lion was the form taken by the king specifically as subjugator of the southern foreign lands, and that he was likened to the bull and ichneumon as victor over Libya and Asia. Sety I and Ramesses II were both described as "Bull against Kush", which may lend confirmation to the idea that the lion-Nubia juxtaposition is a peculiarly late-18th dynasty phenomenon [79].
The Cult of Tutankhamun at Faras and Kawa.

The scanty evidence available from Faras, Tutankhamun's major cult and administrative centre in Nubia, does not indicate whether this was a 'Living Image' cult. Nor is there any evidence for whether the king used the epithets nb pt, nb T3-Sty, or nb ḫnt-hn-nfr characteristic of the 'Living Image' cults of both Amenhotep III and Ramesses II [80].

Tutankhamun's reign certainly exhibits a change in the ideology of, or method of promoting the royal and state cults, and this, possibly expressed first at Faras, was developed by Ramesses II. Tutankhamun's most significant introduction (or promotion) was the triad of state gods, Amun-Re, Re-Harakhty and Ptah, with which the ruler is usually associated, to make four deities [81].

In the reign of Tutankhamun the lunar aspect of the kingship was extended to embrace Khonsu. A statue group from Faras depicts the king seated between Amun and Mut [82], a standard type in which the king is appearing as the son of the deities, but without him necessarily assuming the characteristics of their divine child, Khonsu. The texts on this statue group define the divine nature of Tutankhamun in this temple, and amongst them he is described as 'He who is born entire every month'. There is no evidence that the lunar manifestation of Tutankhamun was ascribed the iconography of Khonsu, but a colossal statue of the god from Karnak is given the king's features. There may be a case for arguing that the falcon iconography of Khonsu derives from, or was at least related to, this royal association. The earliest depictions of Khonsu as a falcon-headed god seem to date to the reign of Tutankhamun [83].

There might have been a complex balancing of solar and lunar aspects of the king deriving from the cult of Amenhotep III. Such a pairing of deities can be found in the Nubian temples: at es-Sebua, Monthu and Khonsu are paired as falcon-headed Theban deities, one solar the other lunar, and juxtaposed with the Hermopolitan solar and
lunar deities Shepsy and Thoth [84]. Whether such solar and lunar dualities should be pursued further is more debateable [85].

The lunar association with death and the potential for rebirth is clearly significant in the worship of Amenhotep III and probably so in that of Tutankhamun and Ramesses II. More specifically it was probably connected with the rising of the Nile flood in Nubia. There is some suggestion that part of the area around the Soleb temple would have flooded, or have been a swampy area - the temple itself representing the primaeval mound (something similar is noted for Kom el-Heitan) [86].

It can never be known whether Tutankhamun was depicted with lunar attributes as the Living Image of Nb-M3t-rc had been. The loss of the Faras temple reliefs is particularly to be regretted because of the important role of Tutankhamun as developer of the kingship ideologies of Amenhotep III and precursor of those of Ramesses II. Tutankhamun's reign must have seen the re-alignment of the kingship ideology along acceptable and more conventional lines after the reign of Akhenaten, which had pursued aspects of Amenhotep III's ideology to their perhaps logical, but manifestly impolitic, conclusion.

Karkowski [87] has convincingly argued that the king's temple was paired with the chapel of Hathor of Ibshek, already existing at Faras, thus paralleling the temples of Soleb and Sedeinga, and the later temples of Ramesses II and Nefertari at Abu Simbel.

Tutankhamun's second Nubian temple was at Kawa [88], where the king seems to have been identified with the local form of Amun, "the Lion over the South Country" [89]. At Kawa, Amun was depicted as a crio-sphinx, an image which recurred in Meroitic times for the Amun of Pnubs, the district north of Kawa.

In the reigns of Ay and Horemeheb, the royal cult seems to have been celebrated along rather different lines than it had in the reigns of Amenhotep III and Tutankhamun. A new Horus-god in Lower
Nubia, "the Lord of M³", the region of Abu Simbel, appears for the first time now [90]. This may reflect a renewed emphasis upon the Horus-king as opposed to the cult celebrated for Amenhotep III, Akhenaten and Tutankhamun. The nature of these rulers' accessions may itself have dictated a more conventional, and less personal cult form.

The frequent occurrence of the name of Tutankhamun on temple blocks from Faras suggests that the decoration of at least the innermost rooms, and consequently much of the building work, was complete at Tutankhamun's death [91]. The erasure of Tutankhamun's name and its replacement with that of Horemheb on a relief depicting the bark-shrine, is unusual (Tutankhamun's name in most cases being left) and results in Horemheb being described as "beloved of Nb-hprw-Rc" [92].

The chapel of Thoth, built by Horemheb at Abahuda (Imn-hry-ib) is probably to be seen in relation to the lunar aspects of Amenhotep III at Soleb and Tutankhamun at Faras. The deity, Thoth ḫry ɪb Imn-hry-ib continued to be important in the early-19th Dynasty at Abu Simbel [93].

The Deified Ramesses II in Nubia.

The divine form of Ramesses II appears many times in his Nubian temples, with variant iconography, and is well-known. Habachi's seminal study demonstrated that the cult was identical to that of the king in Egypt, although there has been no close analysis of the numerous variant forms [94].

The structure and decoration of the Ramesside temples in Nubia class them as ka-chapels, albeit particularly elaborate versions [95]. The features of named colossi, standard-bearing statues and 'Osiride' colossi are all familiar from the 'mortuary' temples on the West Bank at Thebes [96]. The relief representations and the evidence for cult images depict the various forms of the divine
ruler, and further features of the cult, or the divine aspect of the king, are revealed by the names of doorways and subsidiary architectural elements of the temples.

The numerous building works of Ramesses II in Nubia can be divided into three distinct groups: the earliest completed the foundations of Sety I; the temples of Abu Simbel marked a change in the royal cult; finally, a group of temples - at es-Sebua, Gerf Hussein and Derr - allied Nubia with the three main centres in Egypt itself.

In the earliest years of his reign the cult of Ramesses II followed that of Amenhotep III (perhaps indicating how it was practised for Sety I), but soon developed a different form perhaps following the pattern initiated by Tutankhamun. Fundamental changes occurred, as has already been well-established, during the construction of Abu Simbel, and in the later years of the reign the manifestation of the king with specific iconography and attributes was replaced by a multiplicity of forms and epithets in which the same epithets can be carried by human, falcon, solar and lunar iconography.

Aksha was certainly founded by Sety I, but it is not clear how that king would have been associated with the cult [96]. Similarly Amara was a foundation of Sety I, called the pr Mn-m3t-r, but the decoration was completed by Ramesses II, the building itself undergoing major alterations in design and orientation [98]. The decoration of the inner parts of the temple at Gebel Barkal, perhaps begun by Horemheb, but certainly completed by Sety I and Ramesses II, remains unpublished [99].

The temples of Abu Simbel mark the transition from the early to the later form of worship. The main work at Abu Simbel was completed by the mid-twenties of the reign, although there were certainly additions and alterations later [100]. During the construction of the temples, there were fundamental changes to the status of the king, as Habachi clearly showed [101]. Instead of the king being
worshipped as his bnty-cnḥ, he was included in a number of different forms. These forms of the king are also found in the later temples of the reign, with some qualification. Alterations were made in the decorative scheme of the central axis, to include the divine king.

Of the later temples, es-Sebua can certainly be dated to the Viceroyalty of Setau from the large number of private monuments erected by him there. These include a stela which states that Libyans captured in one of the oases were employed in the construction of the temple [102]. It is an extremely elaborate architectural arrangement, with dromos, gateway flanked by colossi and sphinxes, a second dromos flanked by andro-sphinxes; a brick pylon and gateway, leading to a dromos flanked by hieraco-sphinxes. The stone-built pylon stands on a high terrace with named colossi, beyond which lies a festival court lined with colossal statues leading to a second terrace with emplacements for sphinxes or colossi, and a rock-cut shrine with columned hall (the central piers with engaged colossi), pronaos, sanctuary and subsidiary rooms. In most cases the names of the doorways and other features survive. The temple was called Pr R^2-ms-s-mry-Imn m pr Imn [103]. This plan was followed, although perhaps not quite so elaborately, at Gerf Hussein and Derr.

Gerf Hussein, Pr R^2-ms-s mry Imn m pr Pth, probably also dates to the Viceroyalty of Setau. The outer parts have been ruined and it is impossible to know whether there was originally an elaborate dromos as at es-Sebua. The arrangement of pronaos and related rooms was very similar to that at es-Sebua. The major decorative distinction was to be found in the columned hall, where the walls were dominated by eight carved niches with triads of the king and deities [104].

The outer parts of the third of the late temples, ed-Derr [105], Pr R^2-ms-s mry Imn m pr R^2, were also badly destroyed, although the depiction of the cult images survived in the sanctuary rooms. It was usually assumed that ed-Derr was the latest of the temples to have been built, parts of it being only summarily decorated. Spalinger [106] argued it was much earlier, on the evidence of the spelling of
the name Ramesses as R^c-ms-sw. It seems likely that, following the construction of Abu Simbel the three temples, es-Sebua, Gerf Hussein and ed-Derr were conceived as a unit, each attached to the pr-domain of one of the state gods. It is significant that the triads at Gerf Hussein include Ramesses m pr R^c and Ramesses m pr Imn as well as Ramesses m pr Pth.

Following the precedent of Amenhotep III, the earliest temple of the reign, at Aksha, was dedicated to the "Living Image of Wsr-M3^c t-R^c-stp.n-R^c", otherwise hnty cndj.f tp t3 with the additional epithets nb t3-sti. One of the doorways carries the name: Wsr-m3^c t-R^c dsr sfyt and the Amun depicted is called Amun hry ib pr Wsr-m3^c t-R^c nb T3 Sti [107]. At Amara, Ramesses completed the temple of Sety I and appears to have been worshipped as ntr c3 Nb T3-Sty hry ib mwn Pr Mn-[M3^c t-R^c] [108].

A change in the worship of the divine king certainly took place before the first sed-festival, and during the decoration of the temples of Aksha (2nd Hall) and Abu Simbel [109]. It may be dated around year 15 [110]. The cult of the 'living image' gave way to a series of divine manifestations, which may be categorised, on the basis of their iconography, as:

1. Human-headed with solar aspect.
2. Human-headed with lunar aspect.
3. Falcon-headed with solar aspect.
4. Falcon-headed with lunar aspect.

Alongside these there were two other divine forms: the personified royal name and the king assimilated with another deity as, for example "Amun-of-Ramesses".

The solar aspects of the king, both human- and falcon-headed, continue the divine associations of the 18th Dynasty kings. The lunar aspect of the divine king also has human- and falcon-headed forms, and can probably be seen as a development of the Living Image cult of Amenhotep III. Both solar and lunar forms can be depicted wearing the divine costume (simple shendyt kilt) or with the more
elaborated 'contemporary' long robe. They are called by both nomen and prenomen, which can be written with, or without, cartouche.

The 'Thoth chapel' at Abu Simbel [111] contains some striking images which reveal the complex associations of the royal cult. The chapel's decoration includes two large-scale depictions of sacred barques. One of these, on the south wall, shows the barque of Thoth hry ib Imm-hry-ib (Abahuda) [112]. The high prow, characteristic of a solar barque, supports a human-headed falcon crowned with a solar disk, but the stern has a falcon aegis with lunar disk and crescent. Behind the barque stands a figure of its cult image - not a figure of Thoth, but a falcon-headed human wearing the double crown to which are added wavy ram horns and pendant uraei. This deity is called "the Perfect God, Great of Wonders m pr ms nb hps nb t3wy War-m3Ct-Rc-stp.n-Rc nb hCw Rc-ms-s-mry-Imn" [113]. In what way this cult related back to the chapel of Horemheb at Abahuda is impossible to know.

While the solar and lunar forms of the king have a close relationship to the earlier royal cults, the personified royal name takes on an importance which it does not seem to have had before. The earliest examples of the royal name in statue form belong to the reign of Amenhotep III [114] and a fine statue group depicted Amenhotep III as Nb-m3Ct-Rc mry Dhwy [115] in which the squatting royal image (nb) was crowned with the sun-disk and carried the m3Ct-feather. Such 'cryptic' writings of the royal name began to proliferate in the later-18th Dynasty, and are common on the jewellery of Tutankhamun [116]. A particularly elaborate example at Abu Simbel is to be found on the south jamb of the main entrance [117]. Of significance, the name Ramesses, is there written with the figure of Re, followed by a child god with lunar disk and crescent carrying the symbols sw and s [118].

Now the personified name takes on a new significance - being in some temples the cult-image in the sacred barque. Three forms of the personified royal name are attested in the Nubian temples. At Abu
Simbel the most common is the icon of the king with a falcon-head surmounted by solar-disk and carrying the wsr-sceptre and Maet-feather. This image is found in many cartouches throughout the temple [119], and in its most majestic form within the niche over the entrance to the main temple [120]. Here the wsr-sceptre and Maet-feather flank the king, rather than being carried by him. The two panels of low relief on either side of this niche show the king offering his name (a figure of Maet carrying the wsr-sceptre and squatting in the nb-basket) to his name. There is no evidence from the sanctuary rooms that this was the form taken by the cult image of the king, although that might be suspected.

At ed-Derr the personification of the royal name certainly was the cult-image within the sacred barque. Here, the image depicted behind the barque is of the king wearing a short wig surmounted by a solar-disk, and carrying wsr-sceptre and Maet-feather [121]. Inscriptions refer to the image as Rc-mw-pr-mr-Inn m wi3 m pr Rc. As Bell observed [122], this cult image is itself a representation of the royal ka.

The north wall of the Thoth-chapel at Abu Simbel [123] shows a barque with falcon aegides, which is described as that of "Ramesse-mer-Amun (written without cartouche) m wi3 ntr "[124]. The image behind the barque is most arresting: instead of a figure of the king himself we find the personification of his name, but unlike the comparable images elsewhere in the temple, it is female [125]. The goddess Maet is here depicted with solar disk and feather on her head, and carrying the wsr-sceptre. There are numerous examples where the royal name is written with a Maet figures wearing sun-disk and carrying the wsr-sceptre, but these all occur within a cartouche [126]. It is only in the Thoth chapel that the personified royal name is shown as figure of the goddess herself. As at Derr, there are strong reasons for believing that this was the form of the cult-image within the barque of the king. It should not be discounted that there may have been a number of different cult images which occupied the shrine as appropriate to various feasts.
All of these images have some sort of precedent in the 18th Dynasty, but a new form of divine association seems to have been developed in the later years of the reign, at the time of the construction of es-Sebua, Gerf Hussein and Derr. Now the divine image was described as "Amun (or: Ptah, etc)-of (n)-Ramesses (or: Usermaatre)". The images of the king (both relief and statuary) also acquire the descriptions m pr Imn/Pth/ Rc.

At es-Sebua, the complexity of these cult-forms is demonstrated by the reliefs in the sanctuary [127]. These show two sacred barques: one, with a ram aegis, is said to contain the image of "Amun-of-Ramesses in the house of Amun". The second barque, with falcon aegis, holds the ssww-hwi of Ramesses in the House of Amun. On the stand of this second barque, Ramesses II is "beloved of the Amun-of-Ramesses in the House of Amun". Ptah-of-Ramesses occurs at Gerf Hussein, as does Hathor, Mistress of the Southern Sycamore of (n) Ramesses-mery Amun m pr Pth [128]. The less-common form, using the prenomen, is found at Abu Simbel [129]. Here the deity, called Imn n Wsr-m3Ct-Rc-stpn-rc (with no cartouche), is ram-headed, with curled horn and solar disk, but no uraeus.

The divine king as "Amun of Ramesses" was also worshipped at Amara, where the cult continued into the late 20th Dynasty [130]. At Sebua, the Amenhotep III chapel was reconstructed by the Viceroy Setau, at the time of the construction of the Ramesside temple. Here, the local form of Amun, "the Lord of the Roads", was once depicted as a recumbent crio-sphinx [131] and Bell [132] suggests that there may have a relationship with the similarly depicted Amun of Kawa. Ramesses II was himself merged with this manifestation of Amun as "Amun of Ramesses the Lord of the Roads".

Broadly, it can be said that the royal cult in Nubia during the reign of Ramesses II developed from that of the later 18th Dynasty kings - although this was doubtless by reinvention and revision rather than any Darwinian evolutionary process. The later forms embraced both solar and lunar aspects, with human and falcon
iconography. Significantly, the divine manifestations could be called by either the nomen or the prenomen. At Soleb the Living Image of Amenhotep III had been Nebmaetre, and at Faras the surviving evidence suggests that Nebkheperure was the form used. All of the known rebus writings associated with Amenhotep III and Tutankhamun had employed the throne name. With Ramesses II, the nomen and prenomen are employed with equal frequency, or perhaps with a greater frequency for the nomen. Quite frequently the nomen is written rather than . This has been considered as a chronological determinator, but at Abu Simbel both forms are used, and it also occurs in the later temples [133].

The reign of Sety I had looked back artistically, and perhaps spiritually, to that of Amnehotep III. Ramesses II moved away from this, and in some ways more closely followed the course taken by Akhenaten. But, whereas Akhenaten removed the images of deities and focussed upon the king with an abstract solar god, Ramesses II multiplied all forms and associations of the royal image.

The sacred barques and their images have already been noted, but these were not the only portable statues kept in the temples. A number of stelae from es-Sebua depicts a portable-shrine containing divine statues [134]. On these, the figure of the king is shown wearing the khepresh with a solar disk above it, flanked by Amun and two other deities, one possibly wearing the white or double-crown [135], the last a goddess with disk and horns. In all cases the naos has carrying poles and large lion images at the side [136]. A statue of Ramesses II, "Ramesses-mer-Amun-Beloved-like-Horus", probably at Miam, may have possessed land in the district of Tonqaleh where stelae of Ramesses II and the Viceroy Setau refer to it [137].

In addition to statues there were other divine images. Two Ramesside stelae refer to fields owned by the of Amun Lord of Thrones of the Two Lands, (Faras) [138]. Also important must have been the -staffs, associated with the ka. The east wall of the Thoth chapel at Abu Simbel is divided into two
panels by the large-scale image of a mdw-staff [139]. This has a falcon head with the same double-crown, wavy horns, solar disks and pendant uraei as the image of the king on the south wall of the chapel. It also has the curled ram's horn. The staff is flanked by two deities, Amun-Re-Harakhty-Khepri and Amun of Napata. A stela from Amara West shows a staff with a royal head and Šwty-plumes [140].

The Late New Kingdom

No temples of comparable size were built for the royal cult in Nubia in the later 19th Dynasty. Doubtless the cults of the later kings were accommodated in the existing temples. At Amara West statue niches were constructed for the twt-image of Amenemesse [141].

Papyrus Harris I (10, 1-11, I) names a ka-chapel of Ramesses III in Nubia. The chapel was called Pr (R^c^-ms-sw ḥk3-Iwnw) | cḥrp wd3 snb C3 mḥtw. Grandet [142] suggested it was to be identified with Amara, since the name suggests a frontier location, and is paralleled in the papyrus with another foundation in Canaan (probably Beth-Shan).

Although the building of large temples ceased, the dedication of royal statues, some specifically cult-images, continued in both Nubian and Asiatic [143] dominions until the time of Ramesses VI. The Pennut text records the donations to the statue of Ramesses-Amenhirkhepeshef-son-of-Amun-lovely-like-Horus Lord-of-Miam [144]. The statue shown in the scene is a standing figure with blue crown, pointed kilt and supporting two ensigns with ram's heads and solar disks. The Pennut text also refers to a statue of queen Nefertari which continued at Miam. At Amara, also during the reign of Ramesses VI, an inscription was added, presumably with a new image, to the statue-shrine of Amenemesse. The dedication of cult-images, and their endowment with land is not the action of an administration conscious of its own impending demise.
Despite the sudden collapse of Egyptian authority in Western Asia, during, or soon after, the reign of Ramesses VI, control of Nubia continued, and alongside control, veneration of the ruler: Ramesses IX is invoked as a deity in an inscription from Buhen [145].

The complex imagery of the New Kingdom royal cult is less well documented during the Third Intermediate Period in Egypt, although kings still built 'Houses of millions of years' and priesthoods attached to royal statue cults continued until the Ptolemaic period. Cults of members of the 25th Dynasty royal family are known from Egypt, but from Nubia itself there is little evidence that this most obvious sign of Egyptian acculturation had any lasting influence on the practice of religion on Nubia.

The broader influence of the Egyptian cults in Nubia is a more complex issue. The primacy of the Amun cult in the Meroitic state has long been seen as a 'residue' of Egyptian rule. Less attention has been drawn to some specific manifestations which might suggest either continuance, or renewal of New Kingdom cults. The worship of the crio-sphinx at Kawa during the New Kingdom is found at nearby Pnubs during the Meroitic period. At Sanam the chief deity was Amun-Re-the Bull, Lord of Nubia, which seems to look back to the earlier 18th Dynasty, and in Taharqo's temple (B300) at Barkal, the image of a falcon-headed 'Horus, Lord of Nubia' was included.

It will remain difficult to assess the impact of Egyptian religion until sites (such as Kawa) which continued to flourish from the viceregal period to the Kushite kingdom are excavated.
Part 2

THE EMERGENCE OF THE KUSHITE STATE
The Nubian 'dark age'.

Post-pharaonic Nubia presents a twofold problem: firstly, an historical 'Dark Age' covering the whole of Nubia from Aswan to the 2nd or 3rd Cataracts (opinion is divided) between the end of the New Kingdom and the rise of the 25th Dynasty; and secondly, an archaeological "hiatus" in Lower Nubia lasting the entire 1st millennium BC.

Until recently, all scholars have written about Third Intermediate Period Nubia within the context of the accepted Egyptian absolute chronology - either because they are Egyptologically trained, or because they have felt unable to criticise the chronology, whatever problems it may have created in their analyses of the evidence.

The period between the end of the Viceregal administration during the last years of the 20th Dynasty, and the first datable inscriptions of the 25th Dynasty in the 8th century is frequently treated as a 'Dark Age', and the apparent 'lack' of archaeological material is balanced by a corresponding increase in the use of colourful language:

"Napata, with the great Amun sanctuary at its heart, is lost to view in a perplexing historical void," [1]

"Nubia vanished entirely from history. Its erstwhile Egyptian conquerors had returned to their native soil, and the indigenous population had retreated somewhere into the wilderness of Upper Nubia, whence they were to emerge with a vengeance three centuries later." [2]

The concept of a 'Dark Age' has taken root in Nubian studies, but unlike the comparable, and contemporaneous, Dark Ages of Greece and the Near East [3], has not, until very recently, been discussed [4]. The idea of a Nubian Dark Age is to a degree accidental, resulting from the examination of two different questions within the context of
an accepted absolute Egyptian chronology, and from an Egyptian perspective. Some fundamental questions raised by the material, and by its interpretation, have, as a result, never been pursued. This approach accounts for the attitude adopted by many scholars to the period; indeed, one may suspect that a number would have treated it very differently had they not felt obliged to conform to the accepted chronology. The currently accepted absolute Egyptian chronology may be correct; but if it is, some difficult questions arise concerning events in Nubia during the Third Intermediate Period.

Nubian history during the Third Intermediate Period has been discussed relative to one of two major issues: either the collapse of the Viceregal administration, or the rise of the kingdom of Kurru, its conquest of Egypt and rule there as the 25th Dynasty. These two issues have nearly always been viewed as separate and unrelated phenomena. Indeed, discussion of this period has been Egyptocentric, concerning itself with those problems directly related to Egypt, and also using Egyptian type evidence. Thus in periods where there are no large stone monuments or hieroglyphic texts there is assumed to be some sort of hiatus or 'Dark Age'. At best, the assumption is that the region "regressed" to a "tribal level" [5]. This latter view is particularly applied to the part of the Nubian Nile Valley between Dongola and Napata, an area assumed to have been under Egyptian control during the New Kingdom.

Archaeologically, the "hiatus" in Lower Nubia has been considered within the broader context of an area assumed to have been devoid of a settled population from the later New Kingdom (by some, from the later 18th Dynasty) until the Ptolemaic period. The discussion here has centred upon interpretation of the evidence available, and as Adams [6] recognises, a conflict of opinion has arisen between archaeologists and philologists. Whilst those who have worked as field archaeologists in Lower Nubia agree actively (Arkell, Shinnie and Trigger) or tacitly (Hintze and Millet) with Adams that there was a lack of settled population in Lower Nubia during most of the 1st millennium BC, they are divided as to its causes. Adams and Shinnie
adhere to the view first proposed by Firth, that ecological problems were caused by declining Nile levels; Arkell and Desanges regard political motivation, the hostility between Egypt and Nubia, as more likely, whereas Katznelson suggests economic decline was a prime factor.

The widely accepted view is that a diminishing flow of the Nile throughout the New Kingdom resulted in a decline in agricultural production and an eventual exodus of the population; the Egyptian settlers and administrators, Egyptianised Nubians, local princes and some of their retainers to Egypt, and the rest of the indigenous population to Upper Nubia [7].

Some scholars thought that this decline in population and agriculture began as early as the 18th Dynasty [8] but the interpretation of the archaeological evidence used has been doubted [9]. Adams [10] conceded that Firth had underestimated the numbers of the later New Kingdom graves, but continued to emphasise the discrepancy in the numbers of identified graves of the 18th Dynasty and later. Trigger [11], discounted the explanation of hydraulic crisis for the de-population of Lower Nubia, but was equally certain that:

There can be no doubt that the archeological evidence indicates the total absence of settlement in Lower Nubia during most of the first millenium B.C. This means that the inhabitants of Lower Nubia could at most have been sparse, non-sedentary people who did not make or use pottery.

Although the Scandinavian Joint Expedition discovered extensive New Kingdom cemeteries in the Faras-Gamai region, Säve-Söderbergh [12], observed that it did not change the general picture of a gradual decrease in their number, and an increase in their poverty. One of the main results of this survey was the realisation that in this part of Lower Nubia a C-group tradition continued until quite late into the 18th Dynasty, but, significantly, that graves of typical C-group type contained only Egyptian-type pottery.
Any theory of major depopulation of Nubia in the 19th and 20th Dynasties also requires a rational explanation of the extensive temple-building and private dedications during this period. However, agreement is almost universal that from the end of the 20th Dynasty, or shortly afterwards (c 1080/1050 BC), Lower Nubia was without a significant population until the Ptolemaic period (c 300 BC onwards [13]), even if it is to be attributed to political rather than agricultural causes [14]. Jacquet-Gordon [15] was critical of the low-Niles theory, but her ideas have not been widely considered. For the post-25th Dynasty "hiatus", only Török and Priese have objected to the interpretation of the archaeological material, Török [16] on the grounds that such a no-man's land is rather unlikely in antiquity; Priese [17] arguing from the textual material for campaigns of 'Late Napatan' kings in Lower Nubia. Recent re-evaluation of the material from Dorginarti suggests an Egyptian military presence in the Late Period [18], and Lower Nubia may have been the scene of sporadic conflict between Egypt and Kush. There is some evidence for a nomadic, or semi-nomadic population, but any settled population must have been limited in number and living at subsistence level [19].

According to the most recent historical reconstructions, Upper Nubia was relinquished from Egyptian control by the end of the 19th Dynasty [20] or 20th [21]. It is argued that the Viceregal administration functioned during its latest phase from Thebes [22], or became the leader of an independent Lower Nubia, albeit briefly, before the 'evacuation' of the population [23]. Goedicke [24] and Trigger [25] have tentatively suggested that Upper Nubia was in the control of local princes from the end of the 20th Dynasty or contemporaneously with the 21st Dynasty an idea which may be implicit in the work of other writers [26]. Reisner's reconstruction of the chronology of the Kurru cemetery has now been challenged by Ali Hakem and Torok, although vigorously defended by Kendall.

Admittedly, archaeological knowledge of the area most significant for considering the rise of the independent Kushite kingdom, the
Dongola-Napata reach of the Nile, is limited. No major New Kingdom sites are reported from the region between Kawa and Napata, which, given the easily identifiable nature of Egyptian monuments elsewhere in Nubia, must be significant, and strongly suggests that there were no Egyptian 'towns' in this area. It can be argued that the evidence in this area has been lost; either because totally covered by sand, or destroyed. Large monuments certainly have vanished from this region [27], however, textual evidence and other available sources should also be considered, and even from the Napatan and Meroitic periods these record only Pnubs (Kerma), Kawa and Korti as major centres in this region. The alternative model for New Kingdom occupation of this region argued here [28] may ultimately be proved wrong: but this does not preclude its application and a consequent re-consideration of our preconceptions.

It is not surprising, in the light of the accepted reconstruction of late New Kingdom Nubian history, that most writers have treated the appearance of the 'Kingdom of Kurru' in the mid-9th century as a new beginning, and as a phenomenon largely unrelated to the end of the Viceregal period [29].

Whether the founders were of Libyan [30], Kerma [31], "local" [32] or Meroite [33] origin, or descended from Egyptian priests [34], most writers have accepted that some significant role was played by the temple of Amun at Gebel Barkal (Napata) in forming the Egyptianised state in Upper Nubia. Opinion is, however, divided, as to whether the influence was from a temple which had continued to function, and with Egyptian priests, throughout the Third Intermediate Period [35] or whether the cult was revived in the mid-8th century, perhaps by Kashta, as part of an expansionist programme by the Kushite rulers [36].

For Kitchen [37] the main concern within Nubia is the emergence of the Kushite kingdom as a power in the form of the 25th Dynasty, its rule in Egypt and its eventual expulsion by the Assyrians. Kitchen discusses the career of the Viceroy Panehesy, and includes the scanty
evidence for Egyptian activity in Nubia during the succeeding dynasties, but he gives little consideration to what else might have been happening in Nubia during the Third Intermediate Period. Indeed, few writers considering the end of the viceregal administration and the rise of the Kingdom of Kurru, discuss the 'dark age' itself, most restrict themselves to a passing comment on the lack of evidence from this period, or to generalisations.

Adams, in common with other writers [38] proposes that despite the uninhabited region which separated them, there must have been some continued intercourse between Napata and Egypt, and this, along with some vestigial influence from the time of Egyptian domination is generally seen as the stimulus for the emergence of the Kushite state. Adams [39] characterises the view:

After the abandonment of Lower Nubia, a native population which may have been of mixed C-Group and Kerma stock continued to occupy the Nile Valley above the Third Cataract. Recovering in time from the natural and political reverses of the Egyptian occupation, they developed a prosperous economy and strong local dynasty. Although by no means Egyptianised in culture, they retained from their earlier contacts a complex of Egyptian religious and political beliefs, including divine kingship, a state religion, and a dominant priestly caste.

All discussions of the rise of the Kurru kingdom have been based upon chronological premises which have affected the interpretation of the archaeological evidence. Reisner's original chronology was logically worked back from the, firmly dated, 25th Dynasty. Thus, 20th-dynasty material from the earliest burials at el-Kurru has been designated 'heirloom' [40], and similar explanations have been given for anachronistic material in other Kushite sites [41]. Other factors which might logically have been discussed within the context of a post-colonial Nubia, and which find parallels in contemporaneous Third Intermediate Period Egypt, have likewise been judiciously ignored or explained as 'Late Napatan' phenomena. The assumption of historians that the Viceregal administration was actually
disestablished, with the elites moving to Egypt, raises a number of issues which have never been resolved satisfactorily.

Following the model of New Kingdom power distribution advocated here, it is quite conceivable that with the withdrawal of the Viceregal administration, or its secession, in the reign of Ramesses XI, the power vacuum was filled by local princes. A number of rulers with 'Neo-Ramesside* titularies, a strikingly Third Intermediate Period phenomenon, have been ascribed to the 4th/3rd centuries BC on the slenderest of evidence [42], and, more disturbingly, the inscription of a Queen, Katimala (or: Karimala), universally accepted as of post-20th and pre-25th Dynasty date, is simply ignored in all discussion of this period of Nubian history [43].

Theoretical models of post-colonial systems have never been applied to Nubia, and the assumed emigration of the population never questioned. Indeed, archaeologists have been so bound by the Egyptian framework that the whole concept of a Nubian 'Dark Age* has never really been critically examined.

Whilst direct comparisons should be avoided, analogies with 20th century, and other, de-colonialisation may not be altogether irrelevant here, at least as indicators of the sorts of situations which can arise. It is certain that the end of the Viceregal administration was far more complex than modern writing on this period would suggest: it did not simply stop and go away.
The archaeology of Nubia after the New Kingdom.

One of the major problems afflicting Nubian studies, and one which is now being rectified, is the imbalance in the quantity, and nature, of archaeological material from the north and that from the south. This imbalance affects many periods and has been at the centre of interpretations and discussions of the Meroitic period [1]. The lack of archaeological material has - at its most extreme - been taken to denote no population in Lower Nubia, or at least no permanently settled population, for a period of three to four hundred years [2]. It is generally believed that the people must have resumed a semi-nomadic existence. Whilst reversion to nomadic or semi-nomadic has previous parallels - as at the end of A-group - the situation at the end of the New Kingdom was very different from earlier periods, and these factors need to be considered. If the population had been Egyptianized for close on five hundred years and settled for considerably longer (there is no evidence of disruption at the end of the Middle Kingdom), would they have naturally 'reverted' to nomadism? A period of cultural poverty - with subsistence economy, but no direct control by Egypt, would result in a lack of official monuments - but does not necessarily indicate that there was no settled people. The range of possibilities for what happened at the end of the New Kingdom is very wide [3].

Kendall [4] emphasises the problems of the relationship between archaeological remains and historical reality as revealed by the work of ethnoarchaeologists. Bradley's work with nomadic peoples in Sudan has similarly attempted to assess ways in which they might affect the nature of the archaeological record [5].

Lower Nubia is one of the most intensively excavated areas of the world, but many of the surveys and excavations were carried out under intense pressure. The work of Reisner and Firth, which first established the outline of Nubian culture, was forced to concentrate...
on cemetery sites. Firth himself was conscious of the pressure which obliged him to leave sites untouched, and lamented the number of sites which had already been lost or destroyed, either through the rising water, or pillaging [6]. With the exception of a small number of graves attributed to the 'E'-Group, Reisner and Firth found no notable remains which could be assigned to the period between the end of the New Kingdom and the 25th Dynasty. As Adams averred, the lack of sites from this phase is very suggestive: it is very unlikely that destruction or excavation of sites would be so selective. The re-assessment of the material from Lower Nubia by Williams in the light of the Oriental Institute excavations at Qustul, has, however, shown that greater understanding of the archaeological material, particularly the pottery, allows re- attribution of sites excavated earlier.

    New surveys have been inaugurated in Upper Nubia in recent years, and with the possibility of new Dams in the 4th - 5th Cataract region, these will doubtless increase. Any reconstructions of the rise of the Kushite state are thus based on inadequate material, and open to substantial revision with the recovery of new material. The recent seasons of work at Qasr Ibrim have demonstrated how radical re-assessment of long-held opinions can be necessitated by new evidence from one site.

    Most scholars have, until very recently, accepted the position of Reisner and Firth, reiterated by Adams, that Lower Nubia was without a settled population from the end of the New Kingdom until the 'Meroitic Renaissance'. The building work in the 2nd Cataract fortresses in the reign of Taharqo, is generally accepted [7] as indicative of the garrisoning of the fortresses as staging-posts, but not of a Kushite attempt to settle the region. The recent excavations at Qasr Ibrim have produced evidence of 'pre-Napatan' fortifications at the site, but again, this does not necessarily indicate wider settlement.
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In Upper Nubia, the surveys of Vila south of the 2nd Cataract, in the Dal-Abri Reach, identified a number of sites which contained material closely similar to that from Sanam and other southern Napatan sites. Vila ascribed his sites to the Third Intermediate Period or the 25th Dynasty. Despite the relatively large size of the Missiminia cemetery, Vila estimated that average population for the settlement was only about 30 people, throughout the period. The possibility of other as yet unexcavated sites of the New Kingdom-Napatan period in Upper Nubia is widely recognised [8].

For Lower Nubia, the material from Reisner's post-New Kingdom phase, the 'E'-Group, was re-examined by B.B. Williams who has found that they bear a strong resemblance to a cleft/boulder type of grave which occurs farther south in Lower Nubia. In the publication of the '25th Dynasty and Napatan' remains excavated by the Oriental Institute at Qustul, Cemeteries W and V [9], Williams surveys all of the material from Lower Nubia which can be ascribed a 'Napatan' date. Throughout this survey, and similarly with that from Upper Nubian sites, material is called '25th Dynasty' or 'Napatan' rather than being ascribed to the Third Intermediate Period/Pre-Napatan. Whilst it must be acknowledged that there has been relatively little attempt to analyse the development of amulets during the Third Intermediate Period (these being one of the most significant categories of finds) there must remain a suspicion that the attribution of the grave material as 'Napatan' has, if only subconsciously, been influenced by preconceptions about the history of Lower Nubia during this phase. Williams notes that Steindorff's attribution of some later material from Aniba to the New Kingdom may have been influential.

Whilst the majority of writers would accept that Upper Nubia was settled during the period between the end of the Viceregal administration and the 25th Dynasty, there is still a general belief that the archaeological material - even with Williams's re-attributions - is insufficient to fill the period between c 1070-700 BC in Lower Nubia [10].
Reisner's E-Group

In his first season of excavations at Shellal Reisner [11] identified a culture which he thought was 'post New Kingdom'. In Cemetery 7 he attributed graves 138-140, 148, 152-160, 165-171, 179-182 and 191-194 to this phase. The skeletal material was [12] mostly identified as 'negro' or 'negroid', with extended burials.

Grave 181 Reisner called "typical E-Group". It contained various amulets "not identifiable either with the New Empire nor the Ptolemaic amulets found at this site, and may be assigned to the Later New Empire or possibly to the Early Byzantine period (X-group)"[13].

There were some contracted burials with E-Group characteristics [14], but most were skeletons extended on the back (6) left (12) or right (4) hands on, or before, the pelvis with head to west (varying 15 s of w to 35 n of west), the bodies wrapped in coarse cloth. Only grave 181 had amulets. Reisner commented that "Their exact date is very puzzling" and concluded that they were late New Kingdom "but absence of pottery makes even this date problematical".

Few other graves were assigned to this group in the 1st Archaeological Survey, and the term seems to have dropped altogether by the later Surveys: Adams [15] does not even mention it. Shellal is very close to Aswan, and it would be possible for a small settlement to have existed there which did not necessarily represent a culture spreading throughout the whole of Lower Nubia.

Archaeological material attributable to the late Third Intermediate Period has always been assigned to the 25th Dynasty, and usually associated with a reoccupation of the forts during that period [16]. Temple building and reconstruction in the forts can certainly be dated to the reign of Taharqo, and, it has been generally assumed that there were garrisons if no permanent settled population [17].
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The Archaeology

Vila noted the strong similarities between the burials at Missiminia and those at Sanam and Meroe West Cemetery. Vila designated some of his material "Third Intermediate Period" or "pre-Napatan". The material from Lower Nubia was re-examined by Williams who established a number of criteria for dating sites to the '25th Dynasty/Napatan Period'.

Burial Customs

A. Grave types

A number of different grave types can be attributed this period, largely on the evidence of their contents. All except the 'cave-graves' (with axial chambers), have antecedents in Nubia. The boulder/cist tomb is not reported from Sanam or Meroe [18]. Later interments in New Kingdom Graves are attested at a number of sites (Qustul VC 46; Maharraqa 131-1; Aniba SA; Buhen Cemetery J), but Williams noted that the only large chamber tomb to have been constructed was on Matuga Island.

Burial shafts were variously broad and rectangular; narrow and rectangular; rectangular with rounded ends or corners (even hide shaped); and rectangular with side-chamber. None of these types is exclusive to the period.

Cist graves, constructed of stone slabs or boulders, often arranged around a cleft in the rock, were of a type which occurred in the later C-Group [19] and also the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period at Aniba [20]. If Williams's attribution is correct, this would make Kaganarti the largest Cemetery of this period.

One group, comprising an irregular tomb with single wall (VF 72A) and circular graves with flexed or contracted burials (W 46, Argin 6-
B-18, 24 and G-3-24), contained Sanam "type III" pottery: a difference of custom, rather than date.

B. Burial types

Bed burials occur at Qustul (W 1, W 42, VC 46) and in Cemetery 121 and Cemetery 131. Evidence is from bed remains, or a shaft with four holes or two trenches excavated to receive the legs of a bed. In earlier phases the burials were contracted and lying on their sides, but during the 25th Dynasty/Napatan extended on the back. Grave goods, particularly pottery were deposited - contrary to contemporary Egyptian practice and the Kushite equivalent.

The 'modified Egyptian-type' was attested at Sanam, Meroe and Abri, and was characterised by a wrapped body with mask and bead-netting, possibly with personal jewellery and amulets, and a libation table. There were no canopic jars or actual evidence of embalming. Williams notes that no true coffin has survived, although evidence from Missiminia suggested that there had been coffins (or perhaps cartonnage) in some of the burials there. Some burials combine the bed and modified Egyptian type.

Williams suggested that shallow pit or regular round holes with burials contracted on the side, and containing Napatan pottery, represent a difference in tradition; "these were not merely poor burials" [21].

Cleft graves made in the gebel or cliffs, surrounded on one side with stones, or put into a shallow hole surrounded with a circular superstructure were more difficult to assess. Some contained 25th Dynasty/Napatan pottery, but most cannot be dated by associated goods. Some of these graves belong to the New Kingdom, some may be very late (ie 3rd-4th centuries AD). They resemble burials in the Eastern desert and probably represent a distinct cultural tradition. [22]
Grave-goods.

Material from a range of Lower and Upper Nubian sites closely parallels that from the major "Napatan" cemeteries of Sanam, Kurru and Meroe, and the more limited material from Kawa.

Pottery

Vila drew attention to the parallels between the Missiminia pottery and types from Meroe, Sanam and Kawa [23]. Williams found similar types at Qustul. The most distinctive types are the tall, red-burnished cups; deep, grey-brown bowls or beakers (especially those with red rim-bands); and the jars of form V. These types do not occur in New Kingdom contexts and correspond to Third Intermediate Period and later materials in Egypt and 25th Dynasty/Napatan in Nubia. Heidorn has recently re-examined the pottery from el-Kurru, and has noted the presence of Theban marl wares and imported Phoenician storage jars.

Glyptic

Glyptic is one of the most important categories for the dating of the Kushite material, because of the large and distinctive collection assembled from the cemetery of Sanam [24]. This included specialised forms of udjat, often pierced below the brow and statuette amulets which have parallels from Meroe as well as Egypt [25]. The iconography of many of the faience amulets has striking parallels in the 'Egyptianising' ivory work excavated at Nimrud, and other artefacts from as far afield as Carthage, all having their origin in the Phoenician workshops.

Inscribed Egyptian objects from Nubia.

Although a large number of Egyptian objects of Third Intermediate Period date have been excavated in Nubia, only a small number carry the names of rulers. Of these, most belong to Egyptian dynasts who
were contemporaries of Piye; a gold amulet [26] from Meroe W 816 belonged to the Great Chief Pimay [27], probably to be identified with Pimay of Busiris son of Shoshenq, one of the Great Chiefs of the Ma mentioned on the stela of Piye. A silver plaque, perhaps the lid of a box, inscribed with the name of Nimlot was discovered in the Treasury at Sanam [28] and a bronze situla with the name of Peftjauawybast was found at Kawa [29]. An alabaster jar fragment of "the Commander of the Army, Pashedenbastet, the justified, son of the Lord of the Two Lands Shoshenq" (perhaps Shoshenq III), was discovered in the burial of Queen Akheqa at Nuri [30]. On the basis of this inscribed vase fragment, Reisner advocated an Egyptianised Libyan ancestry for the Kushite royal family [31].

Earlier rulers are attested only by two scarabs and a jar fragment. A good quality steatite scarab from Sanam Grave 316, is inscribed with the name ḫ₂-bpr-IPC-stp-a-IPC [32], for Shoshenq I or Takeloth II. Also from Sanam, Grave 495, was a scarab inscribed with the name ss-ass-B3stt-mr-Imn [33], most probably for Shoshenq III [34].

Further material, including scarabs of Shoshenq I, Shabaqo and Psamtik I [35], was excavated at Gebel Moya in the southernmost attested region of Kushite influence [36]. Also associated with potsherds of the Gebel Moya culture was a scarab with the name Neferkare (presumably for Shabaqo), similar to one from Sanam [37].

Upper Nubia.

Williams termed the excavated material from the Lower Nubian cemeteries 'Napatan' or '25th Dynasty'. A number of monuments of 25th-dynasty date were already known from the region [38] and the recent work at Qasr Ibrim has shown that that site was occupied from the 10th century BC onwards. Further south, Vila's work attributed sites in the Dal-Abri reach to the period between the end of the New Kingdom and the 25th Dynasty. The major sites south of the 3rd
Cataract - Tabo, Kawa, Sanam, el-Kurru, Barkal and Nuri - have cemeteries and temples which can be certainly dated to the 25th Dynasty. Problems of interpretation remain, however, with those sites which pre-date the 25th Dynasty. Of these, el-Kurru is certainly the most significant, having been recognised as the ancestral cemetery of the Kushite rulers ever since its excavation.

The Cemetery of el-Kurru.

The cemetery of el-Kurru [39] is the only major excavated archaeological site in Upper Nubia the dating of which to the Third Intermediate Period is universally accepted. The latest burials in the cemetery were assigned by their inscribed contents to the 25th-dynasty kings Piye, Shabaqo, Shebitqo and Tanwetamani, and their consorts. Reisner's interpretation of the archaeology of this site went unchallenged until quite recently. Now re-examination of material from the graves has raised the possibility that Reisner's interpretation may be wrong. Indeed several new interpretations have been offered, and the cemetery has become the focus of some considerable controversy.

Reisner's interpretation and chronology.

Reisner [40] divided the earliest fourteen tombs amongst six generations, the last of which was Kashta. Working from a base date of 751 BC, Reisner estimated the date of the commencement of the cemetery, postulating generations of 30 years, as c 930 BC. Dunham reduced the generation estimate to 20 years and concluded that the cemetery was begun around 860 BC [41].

Reisner allotted the early tombs to the six generations according to development from the suggested earliest, a simple tumulus burial, through increasing elaboration into mastaba structures [42]. He also assumed that the prime site in the cemetery marked the earliest burial, with those following choosing the best available position.
Alternative interpretations

Kendall [43] began a re-assessment of the cemetery, to include the quantities of unpublished material which are in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. He identified 20th Dynasty objects in the earliest burials, which, in itself, showed that there was something fundamentally wrong in our assumptions about the chronology of the cemetery. Kendall hinted that the graves should be spread over the period from the 20th Dynasty to the reign of Piye, perhaps assigning them to more than Reisner's six generations [44]. This interpretation has also been proposed by Ali Hakem [45], and now by Török [46].

Ali Hakem [47] questioned Reisner's chronology pointing out that the usual conservative nature of funerary practice and belief might suggest a longer time span for development: the six stages of development might therefore be spread over more than six generations. He also noted that there was an apparent absence of children and women buried in the cemetery, therefore it was possibly reserved for the burial of male rulers only [48].

Ali Hakem [49] attributed each grave to a "ruler", increasing the number to 16. Working from a base date of 750 BC (the end of Kashta's reign) Ali Hakem offered three estimates for the commencement of the cemetery, one based on Reisner's 30-year generation, one on Dunham's 20-years and one based on the 17-year generation estimated for the Nuri cemetery. This produced dates of 1230 BC, 1070 BC and 1022 BC respectively. The first Ali Hakem rejected on the basis of evidence for firm 20th Dynasty control at least as far as Kawa. He suggested that the 1022 date was perhaps too low, and preferred that of 1070. Ali Hakem's preferred date accords closely with the date generally accepted for the end of the 20th Dynasty, around 1070 BC, and consequently suggests the immediate appearance of local rulers. Since there is actually no evidence that the owners of the earliest graves had adopted Pharaonic style, there would, theoretically be no objection to the highest of the dates.
calculated by Ali Hakem. In this case a family of 'chiefs' ruling the 4th Cataract region during the time of Egyptian hegemony would have assumed power after the collapse of the Viceroyalty.

Török [50] has argued that Kurru was a dynastic necropolis divided into two well-defined units: with kings buried in the main part and the 25th Dynasty queens in the southern part. The burial place of pre-25th Dynasty non-ruling family members remains unknown to us. Török [51] calculated on a 20-year generation with Kashta ruling 760-747 BC, and arrived at a date of 1020-1000 for the reign of the first ancestor buried in Tum 1.

Kendall, rejecting his own earlier reassessment has recently defended Reisner's interpretations [52]. Reisner thought that the 16 burials preceding Piye had contained female as well as male bones. From this factor, allied with the apparent groupings of 'peculiar features' into pairs or threes, Kendall concluded that the cemetery belonged not to 16 separate rulers, but to their wives and perhaps other members of their families as well.

Kendall proposed that the New Kingdom material might be 'heirloom' [53], the preferred interpretation of anachronistic material [54]. Kendall supported his defence of Reisner's view of the development and short chronology against the proponents of a long chronology with analyses of the skeletal material, carried out by Lane Beck [55], and of the pottery, by Heidorn [56]. Beck re-examined the material and altered her identifications of some skeletons. Kendall has suggested the possibility of an extra generation [57], but still prefers a short chronology [58].

One further possibility is that the cemetery actually comprises two groups of graves [59], which have no familial, or dynastic connection; one dating from the late New Kingdom, the other to the early 25th Dynasty and its immediate predecessors. Kendall, although preferring a sequential interpretation, has acknowledged that the question should be considered [60]:
The most important element in the puzzle ... is the problem of determining whether the ancestral tombs are sequential and evolutionary and follow one another in order without significant chronological gap, or whether the distinct types of tombs among them represent isolated clusters, each representing separate periods of cemetery use, possibly unrelated to each other and separated by significant gaps in time.

The possibility needed to be voiced for the sake of completeness [61], since Reisner's view - that there were different grave-types in each generation - is not paralleled elsewhere in Nubia. Indeed, such a rapid development seems rather unlikely. As Kendall himself noted, Reisner later worked out a similar progression from tumulus to pyramid in Egypt. This, almost 'Darwinian', concept of evolution, is surely mistaken, and tomb-types possibly represent differing cultural traditions. If the cemetery did contain two or more clusters, the earlier could be attributed to local New Kingdom rulers, whose cemetery was then adopted by the emergent 25th Dynasty.

The development of the cemetery

Ali Hakem [62] commented on the destruction of the superstructures, noting that the tombs were supposedly those of venerated ancestors. Destruction during the post-meroitic period does not account for Kurru 1 remaining, or that some of the mastabas were preserved to a height of 1.20m. Kendall [63] argued that the destruction of the superstructures resulted from the nature of their construction. All of the earlier burials lay directly beneath the superstructures, which effectively sealed them, so when looting began the superstructures were pulled down to get at burials; much later, villagers dragged off any loose blocks.

There is general agreement that the earliest burials (Generations A and B) were tumuli of various types. Ali Hakem [64] observes that these tumuli, covered with earth and gravel and sometimes enclosed with a stone wall, reflect affinities with Kerma traditions.
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The form of the later burials has become a subject of some dispute, and it remains uncertain whether those of the later generations were in fact pyramid tombs [65]. Reisner himself [66] could not determine whether the burial of Piye had been a mastaba or a pyramid. As Ali Hakem notes [67] Reisner presumed the remainder to be pyramids without any further clarification [68]. The superstructures were absent and only the shallow foundation trenches remained with a very few blocks [69].

Reisner suggested a development from enclosed tumulus to mastaba and then to pyramid. Kendall has suggested that this development is probably wrong, and that there was a sudden transition to small pyramids with mastaba bases [70]. All of the superstructures were quarried away to ground level, with only Ku 13 and 8 preserving more than one course of masonry. These courses indicated that the structures had had nearly vertical sides [71].

Reisner stated that the superstructures were mastabas "an assumption now almost universally accepted", but Kendall notes [72] that Reisner had originally called the burials pyramids, and only began to have doubts about this when he got to Ku 13. From Reisner's diary Kendall notes that Ku 13 was preserved to a height of 4 courses above the foundation course and had a mastaba slope not a pyramid slope. From this observation Reisner suggested a number of possibilities: plain mastaba, mastaba with conical or pyramidal top or a mastaba topped with a dome. In the chapel of Ku 8 Reisner found a pyramidal "cap-stone" [73].

Kendall proposed that the later burials were pyramids and observes that

Given their extensive contact with Egypt or Egyptian religious authorities, the Kurru chiefs of the period can probably be expected to have received copies of funerary papyri illustrating pyramid tombs... [74].

Ali Hakem does not rule out the possibility that the later tombs were also square mastabas, commenting that a "reduced mastaba" was the
prevailing form of royal tomb during the 22nd and 23rd Dynasties [74].

Kendall has now given a new interpretation of the grave types, based, in-part, on unpublished notes of Reisner.

Assigned to Generation A/1 [76] were three tombs, the most important being Ku Tum 1. Kendall disputes the interpretation of these earliest tombs as "circular gravel mounds, rubble pitched" and suggests that Dunham's drawing [77] "may only be a hypothetical realization of Reisner's published observations" as there is no equivalent in Reisner's original maps and plans. From the Reisner diary Kendall suggests that Ku Tum 1 was actually "a steep-sided structure, faced on the exterior with rough dry masonry and filled with rubble" of the type associated with the C-group [78].

Kendall [79] concludes - as Reisner did - that "the three tombs of Generation A formed a primary family group and must have been nearly contemporary". Kendall assigns Ku Tum 1 to a man because of "its primacy and large size". The others were females "very likely successive wives - or the mother and wife" of the man whom he calls "Lord A".

The tombs of Generation B, Ku Tum 6 and Ku 19 [80], had round ground plans with low horseshoe-shaped enclosure walls opening to the east. Ku Tum 6 also had an eastward-facing chapel of mud brick. Ku 19 had trenches for a bed burial. Kendall reports that Reisner's original plans [81] show constructional details not reproduced by Dunham [82]. This evidence indicates that the graves had circular masonry outer casings with nearly vertical sides and that they looked like short truncated cylinders. The original height was at least that of the offering chapel ie a roofed room. The blocks were well-cut, unlike those of Gen. 1, suggesting to Kendall that the builders "had suddenly become familiar with the arts of quarrying and cutting blocks of stone", and he proposes Egyptian involvement. Kendall attributes Ku Tum 6 to "Lord B" and Ku 19 to his wife. From this
Kendall develops a theory that "the wives' tombs at Kurru were always built to the S or SW of their husbands', which placed them symbolically at the ruler's 'right hand sides'."

Generation C, Ku 14 and Ku 13, saw a change to square superstructures with more or less rectangular enclosure walls. Reisner thought that Ku 14 was planned with a circular inner wall which was later altered to a square. It appeared that Ku 13 was square from the start, so slightly later. Kendall [83], noting that the circular trench is smaller than the usual diameter, but that the square walls are of similar size, interprets the circular wall as simply a constructional feature. This would have allowed the superstructure to be built before the burial, the central area being filled in afterwards. This interpretation seems, however, to be contradicted by Kendall's reconstruction drawing of Ku 14, which shows a torpedo-shaped dome emerging from the mastaba [84]. No explanation of this is given in the discussion and indeed, no parallels seem to exist in Egypt or Nubia for such a type.

As in Ku 19, Ku 14 contained a trench for bed legs and had the unusual orientation E-W. Kendall attributed the better-built Ku 14 to a male "Lord C", and the less-lavish Ku 13 to a female.

To Generation D [85], Reisner attributed Ku 11, 10 and 9. These were side-chamber tombs with square plans and chapels facing east, surrounded by rectangular enclosure walls. A trench for a bed was found in Ku 10. Kendall modified Reisner's sequence, identifying Ku 11 and 10 as Generation D and Ku 9 and 23 to Generation E. Ku 21, which Reisner had placed in Generation E, Kendall attributes to Generation F (Reisner's Generation I).

Generation E [86], Ku 9 and Ku 23, provided the first trace of a stela niche in the west wall of the chapel and an excavation photograph shows a plain offering table of Egyptian type which is otherwise unrecorded, but may belong to this tomb [87]. From the surface debris between Ku 9 and 23, and possibly from either, was "a
very crude, heavy hollow cast bronze leg terminating in a bird's talon" [88]. Kendall speculated that this formed part of a falcon or ba-bird which had been mounted on the superstructure of one of the tombs.

Reisner noted that the chapel and superstructure of Ku 8 were originally of "grey stones" identical to the preceding burials, but were later reconstructed with "heavy yellow stones" of the type used in the tomb of Shebitqo [89]. Fragments of relief and painted plaster were recovered. Reisner's comments hint that he regarded the tomb as a reconstruction of the time of Shebitqo.

The objects from the burials.

The thorough looting of the site has considerably confused the interpretation of the material, since, in many cases, it is impossible to be certain to which grave many of the objects originally belonged. Also, little of the material can be considered as diagnostic, since detailed work on Late New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period typologies is still in its early stages.

Amongst the material recognised as late New Kingdom discovered in the earliest tomb at el-Kurru is a decorated faience bowl [90]. Kendall originally made much of this object and suggested that the burial perhaps belonged in the immediate post-20th Dynasty. Now [91] he suggests that these and similar pieces might be heirloom, pillage from New Kingdom graves or:

might equally well post-date the New Kingdom, but how long such "Ramesside" wares could have continued into the Third Intermediate period is not known.

In addition to the bowl, Ku Tum 1 also contained many fragments of blue or green faience with black-painted decoration, "all clearly Egyptian and, one would think, also of late New Kingdom date" [92]. Notable amongst these faience fragments were parts of a lotus chalice [93], a bowl with unintelligible decoration [94], and two fragmentary
vertical-sided vessels of green faience [95]. Törökö pointed out that similar faience vessels to those found in Ku Tum 1 had also been found at Debeira [96].

Other artefacts from the Kurru burials, notably the faience amulets, fall into what is generally thought of as Third Intermediate Period types. Amongst these are several types which have striking iconographic parallels in the Nimrud ivories [97].

A rectangular faience plaque from Ku Tum 6 of Generation B carries an hieroglyphic text, which Kendall suggests to be a personal name - that of the tomb owner [98].

Calcite vessels from the Kurru graves have close parallels with material from a number of sites, as widely spread as Nimrud and Assur (these, Assyrian booty from Syria-Palestine) and the Phoenician cemeteries of Spain [99]. Of Generation A/1 [100], Ku Tum 1 and 5 contained Egyptian calcite vessels of the New Kingdom [101] and some fragments of strap-handled amphorae of classic 18th-dynasty type [102].

In Ku 19 (Generation B/2) was a large strap-handled amphora of late 18th-dynasty type with a stopper, and another stopper of red jasper [103]. Kendall says that the objects "would almost certainly seem to be Late Eighteenth to early Nineteenth Dynasty in date" [104]. Heidorn [105] dates the pottery of this tomb to the Third Intermediate Period and suggests Theban connections for some types.

The graves of Generation C (Generation 3) contained more calcite vessels [106] and faience [107] none of which is published. From Generation D (Generation 4) burials came blue faience, an 18th dynasty type calcite amphora [108] and a lug-handled alabstron of 25th Dynasty/Napatan type. Kendall admits it cannot be determined how much of this material might be intrusive from earlier or later burials.
As with the faience, Kendall argues that the calcite vessels should be eliminated from consideration as good chronological indicators.

Other categories of object proved equally difficult to date precisely. The earliest burial, Ku Tum 1 (Generation A/1) [109] contained a large quantity of jewellery, some in gold. This included a cornflower pendant [110], either reused or an Egyptian import. Further gold jewellery was found on the corpse of Ku 2 (Generation B/2). This included a necklace of double-cone beads with a janiform pataikos, with hawk headed deity on the reverse, and an inscribed gold nugget with a text mentioning Amun [111].

A scarab, pieces of ivory, gold, shells from the Red Sea and inlay pieces of lapis lazuli were all recovered from tombs of Generation C/3 and from those of Generation D (Generation 4) gold beads and foil, ivory, Red Sea shells and unworked obsidian [112]. These pieces suggest that the Kurru "chiefs" had wide-ranging trade connections. The lapis-lazuli must have come through Egypt (unless it was re-used), and the ivory from the central Sudan.

A wooden bed from Ku 13 yielded a Carbon date of 2760± 50, or 1073-810 BC [113]. The lower date Kendall finds consistent with his expectations for this grave, but the "upward curve" might be attributable to the age of the bed at the time of burial which, he comments "may already have been quite old, predating the tomb by many years". There is no indication of the type of wood used, or what part of the trunk. The object, in fact, could be considerably younger than the dates obtained.

Pottery might have been thought to be a more specific dating criterion, but again there have been problems of interpretation. A number of vessels with painted decoration in a typically late-New Kingdom style was discovered in Ku Tum 6 [114], Ku 19 [115] and Ku 13 [116]. Some are of buff pottery with black decoration, but most are fragments of polished red-ware with figures painted in white line.
They formed parts of large amphorae and heavy stemmed and footed bowls. Kendall [117] points out that the amphorae were made with holes in their bases, so could not be used for storage, and that the funerary nature of the decoration indicates manufacture for the funeral ceremony itself. Although some have mummiform figures painted on them there was no indication of mummification in the tombs where they were discovered. Kendall concludes [118] that there were experts in Egyptian ritual in the Napata region and thus:

here we would seem to have good evidence ... that the Egyptian sanctuaries ... continued to flourish during the dark centuries after Egyptian political withdrawal ... and came to exercise a powerful influence on the local native elite and the incipient Kushite monarchy.

From all of these Generation A/1 [119] tombs were fragments of a peculiar square pottery jar [120] a type close to that from the cemetery at Debeira East [121]. Säve-Söderbergh dated most of these graves to the mid-18th Dynasty, but Kendall notes pilgrim bottles of 1st millennium type [122] and in any case "the Egyptian objects, like those at Kurru, need not necessarily be contemporary with the graves" [123]. A squat jar also appeared at both sites [124].

From the graves of Generation B (Generation 2) came fragments of bright red-slipped wheel-made pottery with painted decoration [125]. The vessels appear to have been large amphorae and decorated with mummiform figures and mourning women. There were also fragments of other red-ware vessels, all of which seem to have been purposely smashed. Kendall associates the evidence with the ritual of breaking vessels at the end of the funerary meal and concludes that this "dramatic evidence" proves that "Egyptians were now advising the Kurru chiefs and orchestrating their funerals" [126].

Heidorn produced a study of the pottery now in Boston MFA. Notable amongst these types were the Phoenician storage jars found in Ku 19. These are found in contexts as early as the 11th century BC [127] and Török [128] used this in support of his long chronology. Heidorn commented that although these "do indeed belong to a type
that has been dated in other contexts to a period ranging from the mid-eleventh to the ninth centuries B.C.\text{"}, most of the other pottery types are dateable to the 8th and 7th centuries [129]. The dating of this other pottery is based largely upon Aston's study of Third Intermediate Period tomb groups [130]. Other parallels were dated by Jacquet-Gordon more generally to the Third Intermediate Period. To resolve the discrepancy, Heidorn suggests that Aston's dating is perhaps a little low, and in order to synchronise all of the evidence, his pottery typology should be regarded as beginning a little earlier. Hence the Phoenician jars would be at the end of their usual date-range but still compatible with the other pottery and the chronology of the cemetery as understood by Kendall and Heidorn. Heidorn had already allowed the possibility that the Phoenician jars had appeared slightly later than they would in their 'natural' contexts, since she commented that "Phoenician storejars were well-manufactured and may have been reused over a long period of time".

The skeletal material has proved as difficult to assess as most of the other material from the cemetery. Kendall thought that Beck's identifications of such skeletal as survived supported his reconstruction of the chronology of the Cemetery. He attributed to each generation the burial of "chief" and a "wife". Occasionally, when a third burial seemed to belong to the same group/generation, these were assumed to be either an heir who predeceased the chief, or a second wife. Törökök challenged Kendall's thesis, pointing out that the female burials in Ku Tum 4 and Ku 19 contained sets of arrowheads [131]. Beck has now confirmed her analysis [132], and states the skeletal material from el-Kurru in Boston Museum of Fine Arts includes "remains of thirteen males, thirteen females, and five individuals of unknown sex". They range in age from individuals in their teens to older adults (ie over 50 years of age).

Whilst Kendall's re-assessment of the Kurru cemetery and the material from it has led to some controversy, much more information has been presented than was hitherto available. Nevertheless,
Kendall's choice of material, as he himself admits, has been highly selective, and the problems of interpreting the Kurru cemetery seem only to increase.

Kendall published a block of relief from the chapel of Ku 9 [133] which had been described, but not illustrated, by Reisner. The relief shows a man's head in profile wearing a most unusual helmet-like crown [with] an attachment like a uraeus, but which is really no more than a loop, without any serpentine character. It seems imitative of the uraeus without explicitly duplicating it. From the back, falling from a slight projecting attachment, is a streamer, which would seem to be a precursor of the familiar ribands of the later kushite crown. The top of the helmet clearly had a crest of some kind, but the form is unintelligible. [134].

Kendall attributes the burial to Alara, assuming Kashta to have been responsible for the construction and decoration of the chapel. The relief is certainly of great importance, and it is unfortunate that no more of the chapel decoration has been recovered, to permit a fuller interpretation.

In addition to his work on the cemetery material, Kendall also drew attention to unpublished records in Reisner's diaries of excavations in the village of Kurru which had located remains of walls, perhaps part of a fortress. One of these Ku 1200, was a "fort wall of poor masonry" with a rounded bastion [135]. Ku 1300 was of better construction, straight and at least 200m in length. A corner was located at the NE, and there were remains of a gateway [136]. Nothing was recovered which helped to date the walls, although Reisner speculated that he had discovered the palace of Piye. Kendall points out the topographical relationship of Kurru and Barkal, and suggests the possibility that there was a major river crossing here. This evidence is certainly of great importance and it is unfortunate that there was not more excavation and recovery of diagnostic material from the sites.
Interpreting the data: the role of the 'Kurru chiefs'

Discussing objects of Third Intermediate Period date discovered in the Kurru burials, Török [137] countered Dixon's [138] notion that these were the result of sporadic trade or "more likely, casual 'drift!'" by suggesting that such Egyptian luxury goods may indicate that "these local princes enjoyed the political support of Egypt or of some circles in Egypt". Indeed, it is highly unlikely that such objects, including some with royal names, 'drifted', casually or otherwise, from Egypt to Napata. It is far more likely, as Török says, that these were diplomatic presents or elements in the gift-exchange system.

In beginning to reassess the background to the emergence of the Kushite state Kendall had tentatively speculated on a continuity from the New Kingdom, but has now abandoned this position assuming instead that Kurru represents "the resumption of the archaeological record following an informational hiatus - and apparent cultural/political discontinuity - after the New Kingdom of nearly two centuries". Kendall now follows a traditional view - indeed, he has resurrected the idea advocated by Breasted, that a major stimulus to activity at Barkal was priests fleeing from Thebes.

Kendall previously emphasised the New Kingdom faience and alabastra [139], but now regards much of this material as inadmissible chronologically; it must be taken as "heirloom", or perhaps preferably, pillage from earlier graves. Török has now focussed on this period and is opposed to Kendall's use of the archaeological material. He criticises Kendall's stance: "To declare it heirloom, antiquities and exotic and being thus of no chronological significance", preferring to be more orthodox and try to date by it [140]. Török actually dates the el-Kurru cemetery to the period following the end of the New Kingdom, so a quantity of the material, notably the calcite vessels attributed by Kendall to late 18th-dynasty types, cannot be contemporaneous with the burials.
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There are, as has been discussed, a number of alternative interpretations of the chronology of the Kurru cemetery and it seems unlikely that these will be resolved until all of the material excavated has been assessed. In the "long chronology" proposed by Ali Hakem and Török, the cemetery would begin shortly before, or shortly after, the end of the Egyptian New Kingdom. Kendall's "short chronology" assumes an hiatus before the establishment of power by the chiefs and the beginning of the cemetery. The radical, and highly controversial, reduction in dates for the New Kingdom advocated by James and his collaborators would result (assuming their maximum reduction of 230 years) in two further possibilities. Assuming a "long chronology" of sixteen generations of c 20 years, the earliest graves would belong to the early 19th Dynasty. Following Kendall's short chronology of six generations, the earliest burials would belong to the mid-20th Dynasty.

The 'chieftains' buried at el-Kurru were presumably the rulers of the region between Korti and the 4th Cataract, before expanding their power northwards. As such they would have been able to command the desert road to Meroe, and hence the transport of the 'luxury' products of the central Sudan. This would itself account for the quantity of Egyptian manufactures found in their burials. Control of these commodities may itself have led to military expansion to protect their monopoly. That Kushite materials continued to be sent to Egypt is evidenced by a number of sources.

Kendall [141] suggests that these chieftains were exploiting the gold mines in the Napata region and that this formed part of the base for their wealth. The burials at el-Kurru contained quite large quantities of gold, most of it worked, but also including a large natural gold nugget which had been inscribed in hieroglyphic [142]. It is uncertain whether the gold mines of the 4th Cataract region would have produced sufficient quantities for it to have been a significant export, and the 'luxuries' produced by the central Sudan, ivory, ebony and incense are more likely to have formed the basis for their power. The presence of Red Sea shells in the burials suggests
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strong contacts with the eastern Sudan. The lapis-lazuli, if not reused from earlier graves, must have been acquired through Egypt.

As argued above, there is no reason to believe that the administration had withdrawn from Upper Nubia during the 19th Dynasty; indeed, the evidence indicates that it still controlled as far as the 3rd Cataract until the reign of Ramesses IX. It is, of course, quite possible that the Kurru chiefs established their power in the 4th Cataract region during the later 20th Dynasty. It may not be necessary to assume a direct Egyptian source for the artefacts in their burials; such objects could have been manufactured by the artisans of the Viceregal administration in Nubia itself, either at Amara or Aniba, in which case they would represent the gifts exchanged for the products which formed the imw and b3kw of Kush. The painted pottery is suggestive of an artisan, trained at an Egyptian centre, working for the Kurru chiefs. This, in itself, does not predicate a large 'colony' of such artisans, nor indicate that all of the other Egyptian-type objects were manufactured at Kurru. It is not necessary to postulate a new contact established between Napata and Thebes (or the Delta) in the Third Intermediate Period, but the continuation of an already existing relationship throughout the period, and one which varied according to the power structures of Nubia and Egypt.

The Kurru cemetery contains a comparatively small number of burials and Reisner's attribution to a family of 'chiefs' therefore seems substantiated. However, little attempt has been made by writers to place this chieftdom within any context: where was their residential centre, and where was the remainder of the population buried? The location of Kurru strongly suggests that Sanam, which was certainly an important centre in the 25th Dynasty, was already their power base. Griffith suggested that the cemetery at Sanam was commenced during the reign of Piye, but there may be a case for review.
Sanam.

At Sanam [143] a cemetery, temple and a building called the 'Treasury' were the major remains excavated. The temple [144] was firmly dated to the reign of Taharqo by its reliefs and foundation deposits, and no evidence of an earlier building on the site was recovered. The material from the Treasury [145] was also datable to the 25th Dynasty and later.

The cemetery [146] is particularly important because it is the only non-royal one in the region of Napata which has so-far been excavated [147]. Although 1550 graves, some with subsidiary burials, were cleared, the cemetery was in part covered by the town of Abu Dom. Griffith [148] estimated that there had originally numbered possibly 1700 separate graves, many of which contained two skeletons, some were multiple burials, and some re-used. This suggested to him a minimum of 3000 burials, but he considered it impossible to make a satisfactory estimate. There had been no modern plundering of the site, although extensive ancient disturbance. None of the burials had surviving superstructures, increasing the difficulties of classification.

Griffith noted some problems in giving an exact date to the cemetery, although he finally argued that it was begun not earlier than the reign of Piye and ceased to be used within a century after the reign of Aramatelqo (given f1 530 BC). He commented [149]:

Now one might be tempted to think that some of the cave tombs at Sanam (especially 154 which, by exception, had remains at many different levels including a scarab of Sety II), began to be used at or not long after the end of the New Kingdom. But Dr. Reisner's researches at Kurru and Nuri prove that in the royal graves the old-fashioned vertical pit and side chamber did not give place to the stairway until Pi'ankhy, although the stairway thereafter continued as a regular feature beneath the royal pyramids at Napata.

The graves in the cemetery were variously (1) staircase graves, (2)
cave graves, (3) built graves with stairway, and (4) rectangular graves. Although most of the burials were badly preserved, Griffith was able to identify many which had contained fragments of bead nets, cartonnage and traces of coffins, all of which indicated mummiform burials. Griffith dated these mummiform burials as earlier than the contracted burials. Because the 'royal' burials at el-Kurru have staircases only from the reign of Piye (Piankhy) onwards, Griffith dated the mummiform burials, and the commencement of the Sanam cemetery, to that reign. The mummiform burials, he proposed, continued to the reign of Aramatelqo. The later stage of the cemetery, represented by the contracted burials, covered the century or so following. This period, Griffith believed, was one of declining importance for Sanam, indicated by the use of the temple as a factory for the manufacture of faience [150].

The contents of the graves again distinguished the two types of burial, those with mummiform burials, being of "purely Egyptian character" and those with the contracted burials having "barbaric admixture". The pottery, likewise, differentiated the burials. That connected with mummy burials was "entirely wheel-made, red in colour and of forms reminiscent of the New Kingdom", but "that of the contracted burials includes much that is hand-made, while the Egyptian wheel-made types amongst it, of a hard and pale fabric, are those which began in Egypt in the Saite time" [151].

A large number of scarabs with royal names was discovered, but these included kings of the Old and Middle Kingdoms, associated in the same grave with 18th, 19th or 25th Dynasty rulers [152]. Scarabs are a notoriously unreliable dating criterion, genuine New Kingdom scarabs having been discovered in Meroitic graves at many sites, and those with the names of some rulers, notably Thutmose III, continued to be manufactured into the Late Period. Some scarabs [153], were clearly contemporary with the named ruler. The scarab of Sety II [154] coming from a grave with several levels, had tempted Griffith to place some of the graves in the late New Kingdom or Third Intermediate Period. Two Third Intermediate Period kings were
represented by scarabs: Shoshenq I, and Shoshenq III. The 25th Dynasty and their immediate successors were represented by scarabs and plaques [155]. As at Kurru, parallels for the faience amulets and alabaster vessels can be found. A number of objects of Near Eastern origin were discovered in the graves, but mostly belong to the period following the 25th Dynasty. A Cypriote (perhaps Palestinian imitation) vessel with painted decoration [156] and spindle-jars [157] were notable amongst the pottery. From farther away in time and place was an Old Babylonian cylinder [158].

Without more detailed examination of the material it is difficult to establish a more precise date for the beginning of the cemetery. Griffith's analysis of the cemetery's chronology placed the mummiform burials earlier than the contracted burials, a conclusion which seems to be supported by the nature of the pottery associated with burials. However, there is the possibility that some of the burials may represent a different cultural tradition. Vila [159] suggested that the late graves at Sanam belonged to people originally from the deserts, who occupied the region after the destruction of Napata by the forces of Psamtik II in 591 BC.

Sanam stands at the end of the desert road to Meroe, on the south side of the river (here flowing NE>SW), and it is therefore protected by the river from attack from the Eastern Desert, known by the inscriptions of the New Kingdom and Napatan-Meroitic period to be the major source of problems. It is quite likely therefore that Sanam was the base of a chiefdom as early as the New Kingdom. This chiefdom would have controlled the desert road to the Shendi Reach. The Egyptian fortress of Napata, possibly on an island, dominated the Cataract and marked the Egyptian 'frontier'; Gebel Barkal as a religious site apparently developed considerably later than the founding of the fortress. This relationship of indigenous centre and Egyptian centre is already found in Lower Nubia where the Princes of Aniba were buried at Toshka, south of Aniba, and those of Th-ḥt at Debeira, when the centre was Buhen or Faras. If, as suggested in the model proposed for the New Kingdom, the acquisition of products from
the Shendi Reach was left in the control of the indigenous princes and passed by them to the Viceregal administration, then Sanam would doubtless have been a principal power base. The continuation of Sanam as an important centre during the Third Intermediate Period is thus to be expected, and the burials at Kurru indicate as much. It is possible that some of the burials at Sanam are in re-used graves of New Kingdom date belonging to the indigenous princes. The loss of all superstructures unfortunately renders confirmation of such a possibility difficult, but a close re-examination of the material from the Sanam cemetery is certainly a necessity.

Establishing firm documentary and archaeological evidence for absolute dating of Kushite civilization before the expansion of the 25th Dynasty remains more difficult.

Meroe.

Bradley [160], discussing material from excavations at Meroe city, describes several forms (cf her figs 2 and 3) "which were Egyptian or Egyptianesque of circa Dynasties XXII to XXV", and which also occurred frequently at Kurru and Nuri. All of the material comes from the bottom levels of the excavation, dated by Bradley to the 8th/7th century BC. Her form 101 was similar to one found in Ku.52 [161] and "related to a tradition of amphorae general throughout Egypt and the Near East in the 9th to 6th centuries BC" [162]. She suggests that some were possibly imported, but that the forms also occurred in wares which were apparently locally made; for which she cites form 89 and its variants, found also in the "Napatan" levels at Kawa [163] at Sanam [164] and in the West Cemetery at Meroe [165] occurring in both red-slipped or red-burnished local fabrics, and in very fine pink ware "which is obviously exotic".

The earliest so-far identified levels at Meroe City belong to the time of Kushite expansion of power into, or immediately before it.
The imported pottery at Meroe indicates that commodity exchange was established rapidly, if it was not already a significant factor.

**The archaeology of Nubia after the New Kingdom.**

Recent surveys and re-assessments have radically changed the perception of Nubia's post-New Kingdom archaeology. Nevertheless, there is still no consensus on the interpretation and historical reconstruction. Williams attributed the Lower Nubian material to the 25th Dynasty rather than earlier Third Intermediate Period, but in Upper Nubia, Vila assigned similar material to the period between the end of the New Kingdom and the beginning of the 25th Dynasty. There was almost certainly a continuity of population from Dal southwards [166], although there has been little excavation of sites of this period from the Dongola Reach. On the interpretation of the one site generally accepted as pre-25th Dynasty, el-Kurru, there is no agreement. Despite the problems related to specific issues, there is increasing evidence for the rapid emergence of an indigenous state and the possibility of a small population throughout Nubia. Re-examination of the historical material available, and the evidence from recently found inscriptional material from Elephantine supports the view of a more dynamic post-viceregal phase than was suggested by earlier archaeologists.
The Ramesside successors in Nubia.

The End of the Viceregal Administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharaoh</th>
<th>Reign Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses IX</td>
<td>19 years [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses X</td>
<td>9 years 6 months [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses XI</td>
<td>28 years [3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nubia in the later years of the 20th Dynasty was in the control of a family of Viceroys; Naherha, Wentawat and Ramessesnakht [4]. Their monuments are found in Egypt [5] and throughout Nubia, at Abu Simbel [6], Serra [7], Buhen [8], Semna [9] and Amara [10]. Amara remained the major southern centre of the Viceregal administration [11], and work continued in the temple there until the reign of Ramesses IX [12]. After his time, there are, so far, no recorded inscriptions of Viceroys or other officials of known date from the region south of the 2nd Cataract. The name of Ramesses X occurs at Kubban [13] and Aniba [14].

A letter dateable to the reign of Ramesses IX records activities in the region of the Eastern Desert of Upper Egypt and Nubia [15]. The letter is from the High Priest of Amun, Ramessesnakht and addresses the "feather-wearing Nubians" and the "bow-carrying Nubians of the land of Akuyta". These Nubians are accompanying gold-washing teams, and have apparently been successful in defeating š3šw-bedouin of Muqed [Mw-kd] on the Red Sea. The letter states that the bedouin had previously attacked "the land of Egypt". If this really does mean the Nile Valley, and not simply the gold-washing stations, then they would have constituted another of the groups which were a problem in later Ramesside times. The letter does demonstrate that there were still groups of Nubian troops, probably mercenary, in the Egyptian service late in the 20th Dynasty. Akuyta was itself in the Eastern Nubian Desert, and had earlier been a focus of military action by the Egyptians.
A number of documents from Egypt shows that there were Kushites settled and working there [16], and, whatever the attitude of individual Egyptians towards the southern dominion [17], official policy continued.

The Egyptian empire in Western Asia had come to an end in the reign of Ramesses VI, but although there may have been a withdrawal from Upper Nubia at some point prior to the reign of Ramesses XI, there is no certain evidence of crisis there. The appearance of Panehesy in Thebes, and his involvement in events there for an extended period, suggests that control of Nubia, or at least Lower Nubia was fairly secure.

The Viceroy Panehesy.

The 'suppression' of the High Priest of Amun, Amenhotep, during the reign of Ramesses X or early in that of Ramesses XI, is a rather difficult historical question, the events and political motivation of which remain obscure [18], despite Wente's detailed analysis. The event cannot even be dated precisely, although it must have occurred between year 10 of Ramesses IX and before year 9 of Ramesses XI [19]. The High Priest Amenhotep was ousted by a rival and apparently spent eight months petitioning Amun and the pharaoh for redress. Aldred [20] argued that the events may have taken place during years 8 and 9 of Ramesses XI. Cerny [21] had noted that in year 8 there was a reduction in the number of workers employed on the royal tomb, and Aldred suggested that they had perhaps been conscripted by the rival High Priest to oppose Panehesy.

Differing motives have been attributed to Panehesy's appearance in Upper Egypt [22], and he has been seen variously as the one who removed the High Priest Amenhotep from office [23], or the one who reinstated him [24], in either case with the royal approval. The evidence seems to support Wente's interpretation, that Panehesy was, at least initially, acting as the king's agent in restoring the High Priest, and attempting to bring order to an anarchical Thebes.
It is certain that Panehesy entered Upper Egypt with soldiers from the Nubian militia, eventually campaigning as far north as Hardai [25] in Middle Egypt and perhaps into the Delta itself. Wente [26] argues that the 'barbarians' who seized Medinet Habu in the sixth month of the suppression of Amenhotep [27] were probably the Nubian troops of Panehesy, since they are called 3ccw, not the usual term for Libyans in this text. Papyrus BM 10053 [28] of year 9 of Ramesses XI [29] details an investigation headed by Panehesy into the depredations by priests at Medinet Habu [30]. There is also evidence for summary execution by the Viceroy [31]. Some local people, sheltering in Medinet Habu, were taken into slavery [32], and others, like the wab-priest Peison fled, when Panehesy dismissed their superiors [33].

Panehesy is further attested at Thebes in year 12 of Ramesses XI [34], and was probably still there in year 17 [35], when Ramesses XI addressed a letter to him, and sent the Royal Butler Yenes to convey a shrine and various commodities to the north [36]. The Viceroy had apparently left Thebes by year 19 [37]. The year 12 text gives Panehesy an extraordinary array of titles: Fan Bearer on the right hand of the king, Royal scribe, general, Overseer of the granaries of [pharaoh], [King's son of] Kush, Overseer of the southern foreign lands, leader of the troops of pharaoh.

The Tomb Robbery Papyri have a number of references to soldiers of the Nubian battalion resident in Thebes in year 17 of Ramesses IX [38] and year 1 of the phmn mswwt [39] although it is not entirely clear from the context whether this was some sort of occupying force, or simply a contingent from Nubia.

The campaign against Hardai (Cynopolis, modern esh-Sheikh Fadl) has usually been interpreted as part of the war against the High Priest [40], but Aldred [41] argues that it was most likely part of the campaign by Panehesy, referred to in the texts as mdwt-cu. How far north Panehesy and his force campaigned—and what his intentions were, is unfortunately not known. It seems that this time may have
seen a breakdown in order amongst Kushite troops left in Thebes. Aldred [42] drew attention to the violent destruction of the sarcophagus of Ramesses VI, and the damage to other royal mummies, which, he argued, indicated activities by a large gang who were not professional tomb robbers. This major looting of the royal tombs possibly took place during the period of Panehesy's campaign in the north. Aldred emphasises a number of texts which attest the presence of Ramesses XI in Thebes [43], possibly to see the destruction wrought by Panehesy, and his force, and to institute the whm mswt.

It seems, therefore, that having called Panehesy into Egypt to settle problems, Ramesses XI needed to despatch another army to drive him out. The military head of this campaign was certainly Herihor.

Year 19 of Ramesses XI marks the beginning of the whm mswt 'Repeating of births', commonly termed 'Renaissance' era. Kitchen [44] writes that from year 19 all of Egypt and Nubia were divided into two great provinces, each under a chief whose common link and sole superior was the pharaoh. These two powerful officials were Nesubanebdjed ('Smendes') and Herihor. Nesubanebdjed, of whom nothing is known before this time, controlled the Delta region, Memphis and Nile the valley as far south as El-Hiba or the entrance to the Faiyum: at some point he assumed the kingship [45]. Herihor bore the rank of Generalissimo, alongside the titles High Priest of Amun at Karnak, and Viceroy of Nubia.

Herihor's assumption of the title Viceroy of Nubia must have taken place after year 17 of Ramesses XI, when Panehesy is still attested as the holder at Thebes. Herihor [46] was an army General, before being given the offices of High Priest of Amun and Viceroy of Nubia. He also, within the precinct of Amun, assumed the royal style [47].

Herihor, as Kitchen rightly emphasises, was 'king only within the Karnak precinct. For one man to have been invested with the offices of High Priest of Amun and Viceroy of Nubia whilst retaining control of the military, circumstances must have been extraordinary.
However, it should be emphasised, that Herihor's position as Viceroy can never have been more than titular.

It is only from the beginning of *wmt msyt* and with the appearance of Herihor in Thebes that there are signs of antipathy towards Panehesy. Wente proposes, surely correctly, that the opposition of Herihor and Piankh to Panehesy, and perhaps also to Ramesses XI, may provide an explanation for the Viceroy's defamation in Renaissance era texts [48].

Panehesy continued to control Nubia, or at least Lower Nubia, and was buried at Aniba. Was it the government of Ramesses XI who removed Panehesy from office, and sent Herihor, as his successor, with the rescript to make the word fact? Or was Panehesy still loyal to the delta ruler, against the ambitions of Herihor and his family? The role of Ramesses XI in all of these events is unknown.

Herihor died in year 6 (last attested) or 7 of the Renaissance, his successor Piankh, being called Viceroy of Nubia and High Priest of Amun, General and Army leader in an oracle text of year 7 [49]. Piankh was formerly thought to have been a son of Herihor; he was possibly a son-in-law [50]. Recently, Niwinski and Jansen-Winkeln have proposed that Piankh was the predecessor, rather than successor of Herihor [51].

Active hostilities against Panehesy seem not to have commenced until after the death of Herihor. Kushite produce was being sent to the delta residence in year 17 of Ramesses XI [52], when, it seems, Panehesy was still in Thebes. The Tomb Robbery Papyri of year 19 (year 1 of *wmt msyt*) refer to Panehesy with a determinative indicating he is regarded as an enemy [53], but the *inw* was still being paid in year 4/5 of *wmt msyt* [54]. This suggests the possibility that Panehesy and his troops withdrew, or were forced out of Upper Egypt around year 18 or 19 of Ramesses XI, but that the Viceroy still acknowledged the pharaoh and continued to send the tribute. The correspondence of Dhutmose and Piankh relating to the
Nubian campaign all dates to year 10 of wgm mswt [55], and Panehesy is mentioned by name, apparently as the opponent of Piankh in one of the letters [56]. There is no evidence from the archive, or any other source, to show that there had been military actions against Panehesy before that year. It is perhaps significant that the records of the tomb robbery trials in year 1 of wgm mswt contain oaths sworn by the witnesses that they might be sent to Kush, be mutilated and sent to Kush, or sent to the battalion of Kush [57].

The letters of Dhutmose invoke Horus of Kubban and Horus of Miam [58]. It seems likely that the fortress of Kubban was the base of Piankh's troops, since Panehesy was buried at Aniba [59], which had been a principal seat of the Viceregal administration throughout the New Kingdom. These latest letters date from the end of year 10, when Dhutmose and Piankh were still in Nubia, but the result of the campaign remains undocumented. At Thebes, a graffito of Butehamun is dated to "3 shomu day 23" without a year, but is probably 3 days into the following year, 29 of Ramesses XI or 11 of wgm mswt [60]. The text refers to the return of "the General" to Thebes, certainly meaning Piankh. With the death of Ramesses XI, which must have occurred soon after this, Piankh also vanishes, to be succeeded by his son Pinudjem.

A successor of Panehesy in Nubia?

An inscription in the North Temple at Buhen is dated to the reign of Ramesses XI by its cartouches, but seems to belong to a Vicereoy other than Panehesy.

The ex-voto is carved on Pillar 7 of the forecourt of the North Temple [61]. The official stands with one arm raised in adoration, the other holding the hwi-fan, hk3-sceptre and sash, typical attributes of a Fan-bearer on the right hand of the king. Two vertical lines of text separate the figure from the object of adoration, two large cartouches of Ramesses XI surmounted by solar disks and feathers. The whole ex-voto is rather crudely carved. The
hieroglyphs in the cartouches are not well-formed, and those of the text are more difficult, resulting in some difficulties of reading.

The official bears a number of titles, \( r-p^c h3ty-c imy-r pr n Imn s3 nsw n Ks imy-r sn^c wh htpw n ntrw nbw T3-hnty \) [62]. The name is damaged, and Caminos was adamant that it could not be read as the name of Panehesy, as it had been understood by Breasted [63], Reisner [64] and others [65].

The first sign, a flying goose, is, in Caminos's opinion, either \( tn \) or \( km(3) \), not the \( p3 \)-bird. Those following are more difficult. Caminos suggested that the final group designates the official "son of the Overseer of the Storehouse Sethmose". Smith [66] read the name "Kema...", and Kitchen [67] "Tjeni...". Bohleke [68] tried to emend the damaged word, or name, as the title \( t3y hw hr wmy nsw \) "Fanbearer on the right hand of the king", a usual Viceregal title, proposing that the Viceroy himself was called Sethmose.

It is unknown when Panehesy became Viceroy, and it is possible that the Buhen inscription belongs early in the reign of Ramesses XI. An earlier date might be preferred since Panehesy is attested close to the end of the reign of Ramesses XI, although, on the new model proposed by Jansen-Winkeln, there may be room to accomodate this official after Panehesy.

The Disestablishment of the Viceregal administration.

The disestablishment of the Viceregal administration is suggested to have occurred at the end of the reign of Ramesses XI. Even if hydraulic crisis had caused depopulation, there must have a point at which the Egyptians decided to quit Nubia, and this issue has never been adequately discussed by writers on the period [69]. Whilst it is perhaps possible that the elites would have gone to Egypt, without severe agricultural disruption in Nubia itself it is difficult to believe that the agrarian proletariat would have moved. O'Connor [70] suggested that the intensity of Herihor's and Piankh's
campaigning in Nubia was responsible for the de-population, but again it is difficult to see what the Egyptians would have achieved by this, other than the repression of a formidable military opponent who was threatening the security of Upper Egypt. If the titular Viceroys in Thebes were attempting to re-establish Egyptian authority over Nubia there would be little point in driving out its population. In any case, the intensity of the campaigning is hardly likely to have been greater than that of the pharaohs of the early 18th Dynasty who established Egyptian control over Nubia; they did not drive out the population. The disestablishment of the 500-year old administration can hardly have been effected overnight, and the land-holding officials may not have wanted to abandon their property.

It was the record of Panehesy's presence in Thebes earlier in the reign of Ramesses XI, and the appearance of Herihor and Piankh with the Viceregal titles later in the reign, which led Reisner [71] to suggest that Thebes had been the Viceregal centre in the late 20th Dynasty. This is fallacious; but has maintained an unwarranted authority in literature [72]. Viceregal titles continued to be held by Theban royalties and officials of the 21st and 22nd Dynasties, but opinion has, until very recently, been unanimous that this does not indicate a continued Egyptian control of Nubia. Newly published material identifies more Viceroys of Third Intermediate Period date and combined with the new archaeological evidence from Qasr Ibrim, requires us to reconsider Egyptian activities in, and attitudes towards, Lower Nubia.

The lack of Viceregal monuments in Upper Nubia after the reign of Ramesses IX, although the area is inadequately surveyed and excavated, suggests that fragmentation may have begun in the late 20th Dynasty. The campaigning of Panehesy in Middle and Upper Egypt during the early years of Ramesses XI, and possibly as early as the reign of Ramesses X, would have presented ample opportunity for new powers to establish themselves in Upper Nubia. Even if he was not resident in Thebes, Panehesy seems still to have been involved with the area as late as year 17 of Ramesses XI, and the political
situation in Egypt possibly distracted him from events in more southerly parts of Nubia. Certainly, the campaigning of Herihor and Piankh would have preoccupied the Viceroy in Lower Nubia, and possibly have forced a withdrawal of troops from the southern garrisons, if not an abandonment of the territory south of the 2nd Cataract.

The excavations at Amara suggested the possibility that the site had been systematically closed down, rather than simply abandoned, or destroyed in a period of unrest. Given that the latest work there belongs to the reign of Ramesses IX, it is perhaps possible that the reigns of Ramesses X or Ramesses XI saw a withdrawal by the Egyptians back to the 2nd Cataract in the face of rising Kushite power. This, of course, is speculative, but the later years of the reign of Ramesses XI must have been marked by considerable political disturbance in Nubia and in Upper Egypt. However, Panehesy may still have acknowledged Ramesses XI as his sovereign, even if the king and government had technically deprived him of office. The death of Ramesses XI, and with it the end of the Dynasty, may have been the turning point in the political situation in Nubia. With a new dynasty in the Delta, and the High Priests of Amun at Thebes arrogating the royal style, the successor to Panehesy, and perhaps other Nubian chiefs, may likewise have assumed the symbols of a power they already actually possessed.

The Ramesside successors in Nubia.

After the reign of Ramesses IX Upper Nubia may have ceased to be directly under the control of the Viceregal administration, and the local princes may rapidly have established their authority. Lower Nubia continued under Viceregal control until the end of the dynasty, but no documents detail what happened after the death of Ramesses XI.

It was widely assumed by earlier archaeologists that there was a major depopulation of Lower Nubia at this time, due to hydraulic crisis. Any depopulation may have been the result of changing power
configurations in Nubia itself rather than the result of direct external (ie Egyptian) activities. If, as is proposed here, post-viceregal Nubia came under the sway of indigenous princes, military conflict between them, or simply the establishment of local centres may have had a considerable effect upon the population distribution; elites attaching themselves to the various 'courts'. Movement of population, or depopulation, may have taken place over a longer rather than shorter period.

Initially, Nubia was perhaps divided amongst a number of princes who, with the establishment of new dynasties in Egypt, adopted the Egyptian royal style. Whether a dynasty arose, or whether a number of different princes vied for preeminence, is, of course, impossible to say. The cemetery at el-Kurru is certainly of Third Intermediate Period contemporaneity, and there is now considerable debate whether the earliest burials date from as early as the later 20th Dynasty [73]. Nothing from the burials, however, implies that these "chieftains" had assumed the Egyptian royal style, but such rulers might be identified from monuments which have usually been given a considerably later date.

The 'Neo-Ramesside' kings of Kush.

The term 'Neo-Ramesside' was first used by M.F.L. Macadam to designate features of the art and titularies of a number of kings attributed to the Late Napatan or Early Meroitic period [74]. The formation of the names used by the kings, and certain features of the art of the period suggested a revival of Ramesside styles.

The kings categorised as Neo-Ramessides, and dated to the period (within broad limits) 320-275 BC, are:-

1. Mn-M3c-t-Rc-stp-n-R<Imn> Ktsn ("Aktisanes")
2. Wsr-M3c-t-Rc-stp-n-Rc Iry (Aryamani or Ary-mi-Amun)
3. Kash-[, ...] mry Imn
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4. Irike-piye-qo
5. Sabrak-ramani mry Imn iec-m-Npt

Of these only the first and second can properly be said to carry Neo-Ramesside titularies. The epithet mry Imn attached to the names of Kash- [...] and Sabrak-ramani is common, and particularly common in Egypt during the New Kingdom, Third Intermediate Period and is used again in the Macedonian period. Irike-piye-qo, himself, carries no epithet which can be considered Neo-Ramesside, and he is included only because inscription Kawa XIII [75] records him as predecessor of Sabrak-ramani. Sabrak-ramani's prenomen iec-m-Npt had been used as a Horus name by Piye (Piankhy). Kash- [...] mery Amun is known only from a fragment of gold leaf from Kawa [76] and cannot be associated with any other ruler. There is nothing in the textual or archaeological sources to link 'Aktisanes' and Aryamani with the other three rulers, or with each other.

All of these kings have been attributed to this period, the turn of the 4th-3rd centuries BC, on the premise that they were buried in the pyramids at Barkal, which, although carrying no royal names, have, on stylistic grounds, been dated to the period c 320-275 BC [77].

The dating of these 'Neo-Ramesside' kings is thus based on circular arguments: the attribution of the uninscribed Barkal pyramids to otherwise undated kings, who are themselves linked together as a group through their supposed 'Neo-Ramesside' titularies. A further contributory factor is the 'stylistic' evidence, which reduces to the "poor Egyptian" in which the inscriptions of Aryamani are written, and the decoration of the Kawa Temple B. Indeed a debased form of Egyptian culture is generally regarded as a Late Napatan phenomenon, if not its signature, immediately preceding the revival of the early Meroitic period [78].

Irike-Piye-qo, his successor Sabrak-ramani, and Kash- [...] mery Amun are not Neo-Ramesside names and therefore are not considered
further in the following discussion. They may belong to the period 320–275 BC, and they may have been buried at Barkal: but the proof is absent.

Menmaetre-setepen-Amun Ktsn 'Aktisanes'.

Three monuments are attributable to this ruler:

1 Door jamb from Gebel Barkal (Macadam 1947).
2 Slab from B 501 (Dunham 1970: 34 (25), pl XXXVII).
3 Text from Nuri (Priese 1977).

Macadam first published the cartouches preserved on a door jamb found at Gebel Barkal, belonging to an hitherto unknown king. He dated this ruler to the period 350–150 BC on two premises: as owner of one of the Barkal pyramids, already dated by Reisner to the 'Late Napatan' or 'Early Meroitic' periods; and because the epithet Stp-n-R® was also found in the cartouches of King Ary (Aryamani) at Kawa, which Macadam had attributed to the same period.

The text on the Barkal jamb reads '[... Month]u, Lord of Thebes, (he) gives might to the Lord of the Two Lands, Mn-MSct-R®-Stp-n-R®, the Son of Re, [cartouche with name]'. Macadam refused to transliterate the second cartouche, although he gave his verdict on each visible sign.

Macadam drew attention to the upper part of a stela discovered by Reisner in room B 501 of the temple of Amun at Gebel Barkal which carried the same cartouches. This slab was illustrated by Dunham, but he, like Macadam, did not venture any reading of the cartouche.

Priese reconsidered both inscriptions when he published a copy made by Weidenbach of a text, apparently found at Nuri on 31st May 1844 by the Lepsius expedition. This text was preserved only on the left side (the ends of the lines), the block having been broken in half vertically [79]. The significant feature is the, badly-
preserved, five-fold titulary. Priese suggested transliterating the nomen on the Barkal slab and the door-jamb as G3-ti-s-n. The nomen is not actually preserved on the Nuri inscription, and the attribution to this king is made through the restoration of the partly-preserved prenomen as [Hn]-M3t-R®-stp-n-Imn. The writing G3-ti-s-n Priese suggests may be read as Ktsn or Gtsn, whom he identifies with a king, Aktisanes, whose name is preserved in Diodoros.

The story of Aktisanes narrated in Diodoros (I.60, Iff) is, like most of Book I, thought to have been taken from the Aigyptiaka of Hekataios of Abdera, a work written during the satrapy (323-305 BC) or reign (305-282 BC) of Ptolemy I [80]. Diodoros' source materials are a complex issue, and Jacoby's argumentation for Hekataios as the origin is not substantiated [81].

Nearly all of the scholars who have discussed the Aktisanes story in Diodoros agree that it has no historical foundation. The story is a direct parallel to that of the invasion of Egypt by Sabacos (Shabaqo) in Herodotos [82]. Lepsius first noted the parallelism of the episodes [83], and Wiedemann later suggested the identification of Aktisanes with Sabacon/Shabaqo [84]. Schäfer, however, equated Aktisanes with Nastasen, assuming a corruption of the Greek from 'Astisanes' [85].

Ahmose II's Kushite contemporaries are fairly certainly established [86] and none of these can be identified with 'Aktisanes'. In any case, Diodoros's own placing of the episode in his narrative does not equate Amasis with Ahmose II of the 26th Dynasty [87]. Even if the source used by Diodoros intended the 26th-dynasty king to be the subject, Diodoros clearly assumed he was not. In his narrative of the reign of Amasis/Ahmose II, Diodoros gives the king an entirely different treatment, and there is no reference to invasion from Nubia [88].
Yet scholars have persisted in a belief in the reign of an 'historical Aktisanes', which must, it has been argued [89], be placed before or during that of Ptolemy I, when Hekataios wrote. 'Aktisanes' thus appears in the modern Meroitic king lists as reigning in the 4th century BC, on the assumption that Hekataios had taken the name of a near contemporary ruler and inserted it into his narrative [90]. This identification of the 'Aktisanes' of Diodoros with the ruler named on monuments as Ktsn has been assumed by all recent writers.

Macadam, on the basis of the epithet stp-n-<R®>, placed Menmaetre (ie 'Aktisanes') close in time to Aryamani, and suggested he may have been owner of one of the uninscribed Barkal pyramids dated by Reisner to the Late Napatan or Early Meroitic Period.

Wenig [91] places (Aktisanes) at generation 28 and (Aryamani) at 29, bracketed with three other kings as 'succession uncertain' with the date limit for the whole group as 315-270 BC. Tőrők [92] gives Aktisanes (generation 28), before 300 or at the latest before 282 BC, and Aryamani (generation 29), at the opening of the 3rd Century BC.

The Aktisanes episode as recorded by Diodoros has no historical foundation, and its validity as a dating criterion for Menmaetre Ktsn/Gtsn must be seriously doubted. It should also be noted that, although Priese's reading of the name as Ktsn/Gtsn has been widely accepted in Meroitic studies, other alternatives have been suggested. Goedicke [93] whilst noting that the reading was uncertain, thought P3-tmr 'would seem a feasible conjecture'. Von Beckerath [94] gave the reading G/P-3tiC-qo, following Macadam's indication of the variant readings of the signs as G/P, 3, t/i, i, t (perhaps accidental), f/n/t, and a final t or ᵃ (ϰ being the suffix -qo found in many Meroitic royal names). Clearly this text needs re-examining, if, indeed, any improvement could be made upon Macadam's reading.
Far more important than the narrative of Aktisanes for establishing the date of Kttn are the ruler's monuments, and the fragmentary titulaires recorded on them.

Reviewing Dunham (1970), Goedicke (1972) suggested that the king might be attributable to the Third Intermediate Period rather than the 3rd century BC. Discussing the Barkal stela he argued that the invocation of Amun-Re-Harakhty-Atum as nb itnw 'lord of radiance', and the structure of the prenomen, suggested a date far earlier than the Late Napatan period "possibly as early as the Twenty-first dynasty". The deity's four-fold name is certain, although the epithet is less clear [95].

The five-fold titulary was used by the rulers of the 25th Dynasty and their successors down to Aspelta, but after this is not attested amongst the Napatan and Meroitic kings with the exceptions of Irike-Amanote, Harsiyotef and Nastasen. Most rulers seem to have used only one or two names, although occasionally a Horus, or Nebty, name is found. Most significant is the lack of originality when these names do occur; except for certain periods when there were strong influences from Egypt, the kings who adopted more than one name reused those of predecessors.

That a king should adopt a five-fold titulary, and one which was not repeating names already frequently used by Kushite kings, strongly suggests that he had access to a scribe with at least moderate understanding of Egyptian and the composition of titulaires. Unfortunately the titulary copied by Weidenbach is only fragmentarily preserved. In his authoritative study, Priese made a number of suggestions for possible restorations by analogy with New Kingdom titulaires, and based upon the number of hieroglyphic groups which could be postulated as the length of a line. He commented that "die Titulatur enthalt typische ramessidische Wendungen", but that it also showed similarities with other inscriptions attributed to the Late Napatan or Early Meroitic periods.
Of the Horus name, only the last word, M3^t, is preserved. Priese suggested the restoration [Horus k3 nht mry] M3^t, 'Horus the mighty bull beloved of Maet'. This was the usual Horus name of Ramesses II and of Osorkon II. The form 'Horus the mighty bull' was used by nearly every king from the 18th Dynasty until Shabaqo, after whom only Philippos Arrhidaios and some late Ptolemaic and Roman rulers revived it [96]. Philippos Arrhidaios himself used the form Horus k3 nht mry m3^t, doubtlessly modelled upon Ramesses II.

Having extended over two lines, only the first and last words of the Nebty name were preserved: wr [...] Npwt. Priese suggested the alternatives wr [mmw pr it.f Imn] Npwt, 'Great [of monuments in the house of his father Amun] of Napata' or wr [phty H^t m] Npwt, 'Great of strength, Arising in Napata'. The determinative used for Napata is transcribed by Priese as , although Weidenbach's drawing of the hieroglyph is imprecise. This writing of the name of Napata is known only from the Nastasen stela, but Kendall has recently argued that the mountain of Gebel Barkal was conceived as crowned with an uraeus from the New Kingdom onwards [97]. It is apparently depicted so in a relief in the temple of Taharqo [98], and a relief at Abu Simbel also shows a mountain (either Abu Simbel, or Gebel Barkal) crowned with an uraeus [99].

The Golden Horus name was also incomplete: ir s®nh (?) rhy[t mi it.f Imn] 'who nourishes the rekhyt-people [like his father Amun]'. Priese was unable to find any parallel Golden Horus name. The orthography of rhyt is similar to a 19th-dynasty writing.

The Prenomen was introduced by the titles nsw bit nb t3wy nb H^w, but was incomplete, [...] M3^t-Ec stp-n-Imn. Weidenbach's drawing indicates that the cartouche is partly broken, with the consequent loss of the lower sign of the first group. Priese argued the restoration as Mn-m3^t-Ec, and the positioning of the sun disk requires a low flat sign (mm or nb), or the sun-disk to be on the head of a figure [100]. It should be emphasised that it is the restoration of the name as Men-maet-Re which allows the inscription
to be attributed to Ktsn, since the nomen itself is lost: but this restoration is the most likely because a king with this name and the epithet is already attested on two monuments. The only possible orthographic alternative would be Nb-M3Ct-Rc, the prenomen of Amenhotep III and of Ramesses VI. This, however, creates a new ruler otherwise unattested: possible, but in the light of the other evidence to be treated cautiously.

Men-Maet-Re was the prenomen of Sety I, and is to be found on the Barkal stela [101]. Even more significantly, Men-Maet-Re, with the epithet stp-n-Pth, was the prenomen of Ramesses XI.

Priese [102] argues for the reading of the epithet as stp-n-Imn on the Barkal slab; taking the figure as a seated Amun with double-plume headdress and m3Ct-feather on his knee. Macadam read the Barkal jamb as stp-n-<Rc>, which seems to be supported by the published photograph; but variation of such epithets is well attested.

The Nomen was lost, apart from the introductory title, s3 Rc. Priese restored Ktsn on the basis of the restored prenomen.

Whilst the Horus-name might support a late (ie Macedonian or early-Ptolemaic) contemporaneity, the use of a full five-fold titulary, and one which exhibits both style and orthography typical of the Ramesside period, suggests the, at least equal, possibility, that this ruler belongs to the immediately post-Ramesside period.

A superficial resemblance might be noticeable between the writing of the nomen on the Barkal jamb and the name preserved in the Buhen ex-voto of Ramesses XI's viceroy. It is be possible that, following Panehesy's death (perhaps in the conflict with Piankh) a successor assumed the Viceregal office, and with the death of Ramesses XI and accession of new dynasty, himself assumed the kingship. It would, however, be rash - on the evidence of the published photograph of the Barkal jamb, and with the doubts surrounding the reading of the Buhen
ex-voto - to claim that there is adequate reason for attributing the two monuments to one individual. Menmaetre 'Ktsn' might equally be a ruler of Upper Nubian origin.

Usermaetre-setepenre Ary-mer-Amun.

This ruler, attested by stelae found in Temple B at Kawa, was perhaps also the builder of the sanctuary of the same temple. He used a titulary, of which the Horus name and nomen are preserved, with markedly Ramesside features.

The main monument is the stela, Kawa Inscription XIV, excavated in Temple B. The stela, intact on discovery, was broken when moved, resulting in the loss of part of the text. The lunette scene shows a king, with protective vulture hovering overhead, offering incense to the seated Amun, who is followed by Mut and Khonsu. Two cartouches accompany the royal figure, nb t3wy Wsr-M3Ct-RJC stp.n RJC nb ḫp Yry mr Imn. The figure wears a close-fitting cap or wig, without uraeus, tail and sandals with curling toes. The text, introduced with a year date and titulary, apparently records the building of a temple, and donations to it. Further years, certainly 8 and 9, and possibly 5, occur later in the text. It is possible that these were additions to the original inscription. The titulary is damaged by breaks in the stela, but begins with the Horus-name, followed by the Two Ladies title. After the break, the description "son of Amun" precedes the prenomen.

The Horus name, k3 nḥt ṭmrJC 'Horus the mighty bull beloved of Re', was a variant Horus-name of Thutmose III (significantly perhaps, in the surviving scene above the Karimala inscription at Semna), Ramesses II, and of Shoshenq III. It was the usual Horus-name of Sety II and Ramesses XI, and, with additional epithets, of Nesubanebdjed (Smendes) I, Shoshenq I and Osorkon I.

The Nebty name is lost, although the title remains. Macadam [103] observed that there appeared to be no room for a Golden Horus name if
the lacuna was restored with the prenomen. The Pre-nomen is preserved in the lunette scene, preceded by the title \( \text{nb} \ t3wy \ Wsr-M3c-t-R^C-stp.n-R^C \). This is the prenomen of Ramesses II, used also by Shoshenq III, Pimay and Iput II. Usermaaetre was frequently used as a prenomen by 20th Dynasty and Libyan rulers, with the variant epithets \( \text{mr-Imn} \) (Ramesses III, Shoshenq 'IV'), \( \text{mr-Imn-stp.n-R^C} \) (Ramesses VII), \( \text{hprn-R^C} \) (Ramesses V), \( \text{h.n-Imn} \) (Ramesses VIII), and \( \text{stp.n-Imn} \) (by nine rulers during the Third Intermediate Period). It was later adopted by Piye.

The Nomen, \( \text{Iry-mr-Imn} \) was read by Macadam [104] as 'Ary-Miamun' (ie 'beloved of Amun') "[o]r Aryamani". The second reading would conform to later Meroitic constructions, and has consequently been preferred. The writing of the name does suggest the standard late New Kingdom form with \( \text{mr Imm} \).

The title \( \text{nb} \ bps \) 'lord of might' is not attested in other Kushite titularies and, although found in the 18th Dynasty, is distinctively Ramesside and continued through the Third Intermediate Period [105].

Macadam [106] commented that:

Prof. Griffith's notes show that he wished to place this otherwise unknown king in the Ramesside period owing to his use of the prenomen of Ramesses II. Had he lived to consider the matter further he would probably have altered his decision ... The language of the stela, so far as one can read it, is not Ramesside, but from this fact little can be deduced, since at any time a native Cushite, setting himself up as king, might have written debased Egyptian and made the same sort of mistakes.

Macadam argued for a late dating because of the position of the stelae in Temple B, and on the grounds that 'a stone so soft as this would have been quite worn away had it been there since the Ramesside period'. He identified king Ary with the builder of the sanctuary of the same Temple B, based upon the strong similarities between the figures on the stelae and the reliefs of the sanctuary.
The Temple B at Kawa is adjacent to the 18th-dynasty Temple A (built by Tutankhamun) and faces the processional way of the main Temple T (built by Taharqo, possibly on the site of an 18th-dynasty temple)\[107\]. Apart from the stone-built sanctuary, gates and the columns of the courtyard, the temple is of mud brick. The courtyard has four columns, one of which is totally uninscribed, and two have inscriptions of King Harsiyotef. The fourth column is made up of re-used drums, which carry dedicatory inscriptions of Shabaqo. The duplication of the texts indicates that these drums come from two columns, neither complete \[108\]. The sanctuary itself is stone-built with a pylon entrance. It is a single chamber with relief on the interior walls, and a false door \[109\]. The scenes on the pylon depict a number of deities: Amun, Anhur and Tefnut, Monthu and Khonsu, and Thoth. Anuket and Satet appear on the inside wall of the pylon. The two major scenes show the king making offerings to Amun, [Mut], Khonsu and Monthu, and to Amun, a goddess and a second pair of deities (probably Inheret and Tefnut). There are traces of gilding on the figures.

Although the king has no accompanying names, Macadam suggested, on the stylistic similarities, that the sanctuary had been built by Ary. On the basis of this attribution, and his own late date for Ary, Macadam was forced to argue that the stone sanctuary had been inserted into the already existing brick temple, which, on the evidence of the column inscriptions, he considered to be the work of Harsiyotef. In support of this rather eccentric interpretation Macadam noted that outside the South and East walls of the sanctuary were the lower parts of a second sandstone wall, which enclosed the building. This he suggested, was the original sanctuary wall \[110\]. Unfortunately the wall was never excavated to see whether it did carry relief and it was soon covered again with sand.

A more conventional interpretation of the building stages would date the stone sanctuary as the earliest part. As the sanctuary has a pylon entrance, the original temple probably comprised a brick built courtyard, with the stone-built shrine standing at the back.
The enlarged temple might thus be ascribed to Harsiyyotef. Macadam's idea that the sanctuary was built inside the already existing temple is difficult to comprehend: if Ary was later than Harsiyyotef, it is surely more likely that he would simply have demolished the whole of the building, and included the stone elements (the columns and gateways) in his own new temple.

Stylistically, the reliefs are closer to the late New Kingdom than to other Kushite work. The sandals are typical of the late 20th Dynasty [111] and Third Intermediate Periods [112]; a different form being worn from the 25th Dynasty onwards [113]. Early Meroitic reliefs again depict different forms [114]. Also, significantly, the king in the Kawa reliefs does not wear the necklace with ram-head pendants, which is a normal feature of regalia from the 25th Dynasty until the Early Meroitic Period [115].

Whilst all these iconographic and stylistic similarities with Ramesside art and titulary could be part of a phase belonging to the 4th-3rd century BC, there is nothing in the material which can be dated, indisputably, to that time. Ascribing these monuments and their owners to the immediately post-Ramesside period is, at least, a viable alternative. Indeed, the material is more easily explicable within that context, and parallels the contemporary situation in Egypt. That there were rulers in Kush at this time, is certain from the relief of Karimala at Semna.

Kawa XIV indicates that Ary had assumed some form of pharaonic style by his 3rd year - or at latest his 9th - regnal year. No names or titles were preserved on Kawa XV, but it too should probably be attributed to Ary. The fragments of text record a regnal year 23.

The question inevitably raises itself whether this king, Ary-mery-Amun should be identified with Alara, the predecessor of Kashta. Whilst the orthography of the name on the Kawa stela differs slightly from that of the later texts, there is such a strong similarity
between the two that the possibility cannot be ignored (see below Chapter 11).

Karimala.

The temple built by Thutmose III within the fortress of Semna, at the 2nd Cataract, carries one of the most intriguing texts to be found in Nubia. The inscription of Karimala is carved on the facade of the temple to the left of the doorway, replacing the original 18th-dynasty decoration on the central part of the wall [116]. To prepare the area the surface of the wall was smoothed into a panel, cutting through the original reliefs.

The scene, which forms the left half of the whole relief, depicts Karimala, followed by a second, much smaller female figure standing in front of the goddess Isis. Between Karimala and Isis are three altar-stands with bread, vessels and bunches of flowers. The right half of the relief is a text of thirteen columns of hieroglyphs.

The figure of Karimala is well executed. She wears a long, full garment with loose sleeves, her body being depicted through this in the usual Egyptian fashion. Around her neck is a broad collar, and she carries a flail. A close-fitting cap, or short wig, is decorated with the wings of a vulture, and surmounted by a disk and tall falcon-feathers. The smaller female figure has no identifying text. Above is the hovering figure of the vulture goddess Nekhbet with characteristic white crown. The accompanying inscriptions, written in large hieroglyphs, give the titles of Karimala as "King of Upper and Lower Egypt, king's great wife, and king's daughter" (nswt-bity hmt nswt wrt s3t nswt).

The major publication to date, by Grapow [117] was based upon copies made by the Lepsius expedition, and later photographs. A hand copy of the text, compiled from several made by Reisner, was published by Dunham and Janssen [118], along with photographs of the whole relief made in 1910. A facsimile of the relief, and a detailed
commentary on it, has been made by Caminos, and will be appear in the full epigraphic publication of the temple of Semna by the Egypt Exploration Society [119].

The inscription itself is very difficult to read. The text is dated to a regnal year 14, which Caminos considered can belong to none other than Karimala herself. Most other writers would ascribe the regnal year to the unnamed husband of Karimala.

The queen's name has usually been read as Katimala or Kadimalo. Macadam [120] suggested that the name was Meroitic and corresponded to Kdiml(ye), a personal name meaning "beautiful woman". The reading Karimala was preferred by Caminos, on the epigraphic evidence. Despite a superficial similarity there seems to be no very good reason to read the name as one of the variants of Karomat or Karomama [121]; and hence as an indicator of Egyptian control by a Delta king [122]. The text is too problematic for it to have been the work of a native Egyptian speaker, which, if it commemorated one of the Libyan kings one would expect.

The dating of the relief has been the most difficult problem to resolve. Lepsius [123] placed Karimala after Aspelta as one of the last of the Napatan rulers, which was followed by a number of writers (this is discussed by Caminos). However, her name has been found at none of the excavated sites of the 25th Dynasty and Napatan period, which, considering her obvious importance and the number of female members of the royal family known from this time, is striking. Grapow [124] considered that the text was 21st or 22nd Dynasty, on the basis of the orthography and language. Grapow later attributed the text to the time of Piye [125]. Macadam was unable to suggest a date [126]. Caminos has cautiously recommended an 8th to 7th century BC dating, observing that, although Grapow considered the orthography and language indicative of a 22nd-23rd dynasty date, palaeographically the text has no known parallels.
The style, particularly the image of the queen, is strongly reminiscent, in Caminos's view, of the representations of Nefertari at Abu Simbel. The figures certainly follow later New Kingdom conventions rather than 25th Dynasty-Napatan ones. Lepsius noted that the figures had a Ramesside quality, and are not unlike work found in the reign of Ramesses III [127]. Perhaps the closest parallels are to be found in the depiction of royal women of the family of Herihor, in the Khonsu temple at Karnak [128].

The choice of the Semna temple for the carving of such a large and obviously important text is difficult to account for. All that can be readily be deduced from this, is that the ruler, possibly Karimala herself, controlled part of Nubia which included Semna, and at some time during the Third Intermediate Period. Karimala might have been the wife of a local king, even of Ary or Gtsm, although the writing of the titulary and of the text suggested to Caminos that Karimala herself was the ruler.

In proposing a Third Intermediate period dating for the kings Menmaetre and Usermaetre, it is significant that the early rulers of the 25th Dynasty also followed New Kingdom style before adopting more archaic forms.

The prenomen of Kashta is apparently written "Maet-Re" [129]. Priese [130] proposed it should be read "Ne-Maet-Re", the prenomen of Amenemhat III, but this is far from certain; the only surviving inscription, a stela fragment from Elephantine [131], being poorly carved. The writing may be a solecism: perhaps for an intended Neb-, or Men-Maet-Re.

Piye, whose titulary was varied several times [132], followed Ramesses II with the prenomen Usermaetre, and late New Kingdom tradition in the addition of mery-Amun to his nomen.

Shabaqo adopted the prenomen Neferkare, and the epithet mery-Amun with both nomen and prenomen [133]. Kitchen [134] points out that
the prenomen Neferkare was used by Pepy II and followed by a number of kings during the First Intermediate Period. It is significant that of some 20 rulers recorded in the Turin Canon during that period, seven used the name Neferkare and three others variants of it. The reign of Pepy II, the longest in Egyptian history (at least 90 years) and the king's prestige, led to his emulation, in the same way that the successors of Ramesses II in the 20th Dynasty and Third Intermediate Periods followed his style. Whilst Shabaqo may have adopted Neferkare as the name of Pepy II and thereby begun the archaising tendency of Late Period titularies, it is notable that Neferkare had been used more recently as a prenomen, by Ramesses IX. Two minor Third Intermediate Period rulers also adopted the name, Amenemnisu and Peftjauawybast of Herakleopolis, a contemporary of Piye [135].

Whilst Shabaqo certainly followed the 'archaising' style with his other titles, and in this was followed by Shebitqo, it is unclear whether Neferkare should also be understood as archaic. The archaising tendency in titularies, as well as in art, can actually be found with the Saite rulers of the late Third Intermediate Period, and it is now debated whether this phenomenon is Kushite or Saite in inspiration [136].

Menmaetre-setepen-Amun Ktsn (temp Ramesses XI?)
Karimala
Usermaatre-setepen-Re Ary (temp Shoshenq III?)

[Ne?]maetre Kashta
Usermaatre Pi(ankh)y
Neferkare Shabaqo
Kush and Egypt under Libyan rule.

The usual portrayal of Third Intermediate Period Egypt's relationship with Nubia emphasises the divisions within Egypt, and especially the declining importance of Thebes under a line of quasi-royal High Priests. With the focus of power in Egypt now presumed to be in the Delta, Lower Nubia de-populated, and the new power which eventually emerged in Nubia being situated far to the south, polarisation occurred; all major contact between Egypt and Nubia was sundered, and only the backwater of Thebes maintained some sporadic contact with its daughter shrine at Gebel Barkal [1]. Egypt under Libyan rule was doubtless considerably more dynamic than this picture allows, as Leahy has argued [2].

The crisis seems to have begun in the reign of Osorkon II, with the assumption of royal style by the king's cousin, the High Priest of Amun Harsiese [3]. The death of Osorkon II was followed by the rebellion of Thebes, and, apparently the emergence of a king – and perhaps dynasty – there [4]. Later still, dynasts assumed power in the Delta and Middle Egypt at Leontopolis, Herakleopolis and Hermopolis, although the process is still very unclear [5]. The most significant new power in late Libyan Egypt was the city of Sais, which, after a brief period of ascendancy under Bakenranef and Tefnakht, eventually achieved supremacy under Psamtik I [6].

The over-emphasis on the importance of Thebes in the New Kingdom [7] has correspondingly magnified its 'decline' in the late-20th Dynasty and Third Intermediate Period; it remained an important city, and its semi-feudal ruling families were closely allied by marriage with the Libyan princedoms of the Delta [8].

The documentary evidence for contact between Egypt and Nubia during Dynasties 21–23 is slight, and of a diverse nature, but some significant monuments have recently been found which cast a new light
on the frontier region, and attitudes towards the south. More fundamentally, recent excavations at Qasr Ibrim have identified fortifications and related material which will necessitate a total re-evaluation of activities in Lower Nubia during this phase. A variety of material indicates the continuing economic relations between Nubia and Egypt.

The Theban Viceroys of the Third Intermediate Period.

On the basis of the titles used by Herihor and Piankh, Reisner [9] assumed that the later Viceroys functioned from Thebes. The (presumed) revival of the title for Nesikhons has been considered of no great significance; but more evidence is now recognised which suggests that the title continued in use, possibly throughout the whole of the Third Intermediate Period.

Khonsuemre, Steward of the Viceroy of Kush, was buried in the Bab el-Gasus tomb, with mummy-tabs naming King Pinudjem [10], which suggests he served Herihor or Piankh (perhaps even Panehesy), or a successor in the early 21st Dynasty.

Nesikhons, wife of Pinudjem II [11] accumulated a large array of religious and administrative titles, including a number relating to the frontier region. She was Prophetess of Nebet-hetepet, lady of Sered, an otherwise unknown location, suggested by Kitchen [12] to be in Northern Nubia; and held the benefices of Khnum of Chsti and Hathor lady of Agni (n. el Kab) [13]. Her use of the titles Viceroy of Nubia and Overseer of Southern Foreign Lands, has never been credited with any actual jurisdiction [14], Reisner [15] going as far as to say that they were bestowed on her "to satisfy the vanity of a woman". Kitchen [16] conjectures that they "may indicate her rights to revenues from wealth obtained in northern Nubia or dues levied on trade passing thence". Nesikhons also held the office of Prophet of Khnum, Lord of the Cataract [17], which is significant in the light of the newly-excavated evidence for Viceroys at this period. Nesikhons was buried in the Great Cache, in year 5 of unnamed king,
presumed to be Siamun [18]. Exactly why Nesikhons was granted these offices must remain unknown, although there can be little doubt that they were real functions rather than sinecures.

The next attested Viceroy is known from a recently excavated stela of Osorkon II, from Elephantine [19]. The text is, unfortunately, undated and fragmentary, but refers to a King's Son of Kush and Overseer of the Southern Foreign Lands, who is possibly the same (the beginning and end of the lines are missing) as the son of the Ms wr [20] of the Meshwesh N[imlot]. This Viceroy may also have been Priest of Khnum-Re, Lord of the Cataract. The stela is too damaged for it to be clear whether it records the installation of this man, a royal nominee and relative. Osorkon II established his children in positions throughout Egypt, and petitioned Amun to maintain them in their offices, and in harmony with each other [21]. Osorkon's reign was disturbed by the first signs of rivalry amongst the scions of the royal house; the assumption of royal style by the High Priest of Amun, Harsiese, the king's own cousin. A number, if not all, of the king's sons predeceased him, and the relationship between Osorkon and his successor is not certain. Assumed by some to have been a younger son of Osorkon II, Takeloth II might actually have been the king's grandson, son of the High Priest of Amun, Nimlot [22].

A second stela from Elephantine [23] is dated by the titulary of Takeloth II, and names a s3 nswt n K3s imy-r3 h3st rsyt imy-r3 ... H3t-n[ht]. This stela might antedate Takeloth II's eleventh year, the date of the first insurrection in Thebes.

The Vizier Pamiu is entitled Viceroy on the coffin of Pediamonet son of Nesipakashuty B [24]. Two of his sons were Viziers, one marrying a daughter of Takeloth III as did a grandson, the Vizier Nesipakashuty B [25]. These connections with the royal family place the Viceroy in the period immediately prior to the Kushite invasions and establishment of the 25th Dynasty in Egypt.
Another possible Viceroy also belongs to the time of Osorkon III and Takeloth III. Ankh-Osorkon is given the titles s3 nsw imy-r, h3swt rsywt imy-r gs pr [26]. Although not explicitly s3 nsw n Ks, the combination of s3 nsw with "Overseer of the southern foreign lands", is certainly suggestive. Leahy is cautious about a further title, which seems to read t3ty m3t [27], and which suggests that this man may be identical with another Ankh-Osorkon, who was a Vizier. This Ankh-Osorkon [28] is not specifically called a Viceroy, but carries the title Overseer of Prophets of Khnum-Re mb qbh, given to other Viceroys of the period. There is a possibility that the two should be equated, in which case this Viceroy was a son of Djedptahefankh, himself an imy-r h3swtyw [29] and grandson of Osorkon III [30].

The combination of titles held by these officials, including that of Prophet of Khnum, suggests a group of functions relating to the frontier region, and extending over into northern Nubia. The limits of Egyptian influence in Nubia at this time are unclear, and although the existence of a fortress at Qasr Ibrim is now beyond doubt, whether this was an Egyptian outpost, or a Kushite one, is, as yet, undetermined. There is no direct evidence for Egyptian military activities in Nubia, although these might be suspected, and these Viceroys probably had little jurisdiction beyond the 1st Cataract region. It is striking that, with the exception of the graffiti of two High Priests of Amun, Pinudjem on Sehel [31] and Menkheperre on Bigga [32], there are no inscriptions of the period reported from south of Elephantine.

The precise dating of these last Viceroys is uncertain, although certainly immediately prior, or during, the 25th Dynasty. There is also evidence for the title in the 26th Dynasty, although whether it was revived or continued throughout the Kushite period remains to be established. Apries appointed Nesuhor to the office of his eldest son (s3 wr) Overseer of the Southern Foreign Lands (imy-r h3swt rsywt) to repel the countries that rebel against him. When he hath spread the fear of him in the
southern countries, they flee into their valleys for fear of him [33].

Evidence may yet be forthcoming to show whether the office continued throughout the Late Period, or was only occasionally revived.

Post-New Kingdom Viceroys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vicerey</th>
<th>King</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herihor</td>
<td>Ramesses XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piankh</td>
<td>Ramesses XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesikhons</td>
<td>Pinudjem II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Nimlot ?]</td>
<td>Osorkon II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat-n(akht)</td>
<td>Takeloth II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamiu</td>
<td>Osorkon III?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankh-Osorkon</td>
<td>Takeloth III?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesuhor</td>
<td>Apries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Illusory Nubian Campaign of Shoshenq I.

After the campaign of Piankh against Panehesy at the very end of the reign of Ramesses XI, there is no further documentary evidence for military activity in Nubia during the Libyan period. Given the situation at the close of the 20th Dynasty, there almost certainly were campaigns, at least into Lower Nubia, and the excavations at Aswan might find records of these. On the evidence of the relief at Karnak, Kitchen [34] proposed that Shoshenq I had led, or sent a military campaign into Nubia:

The phrase 'thou hast trodden down the natives of Nubia' in line 2 of the rhetorical text of the great triumph-scene at Karnak ... is reminiscent of that of Merenptah's scene..., but occurs in a broader context sufficiently original in its manipulation of set
phrases to merit Breasted's inference ... that Shoshenq I controlled Lower Nubia. Of all the triumph-scenes at Karnak, the texts of that of Shoshenq I are certainly the most unusual and original in a very traditional genre.

Kitchen, of course, recognizes that conventionalized scenes of enemy-subjugation are to be treated with the utmost caution. Originality and unusual elements in such scenes may, therefore, indicate an element of historical veracity; particularly if a toponym list is included, which can be demonstrated to be more than a copy of earlier such lists. The Shoshenq I relief, the text of which Kitchen cites, is actually the record of the king's Syro-Palestinian campaign [35]. The scene depicts Shoshenq presenting the captive 'name-rings' to Amun, the named towns are all Asiatic, and the rings are surmounted by bound Asians. It is only in the introductory text that Shoshenq makes his generalised claim of subjugating Nubia. Most writers have identified this campaign with that recorded on a fragmentary victory stela from Karnak [36] and with the campaign of "Shishak, king of Egypt" documented in the Biblical record (1 Kings and 2 Chronicles, 12). 2 Chronicles 12: 3-4 says that Shishak came with 1,200 chariots, with 60,000 parasitum (="horsemen"?) [37], and a large number of different peoples from Egypt: Libyans, Sukkiim, and Kushites (Nubians). Kitchen [38] comments:-

The inclusion of the Sukki or Tjuk(ten) is an especially interesting detail, while the presence of Nubians would find ready explanation in the presence of Nubian militia under Egyptian arms at several epochs, and in Shoshenq's forces very likely as conscripts or slave-troops in the wake of his Nubian campaign.

A series of blocks from near the sanctuary of Amun at Karnak contains fragmentary texts in which a king records offerings of various Nubian products to Amun. One block associated with these carries the cartouche of Shoshenq I. The whole group has consequently been interpreted as the record of the booty of his campaign, or the revenues from re-conquered territory; and therefore analogous with the Syro-Palestinian scene.
The Nubian campaign of Shoshenq I has thus passed into history, being cited in subsequent studies as one of the few historical moments in a period of Nubian history otherwise drawn as a notoriously dark age.

However, Kitchen [39] has recently admitted that this supposed Nubian campaign of Shoshenq I is illusory, because many of the blocks in question, including those listing Nubian products, have been identified by Vernus [40], as belonging to a work of Taharqo. Some blocks remain assignable to Shoshenq I [41], but they do not record a Nubian campaign. Nevertheless, activities in Nubia, whether military or not, are still attributed to Shoshenq I in Nubian studies [42].

The identity of the biblical Shishak with Shoshenq I, an identity universally held by Egyptologists since the time of Champollion, has also been disputed [43]. The Nubian soldiery recorded in Chronicles would thus belong to the army of a different pharaoh. The reference to Nubia in the Karnak relief of Shoshenq I is doubtless nothing more than the ritual symmetry characteristic of such scenes. Shoshenq I certainly needed to consolidate his position in Upper Egypt; he was still referred to as "Great Chief of the Ma" in an inscription recording his regnal year 2 at Karnak [44]. Doubtless there were activities in the region of the southern frontier, but, as yet, they remain undocumented.

Kendall has suggested that there were campaigns in Nubia in the reigns of Osorkon II and Takeloth II, possibly to regain control of the goldmines [45]. He associates the "revival" of the title Viceroy of Kush with these activities, and comments that although no hostilities are explicitly recorded, Egyptian activities are verified by the presence of contemporary inscriptions at Semna. Kendall gives no further details of these inscriptions, but might be referring to the inscription of Karimala, which he suggests might be attributed to one of the queens named Karomama [46]. Kendall draws attention to the possibility that the reliefs of the festival Hall of Osorkon II at Bubastis are direct copies of those at Soleb. Whilst the
influence of Amenhotep III's reliefs on those of Osorkon II has long been acknowledged [47], it is more likely that an intermediate source was used: either reliefs surviving in the Theban region, or a papyrus-type record.

Zerah the Kushite.

An obscure and intriguing reference is found in 2 Chronicles 14: 8-15:

there came forth Zerah the Kushite with an army of myriads and 300 chariots, and he came to Mareshah.

Asa, king of Judah gave battle and pursued the army as far as Gerar, defeating it and sacking the cities around Gerar. The composition of the army is given as Kushites and Libyans in 2 Chronicles 16: 8-9. This event happened in about the 14th year of Asa, which can be placed c. 897 BC [48] which Kitchen [49] equates with the 28th year of Osorkon I [50]; Zerah himself, is not to be identified with Osorkon I.

Bersina [51] discussed the record of Zerah's campaign preserved in Josephos and Eutychius (Said ibn el-Batriq). Josephos (Ant Jud. VIII, 292-295) calls him Zaraios and "king of Aithiopia" derived from the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint (where he is called Zârê). Eutychius calls him "king of the Kushites" (al-kûsh) [52]. Bersina accepts these records at face value and concludes that:

Judging by his campaign (he attempted to re-enact the campaign of Shoshenq I), Zerah was a major personality and the ruler of a large state. Apparently, he was one of the first kings of Meroe. This rather naive conclusion was rightly criticised by Hofmann [53] and Vlach [54].

Biblical scholarship has not always assumed that any immediate connection with Kush was indicated. As Eph'al notes, Asa's opponents have been identified with descendants of the Cushi (biblical: Cushan) tribes who lived on the southeastern borders of Palestine, and who had been absorbed by the Midianites [55]. Others suggest that they
may have been descendants of Kushite troops garrisoned in Philistia by the Egyptian pharaohs [56].

It is hardly likely that a Kushite ruler would have marched his army through Egypt to campaign in Syria-Palestine on his own behalf. Indeed, it is extremely unlikely that a Kushite king would have campaigned in Syria-Palestine unless he already controlled Egypt. A comparable situation occurred in the 25th Dynasty, when the Kushites returned Iamani to the Assyrians, but became hostile to Assyria once they had established their control over Egypt, and could see Assyria as a threat to their interests as Egyptian rulers. The description of Zerah as a Kushite 'king' is almost certainly a later interpolation, perhaps by analogy with the 25th-dynasty rulers referred to elsewhere in the Biblical record. Zerah is perhaps best regarded, following Kitchen, as a Nubian general in the Egyptian army, and possibly, as commander of a garrison stationed on the frontier near Gerar [57]. The inclusion of "Libyans" in the troops would support this view. What Egyptian or Kushite equivalent the name "Zerah" is meant to indicate is obscure.

Zerah's army is supposed to have included 300 chariots; assuming that the number has been correctly transmitted, this conforms to the number of 250-300, suggested by Schulman as typical for the New Kingdom [58].

**Egypt and Assyria.**

There is little evidence for Egyptian activities in western Asia during the Libyan period, but this is due largely to lack of 'historical' inscriptions. Egypt has been seen as a supporter of attempts to destabilise Solomon's rule [59], but after the campaign which sacked Gezer, pharaoh gave the city as a dowry to his daughter, Solomon's wife [60]. At about the same time there was also Egyptian support for Hadad of Edom, who had been taken to Egypt as a boy and raised in the palace, and who was later married to the sister of the
king's wife [61]. Both incidents are known only from the biblical sources.

Following the breakdown of the kingdom of David and Solomon there was a period of weakness in Israel and Judah with the increasing power of Damascus [62]. Egyptian attempts to influence events, or regain control of the region are to be seen behind the campaign of Shoshenq I and perhaps the activities of "Zerah".

A military campaign in Palestine is attested for Shoshenq I by the Karnak relief [63] and the stela from Megiddo [64], but there is no evidence that Shoshenq effectively regained control of the region for Egypt. Evidence from Byblos indicates that the Egyptians maintained strong relations with the city. Statues of Shoshenq I [65], Osorkon I [66] and Osorkon II [67] were excavated at Byblos, two with inscriptions added by the local Byblite rulers stating that they had been brought by them from Egypt to be set up in the temple. Byblos was probably not alone in having trade links with Egypt, and objects with Egyptian royal names have been found at many sites which had Phoenician connections. Most of these objects belong to the late Libyan period.

The establishment of the Omride dynasty and the foundation of a new capital at Samaria, saw the re-emergence of Israel as a major power in the region [68]. Possibly inspired by the campaign of Assurnasirpal II along the sea coast (877 BC), Omri (885-874) secured his frontiers to the south and east. He did this through a marriage alliance with Judah and by military action against Moab, annexing the district of Mahdeba. This also ensured Israelite domination of the Transjordanian caravan routes and the exaction of considerable annual tribute [69].

Under the 40-year rule of the Omrides, Israel was at its most Phoenicophile. The Phoenician cities entered into alliances with Israel which gave them access to the inland trade routes to Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Arabia and Aqaba [70]. Ittobaal of Tyre formed
an alliance with Omri - or his son and co-regent Ahab. Ahab himself married Jezebel, daughter of Ittobaal [71], which led to large-scale royal patronage of Phoenician cults in Israel. A little later a further alliance was made between Israel and Judah when Jehoshaphat of Judah with Ahaziah, son of Ahab, attempted to re-open the gold trade with Ophir from Eziongeber, although this came to naught due to the wreck of the ships [72]. The biblical record portrays Ahab as a vassal of Damascus, then under the ruler of Hadad-idri [73], but it is clear from the Assyrian accounts that he was one of the leaders of the coalition at Qarqar [74]. There are good reasons for doubting the accuracy of the biblical account and while Damascus was powerful, it was not powerful enough to subdue the Omrides.

Assyrian intervention in the west began again and in 858 BC Shalmaneser III (858-824) received the tribute from 'ships' of Sidon and Tyre [75]. In the campaign of his sixth year (853 BC), Shalmaneser III first received the submission of the states of north Syria, before turning to bring Hamath under Assyrian suzerainty. This was the first direct move by the Assyrians into central Syria. Shalmaneser captured three towns belonging to Urhilina (Irkhuleni), king of Hamath [76], and then moved on to the royal city of Qarqar [77]. Shalmaneser attacked and destroyed Qarqar, after which he was confronted by the army of the coalition led by Hadad-idri of Damascus [78]. The coalition seems to have had Egyptian backing and a small military contingent, but it remains unclear how active the Egyptians were in trying to bolster opposition to the Assyrian expansion, or indeed what their capability was [79]. The coalition remained active after the death of Ahab until the usurpation of Hazael, Shalmaneser III fighting them again 849, 848, and 845 [80].

In the campaign of his tenth year Shalmaneser pacified Carchemish and Bit-Agusi, before pushing south. He was again confronted by the coalition of Hadad-idri of Damascus and Urhilina the Hamathite, together with twelve kings of the sea coast. It is uncertain whether the Egyptians supplied a contingent on this occasion. There may have been a battle, although not all Assyrian texts mention it. Since
Shalmaneser did not go further south, it must be assumed that he was unsuccessful [81]. Similarly, in the campaigns of years 11 and 14, Shalmaneser met the coalition, but there was never any follow-up. The texts do not mention the taking of cities or of the leaders, or their submission, and it seems that the alliance was strong enough to prevent the Assyrians gaining any significant ground in central and southern Syria [82].

With the accession of the "usurper" Hazael [83], Aram's relations with Israel seem to have deteriorated rapidly [84] and there was a battle at Ramoth-Gilead which resulted in Jehu seizing power in Israel (842 or 841). Both Hazael and Jehu adopted a nationalist policy, and their reigns saw the end of the anti-Assyrian coalition [85]. Shalmaneser III marched west in 841, but this time Damascus stood alone. The coalition had disintegrated and Hamath had made peace with Assyria. Hazael confronted Shalmaneser at Mount Senir, and was defeated. He retreated into the city of Damascus which Shalmaneser besieged. Shalmaneser cut down the orchards, then devastated a number of villages in the Hauran before moving to the coast. Here Jehu brought tribute, along with the kings of Tyre and Sidon [86].

Amongst the tribute depicted on the record of Shalmaneser III's western victories, the so-called 'Black Obelisk' [87], is the 'mandattu-tribute of Musri'. This includes two camels "whose backs are doubled" (ie Bactrian), a "river ox" (hippopotamus) a "sakea-animal" (a rhinoceros), a susu-antelope, bazitu and uqupu-monkeys. An elephant of the Indian type is also included, and this, with the Bactrian camels, has led some to question that Musri is in this case Egypt [88]. Tadmor [89] argues that in all later Assyrian sources Musri is to be understood as Egypt and not the trans-Tigridian toponym [90]. Since some of the animals are certainly of Kushite source, Tadmor suggests that the camels are to be interpreted as a repetition of register 1 (the tribute of Gilzanu, near Lake Urmia), instead of the correct Arabian type [91].
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The obelisk is dated by Tadmor [92] to 841 BC or shortly after, when Israel, Tyre and Sidon surrendered to Shalmaneser III. The terminus ad quem is 838, the king's last campaign against Syria and Palestine. Kitchen [93] attributes this to the reign of Takeloth II, but even a minor revision of Egyptian chronology would place it in a different reign and historical context [94]. The defeat of the coalition at Qarqar and the subsequent Assyrian expansion, must have necessitated Egypt's payment of mandattu - a compulsory payment levied on kingdoms subjected in war [95] - and they must have acknowledged the superiority of the Assyrians for a time.

After the conflict with Shalmaneser III at the battle of Qarqar in 853 BC there is little direct evidence for Assyrian-Egyptian contacts until the second half of the 8th century. Despite this dearth of documentation, there must have been some sort of contact; the Egyptian interests in Western Asia must have led to conflict or accommodation.

The expansion of Kushite power into late Libyan Egypt should be set against this westward expansion of Assyrian imperialism, the two powers ultimately clashing at Eltekeh and in Egypt itself. Direct contacts between Kush and Assyria are much more difficult to document, although Dalley noted the possibility that there were Kushites at the Assyrian court in the reign of Tiglathpileser III [96]. Some items of trade and tribute in Assyrian records also originate in Kush, but they almost certainly passed through Egypt [97].

The campaigns of Tiglathpileser III (744-727) began the process by which much of western Asia was turned from tributary state into empire. Following the campaigns against Urartu the Assyrians entered north Syria. With the defeat of Azriyau in 738, Arpad, Pattina/Unqi and Hamath's province Hadrik were annexed and transformed into provinces and the major southern kingdoms - Hamath, Damascus, Byblos, Tyre and Samaria - paid tribute. In 734 Tiglathpileser III again marched to the west. The Assyrian sources for the three campaigns
are geographical rather than chronological, but the eponym lists are helpful: the campaign of 734 was to Philistia; those of 733 and 732 to Damascus [98].

These campaigns brought the Assyrians much closer to Egypt's borders, although there is no indication that they were attempting an invasion of the country. Fragments of the king's Annals [99] record the events of the campaign against Philistia in 734, and the flight of Khanunu (Greek: Hanno) of Gaza to Egypt. Tiglathpileser first thrust down the coast, Byblos, Simirra, Arqa to Tyre, which surrendered and Hiram brought tribute. Tiglathpileser's army next captured Gaza, plundered the city and set up a stela or statue of Tiglathpileser. Khanunu, the ruler of Gaza, took refuge in Egypt, but was eventually restored as an Assyrian vassal. An Assyrian trading centre was established at Gaza [100]. This may have been an Assyrian attempt to control the south Arabian incense trade which passed through Gaza.

Rebellion in Syria-Palestine in the following years prevented any further attempts to establish an Assyrian presence on the Egyptian border. The leader of the rebellion was Radyan (Rakhiunu; the biblical Rezin) of Damascus supported by Tyre, Samaria and some of the Arab tribes, all of whom had paid tribute in 738. Tiglathpileser campaigned in the west in 733 and 732 [101], but there is no evidence of further confrontation with Egypt. That the Egyptian rulers (presumably those of the eastern Delta) continued to support the anti-Assyrian coalitions is likely, but without documentary proof.

The campaigns of 733 and 732 were directed against Damascus and Israel. In 733 Damascus was besieged but did not fall; the Assyrians cut down its orchards in revenge, and Bit-Khadara, the ancestral home of Radyan, was taken and its people deported. Damascus probably fell in 732 and the kingdom, Bit-Hazael, was made an Assyrian province. An attack on Hiram of Tyre followed, but not on the city itself: Hiram paid tribute.
In Israel, Peqah was murdered in a conspiracy led by Hoshea who replaced him and himself became an Assyrian vassal [102]. The northern part of Israelite territory now became three Assyrian provinces, Hoshea being left with only Samaria and the area around. With the death of Tiglathpileser III and the accession of Shalmaneser V, Hoshea withheld tribute and sent envoys to Egypt for help [103]. The events of the reign of Shalmaneser V have generated a voluminous literature, but there is still dissent on the identities involved. The biblical text records Hoshea's appeal to "So, king of Egypt", who has been variously identified with Shabaqo [104], Osorkon IV [105] or Tefnakht [106]. No assistance was forthcoming, and Shalmaneser V invaded Israel in 724. Only Samaria was able to resist, and was besieged for two years. The city fell to the Assyrians (probably Shalmaneser V, rather than Sargon, who claimed the victory [107] in early autumn 722, and the population was deported to Assyria [108]. The fall of Samaria was followed closely by the death of Shalmaneser V and the accession of Sargon II in 721, which brought a series of rebellions in both Mesopotamia (Marduk-apli-idinna/Merodach-Baladan supported by Humbanigash of Elam) and the western provinces.

It was perhaps now that Egypt moved to reinstate Khanunu in Gaza, just beyond the Egyptian frontier. In 720 Sargon marched into Syria, defeating Yau-bi'di of Hamath at Qarqar. He recaptured Arpad, Simirra, Damascus and Samaria, which had joined the coalition [109], before marching on Gaza. At Raphia he joined battle with an Egyptian force under the command of Re'e (Raia) [110]. Re'e's army was defeated, Khanunu captured and taken to Assyria, Raphia looted and destroyed [111].

Following this incident, the Assyrians made some attempt to exercise greater control over the eastern frontiers of Egypt. In 716 Sargon II put the "sheikh (of the city of) Laban", leader of one of the nomad groups of southern Palestine and northern Sinai, in charge of the people brought to the region of "the City of the Brook-of-Egypt (URU Na-ja'l Mu-sur)" [112]. This sheikh dwelt between Raphia and el-Arish [113]. Sargon II also opened the "sealed-off harbour
(karu) of Egypt" and mingled Assyrians with Egyptians [114]. The harbour was possibly located at el-Arish, the Rhinocorura of the Greeks even though little of Iron Age II date has been discovered there [115].

This move by the Assyrians gave them some control of the road which ran from Gaza through Raphia, el-Arish and Migdol to Pelusium or Tjel [116]. Paucity of water sources and boggy sand confined armies to specific routes, and limited their size at any given time; the local Arabs were therefore indispensable to military campaigns in Sinai as guides and baggage assistants [117]. At this time the Me'Unites appear to have been the major tribe in north Sinai, and ultimately on the borders of Egypt [118].

Usually placed immediately after the activities of 716, is the record of the mandattu-tribute of Shilkanni, along with that of Samsi queen of Arabia, and It'amra the Sabaean [119]. It included "12 great horses of Egypt, their like not to be found in (Assyria)" [120]. A further list [121] reports that "the LU.MAH-chieftains of the Egyptians, of Gaza, Judah, the Moabites and Ammonites arrived in Kalhu with their mandanatu-tribute". This has usually been interpreted as a further reference to the 716 tribute but Cogan [122] dates it after 712. This tribute included 45 horses, and 23 from Gaza.

The records of the Assyrian expansion towards the Egyptian border do little to illuminate the internal events of late Libyan Egypt, and the Kushite expansion. Although all scholars have placed the Piye invasion in the period 730-715, the first explicit evidence of diplomatic contact between Assyria and Kush occurs in 712. The rebellion of Iamani of Ashdod [123] was apparently backed by the Pir'u of Egypt. Sargon's invasion of Philistia caused Iamani to flee to Egypt, and then to Kush, whose ruler extradited him to Assyria. Although Tadmor [124] observes that there is no evidence as to the identity of the Kushite ruler in question, and that it could be
either Piye or Shabaqo, current opinion [125] is unanimous in assuming that the ruler was Shabaqo.

Thus, at the time of the Kushite expansion into Upper Egypt, the Assyrians were extending their control closer to the eastern border of Egypt. It is unclear whether the motive was primarily political — to prevent the Egyptians encouraging rebellion in the Assyrian provinces and vassals, or whether it was economic, to gain complete control of the Arabian routes and the Egyptian trade. It seems unlikely that the Assyrians wished to incorporate Egypt into their empire — even when forced to take decisive military action in Egypt at the end of the 25th Dynasty, the Assyrians preferred to retain vassal rulers. It was probably apparent to the Assyrian kings that the incorporation of Egypt would have weakened an already overstretched empire.

The rise of Sais.

The internal history of Egypt in the late 8th and 7th centuries is the struggle between Kushites and Saites for power. The evidence from the west Delta, both inscriptional and archaeological is insufficient to illustrate this other than intermittently. Nekau's support for the Assyrians can be interpreted in this light and Redford is indubitably right in his observation that the Assyrians are not vilified in Egyptian tradition because they supported the Delta dynasts [126]. However, the rise of Sais is as obscure as the rise of Kush.

The preserved record of Manethonic sources for the 26th Dynasty is in general agreement, and for later rulers largely correct. This has added credibility to its record of the three predecessors of Psamtik I in the opinion of some Egyptologists. The last of Manethon's rulers, Neche, is certainly Nekau I, known from the Assyrian record and a few small monuments. It is with Nekau's predecessors Neche and Stephinates that scholarly consensus is lacking. Neche is usually equated with Nekauba [127], although Ray [128] has argued
that this is Necho again, but with a suffix. Ray also sees a
Manethonic confusion with Bakenranef: Nekauba is also a magician.

The earliest dynast in the tradition is Stephinates, a name
accepted by most as a version of 'Tefnakht'. Whilst Helck identified
this Tefnakht with the protagonist of the Piye stela, most
Egyptologists have assumed him to be a "Tefnakht II" [129]. Some
familial connection between these Saite rulers and the Pharaoh
Bakenranef is widely assumed. Redford [130] is the most critical of
the confusions in the Manethonic pre-26th Dynasty, and would abandon
the two earliest rulers named:

To conjure up a second Tefnakht and treat Manetho's "Necheopsos"
seriously is to lead to unnecessary confusion.

The ascription of regnal years in Manethon also presents a
problem: although the sources agree, the total of years is not
sufficient to span the reign of Taharqo, let alone the whole of the
25th Dynasty. Even taking the 12 or 18 years of the "Ammeris the
Aithiops" recorded in two versions a maximum of 29/33 or 36/39
[allowing for overlap of the 1st regnal year] years is achieved,
against an absolute minimum of 41 years for the 25th Dynasty.
Arbitrary emendation of the sources has been the result [131].
Whilst there is a strong possibility that the Manethonic Stephinates
is to be identified with Piye's opponent, a placement at the
beginning of Taharqo's reign is, almost certainly, impossible.
However, given the Assyrian interventions in the later years of
Taharqo, there is no reason to assume an uninterrupted continuity.
The presence of an Aithiops at the head of Manethon's list indicates
that, after the defeat of Bakenranef, the Kushites installed their
own nominee [132]. Similar breaks in the rule of the family may have
occurred with the Assyrian invasions.

After the rebellion of the Delta dynasts in 667/6, Nekau was
reinstated as ruler of Sais and Memphis, and his son, the future
Psamtik I as ruler of Athribis, with the Assyrian name Nabu-shezzi-
banni. The Babylonian Chronicle states that Esarhaddon had installed
Nekau as ruler of Sais, which would date his accession to 671 BC. Manethon ascribes Nekau 8 years in all versions, and this would correspond with the Babylonian record: Nekau is known to have died, probably killed by Tanwetamani, in 664. Kitchen assumes that Nekau had already ascended the Saite throne as successor to Nekauba in 672, and was simply confirmed in his office by the Assyrians. The list of 667 includes Tabnḫt of Punubu, certainly another Tefnakht, and ruler of Per-nub or Per-Inbu in the south-west Delta: he may have been another member of the Saite family.

The details of Tefnakht's rise are rather obscure. Little is known of the west Delta in the earlier Libyan period, although some Chiefs of the Libu are attested. Kitchen and others have assumed that there was only one Chief of the Libu at any one time, although the evidence from the east Delta shows that there were several Chiefs and Great Chiefs of the Ma. One predecessor of Tefnakht, perhaps his immediate, was the Great Chief of the Ma, army-leader, Prophet of Neith and Prophet of Wadjet, and of the Lady of Imau, Osorkon [133]. His titles suggest that he had expanded his power from Sais northwards to Buto and southwest to Kom el-Hisn. The few monuments which can be attributed to this Chief do not associate him with any pharaoh, although he is suggested to have been a contemporary of Shoshenq V.

Tefnakht himself is attested by two stelae. The Abemayor stela [134] from Tell Farain is dated to year 36, 2 shomu day 14 of an unnamed pharaoh. Tefnakht is entitled Great Chief of the Ma and Leader, and Great Chief of the Libu. A second stela is dated to year 38 followed by two blank cartouches [135], Yoyotte suggested of Shoshenq V. The titles Great Chief and Leader, Great Chief of the Libu, Prophet of Neith, Prophet of Wadjet, m[ek] of Kḥtn and ḫḳ-ruler of the nomes of the West, are followed by the hieroglyphs t and 3 [Ọ] after which the text stops abruptly. This stela is undoubtedly another monument of Tefnakht, showing his increasing control of the west Delta and must belong to time of Kushite expansion into Upper Egypt.
The titles and territories of Tefnakht detailed in the Piye stela show the increase of his power. He was now Chief of the West, Chief of the Ma, H3-wr in Netjer, Prophet of Neith, Mistress of Sais and sem-priest of Ptah. He had extended his rule over the nomes of Kāheseb, Per-Nub and Inbw-hd itself.

After the defeat of the coalition and his retreat to Sais, Tefnakht swore the vassal oath to Piye, although he did not come in person [136]. The stela at Athens carries the titulary of a King Tefnakht. Some writers have attributed the stela to Piye's opponent and argued that Tefnakht broke the oath by declaring himself king [137], but Priese [138], pointing out that Tefnakht is not named by Manethon as a predecessor of Bakenranef, prefers to assign the Athens stela to the later Stephinates. Leahy [139] concedes that the present evidence does not allow a resolution to the problem, but suggests that "the eight years of Tefnakht seem to fit more easily into the vacuum created by Piye's return to Nubia than into the reign of Taharqa prior to the first Assyrian invasion".

The lack of information on Sais in the early Libyan period obscures the rise to power of this ancient city. It is thus impossible to know whether the fortunes of the dynasty were based upon the military and political skills of Tefnakht and Bakenranef, or whether there were other factors involved. Redford suggested that Tefnakht was involved in anti-Assyrian activities in western Asia, based on his identification of "So, king of Egypt" with Sais. Perhaps it might be more realistic to see contact being established through the Phoenician expansion along the north African coast. Objects with the name of Bakenranef were discovered at Pithekoussai and Tarquinia, although their export might post-date Tefnakht's reign [140]. The Saite kings of the 26th Dynasty certainly established strong contacts with Phoenicia and the Aegean world, these may have already begun. The importance of Sais in the 'archaizing' features of art and titularies is now being recognised [141], but the historical problems of the city's rise to pre-eminence will not be resolved without further material from the site.
Nubia and Libya.

Reisner advocated a Libyan origin for the 25th Dynasty [142] based in part on the fragment of an alabaster vessel of Pashedenbast son of King Shoshenq discovered at Nuri [143]. This Pashedenbast, Reisner believed to be the father of Kashta [144]. The excavations at Kurru caused Reisner to revise his views about Pashedenbast, but strengthened his view on the Libyan origin of the dynasty [145]. The evidence was now arrow heads "of well-known Libyan types", and the stela of Queen Tabiry which, in Reisner's translation, called her "the great chieftainess of the Temehu" [146].

Reisner abandoned his idea that the Kushite royal family were a scion of the 22nd Dynasty and argued that whilst the Libyans were moving into the Delta region, other groups were entering the Nile valley via the more southerly oases [147]. The suffix, -qo, found in many of the royal names was considered to be another indicator of Libyan associations; an idea supported by Griffith [148].

Reisner's view has now been generally discredited, and the indigenous Kushite origin of the dynasty is universally recognized. Along with the abandonment of Reisner's theories Libya's relations with Nubia have also ceased to be considered in Nubian studies.

Whilst there is no foundation for the theory of a Libyan origin of the Kushite royal house, there is some evidence that in the late New Kingdom there were Libyans in the southern oases. Setau campaigned to the west of Nile valley, perhaps to Dunqul or Kurkur oasis, and captured Libyans who were then employed in the building of es-Sebua temple [149].

Kitchen [150] has argued that the Libyan invasion of year 5 of Merneptah was carried out in concert with the rebellion in Wawat. He proposes that the Libyan and Kushite rulers were communicating by using the desert routes, just as the Kushites and Hyksos had done in the reign of Kamose. Representatives of the Libyans would have met
those of Nubian and the Asiatic states at the Egyptian court, and
could easily have established their own contacts. The material
culture of the Libyans, as revealed by the records of the conflicts
in the reigns of Merneptah and Ramesses III, suggest that some form
of commodity exchange had been established with states in Western
Asia.

Libyan incursions into the Nile valley in Upper Egypt, notably the
Theban region, are recorded throughout the 20th Dynasty [151]. There
is a possibility that Libyans were also entering the Nile valley
further south. Our knowledge of the archaeology of the south Libyan
desert and oases is very sketchy, and whilst there is little that can
be positively said about the region, its potential importance should
not be ignored.

So-called "Saharan sherds" were found at Amara West, some on the
surface of the town and temple and others below the intact floor
level of Level One in D.14.7 [152]. These locations suggested a
dating not earlier than the 19th Dynasty, for the scattered sherds,
and not earlier than the end of the 20th Dynasty for the sealed
context. So-called "Saharan sherds" were dated by Myers to the 6th
Dynasty in his excavations at Armant, but he noted that the type was
found at all periods in Sudan. As yet, there has been no detailed
study of this type of pottery, although there is a suspicion that it
may prove to have been a blanket term for Nubian-type coarse wares
[153].

Reisner emphasised the importance of arrowheads discovered at el-
Kurru. These were of two types, with and without tangs. The tanged
type came from Ku Tum 1 and Ku Tum 4, whilst Ku Tum 2 and Ku 19 had
only tangless examples [154]. The arrowheads were variously of
carnelian, flint, quartz and rock crystal, with an average length 4.5
cm. and average width 1.5 cm. Kendall [155] suggested that these are
so delicate that they could only be for ceremonial use. Closely
similar examples were found in tombs of New Kingdom date at Soleb
[156]. This type of arrowhead has been found widely distributed to
the west of the Nile valley [157], but there has been no attempt to delimit their area of occurrence. Dixon [158] notes that they were found at el-Kurru along with similar numbers of "the lunate arrow-tips which are typically Nubian", although Kendall [159] regards these as sickle blades. Chalcedony arrowheads which occurred as surface finds at Amara West may well be connected, and suggested to Arkell an "early Napatan" presence.

Libyans undoubtedly caused problems in Egypt during the 20th Dynasty and it is possible that small groups may have penetrated northern Nubia. In proposing that new political entities developed in Nubia immediately on the end of the viceregal period it should not be excluded that threat to the valley from such groups might have forced military and political cohesion.

Nubia and Egypt during the Libyan period.

Despite the considerable attention given to Egypt under Libyan rule since Kitchen's fundamental study of 1973, there are still enormous gaps in the historical record and disagreements about historical reconstruction. Similarly there are problems with the detailing of Egypt's contacts with western Asia during this period. The changes in the trade routes of the eastern side of the Red Sea and the fight for their control by the states of Israel, Jordan and Damascus also must have had enormous impact on Egypt. There is good evidence that Egypt still maintained trade links with the cities of the Phoenician coast, notably Byblos and probably Tyre. Yet, the expansion of the Phoenicians into the western Mediterranean, firstly along the north African coast, must have brought them into even closer contact with the Libyan pharaohs ruling at Tanis and with the rising power of Sais. Joint Tyrian and Israelite attempts to reopen the sea routes to Ophir - probably to be equated with Punt - raise questions about the control of the east African trade and the role of the pre-Aksumite states.
The rise of the kingdom of Kush.

Recent historical reconstructions have tended to portray the 25th Dynasty as an uninterrupted ascendancy over a weak Egypt, and without internal problems [1].

The expansion of Kushite power into Lower Nubia and Egypt, in the reigns of Kashta, Piye and Shabaqo, must have been based upon a strong control of Upper Nubia and the Butana region. Whilst it seems likely that the Kurru kingdom was the master of the desert road to the Shendi Reach, and consequently significant in the transportation of central Sudanese products to Egypt, it does not appear to have been the major power throughout Nubia until the reigns of Kashta, Piye and Shabaqo. Indeed, the 'Neo-Ramesside' rulers may have used one of the old Egyptian centres as their base — perhaps Kawa or Amara. The evidence from the town and cemeteries of Meroe indicates that it was the major centre in the Shendi Reach by the early 25th Dynasty at latest; indeed, the Meroe region has been suggested as the place of origin for the Kurru dynasty royal family [2].

Knowledge of these early rulers is, unfortunately, scant, and all historical reconstructions have assumed that only one major family — the 'Kurru dynasty' of Alara, Kashta, Piye and Shabaqo — was involved. The question of the expansion of the Kurru dynasty's power into the Butana is of fundamental importance, yet there is hardly any material which illuminates this. The predecessors of the 25th Dynasty must have pursued constant and extensive activities in the Butana region, even if attempts at military domination were a comparatively late aspect. Such activities would not have been necessary, or so extensive, if the dynasty did have its origin in the central Sudan and only later established itself further north.

An alternative hypothesis, and one which has received little attention, is that there may be more than one family group involved.
in the emergence of the 25th Dynasty, one based in the Shendi Reach, the other at Kurru.

**The ancestors of the 25th Dynasty.**

Kendall's re-examination of the evidence from el-Kurru, albeit incomplete and inconclusive, has led him to advance some opinions on the origin of the 'Kurru dynasty'. He suggests a possible northern origin by analogy with the pottery from Debeira [3] and would date this family's appearance as chiefs in the 4th Cataract region around 890-840 BC [4].

Kendall suggests the possibility that gold was one of the commodities which formed the economic base of the emergent power. He proposes that during Generation B some contact had been established with Thebes [5], demonstrated by the evidence for the ritual of breaking the red pots at the funeral, and the presence of Theban marl wares and Levantine storage jars in the burials assigned to this phase. A gold nugget with a text mentioning Amun [6] indicates to Kendall that by the end of the second generation, [the chief] and his family held the Theban god in some awe and possibly had become adherents to his cult. This would seem to imply active missionizing on the part of Egyptians of Theban origin.

It is rather doubtful if Egyptian religion was ever of a proselytising nature, and even if - as Kendall's evidence from Barkal suggests - the temples in the Napatan region had lapsed into desuetude, there is some indication that Kawa remained important.

In the evidence Kendall sees a "sudden, very active Egyptian presence at Kurru", with the local ruler actively inviting the Egyptians particularly "for their know-how and religious beliefs" and the Egyptians "vigorously cultivating and enculturating him" [7]. Kendall imagines the beginning of close contacts to be connected with the Theban opposition to the Crown Prince Osorkon in the reign of Takeloth II which he dates around 833 BC (year 24 Takeloth II,
following Kitchen 1973):

It is of the greatest interest that these events should almost exactly coincide in our chronology with the sudden infusion of Egyptian influences at Kurru in Generation B. One is thus drawn to the highly intriguing possibility that the court at Kurru had received a band of Theban priestly families who had fled to Nubia in order to escape persecution. [8]

These families, Kendall feels, would have had a hatred of the Tanites (glossing over the fact that many of Theban nobility were descended from the Tanite royal house) and would have been only too willing to serve the Kushites. They thus set up Gebel Barkal as a rival sanctuary to Thebes. Kendall suspects that there was intermarriage between the Theban priestly and Kushite royal families [9].

Kendall is convinced that "This possibility seems perfectly to fit the actual evidence". He sees the Amun cult spreading to other Kushite towns and this soon exciting the respect and interest of Thebes. Kendall emphasises theocracy and a proselytising form of the Amun cult, for which there is really very little evidence. His theory, in any case, is fragile in that it is built on the coincident chronology of Kurru and the pontificate of Osorkon as established by himself and Kitchen. There is good reason to believe the pontificate of Osorkon was in fact much later than the 830s BC, and it is equally possible that the 'generation B' of Kurru was earlier.

Unfortunately, the documentary evidence sheds little light on the ancestral phase of the 25th Dynasty, and such evidence as survives is extremely difficult to interpret, consisting as it does, of fragmentary genealogies, filiations and titles. The evidence for the genealogy of the 25th dynasty was closely examined by M.F.L. Macadam and D. Dunham, whose reconstruction has been generally accepted. There are, however, grounds for reassessing their work and questioning some of the premises upon which they based their conclusions (see Appendix: The Kushite succession: matriliny or patriliny?).
Macadam's fundamental premise was that there was only one family in the generative stage of the Kushite monarchy, and this view has been accepted by all writers who have subsequently discussed the material. Macadam also argued that the succession was from brother to brother, then to the children of the eldest brother.

The emphasis on the Kurru cemetery has, itself, centralised our view of the Kushite state, yet there is a possibility that three or more families were actually involved. The problem centres on our understanding of terms such as s3t nsw, snt nsw etc. We are forced to assume that they had a specific, rather than a general, application: since if they were loosely used terms, we can have no possibility of reconstructing the genealogy, or understanding the succession.

The idea that a form of matrilineal succession existed in Kush was suggested by Reisner (1931) and elaborated by Macadam (1949) and has been favoured by a number of writers [10]. Török has criticised the hypothesis, emphasising that the main source cited in support, Nicholas of Damascus, allows matrilinear succession only as an alternative to other forms, and not as the sole system [11].

The sister-son relationship of Tanwetamani to Taharqo, emphasised by the Assyrian texts, might indicate a form of matriliny, but the evidence is far too scanty to make any general comments. I have argued against many of the matrilineal theories proposed by Macadam, because I believe them to be founded on insufficient evidence. Women were undoubtedly important in the Kushite royal family, and, it seems, in a different way to the role of Egyptian royal women. However, even if a form of matriliny did prevail, I feel that - with the type of evidence available - we cannot hope to define or penetrate it.

Once the genealogies are questioned, many other aspects of the period also demand attention. The brother-succession theory, so
persuasively argued by Macadam, cannot be accepted if the genealogies are as presented here (see Appendix).

Looking at the earliest evidence for the Kushite state - the Nasalsa genealogy, the titles of Alara, Kashta, Pebatma and Kasaqa - other possibilities emerge.

A Dynasty Divided?

Priese [12] contested the accepted relationship of Piye and Shabaqo, that they were brothers, and a close examination of all of the available evidence challenges the whole scheme proposed by Dunham and Macadam. It is certain that Piye and Shabaqo were connected by a number of marriages, but a blood relationship is far from certain.

In his inscriptions Taharqo emphasises his relationship with Alara through his mother, Abar, who was the daughter of Alara's sister. Abar was also a snt nswt, but not, on any surviving monument a s3t nswt. The use of one title and not the other (assuming a narrow and literal usage) makes a connection with Shabaqo and Kashta unlikely. Abar, indeed, might have been a sister-wife of Piye. Piye himself married a daughter of Alara, Tabiry, and at least one daughter of Kashta, Pekareslo. The evidence is strong that both Shabaqo and Shebitqo were married to daughters of Piye.

The possibility emerges that the 25th Dynasty actually comprised at least two distinct, but closely interconnected, families, one of Alara, Piye and Taharqo, the other Kashta, Shabaqo, Shebitqo and Tanwetamani. The extremely complex intermarriages between the two groups are more easily explicable within the context of some form of dual monarchy, and a dual monarchy itself would resolve some of the chronological and generational anomalies of the family relationships.

Piye may have been Alara's legitimate heir, either through a matrilineal descent (as emphasised by Taharqo), or if Alara had no sons; or he may have been 'elected' from amongst the royal brethren.
There are, however, indications that Piye's memory suffered some attack after his death, and this is again more readily explained in the context of two families and a dual monarchy. His figure is erased on the Victory Stela, as are both his figure and names on the sandstone stela from Barkal [13]. The name and figure was later restored on the Barkal stela [14]. Reisner proposed that the erasures belonged to the reign of Shabaqo, and the restorations to that of Taharqo. Further confusion is created by the stela of Aspelta detailing the building and equipping of a tomb and funerary offerings for Prince Khaliut, a son of Piye, which has been interpreted as an attempt to placate Piye's descendants.

The possibility cannot be ignored that various elite/ruling families from different parts of Nubia (e.g., the central Sudan, the Kurru-Barkal region, perhaps Kawa/Kerma, Lower Nubia) through a series of marriages were the ancestors of the '25th Dynasty'.

Priese suggested a number of different models for the succession. The alternatives he proposed were that succession would go to the eldest son of the eldest sister; to all sons of the eldest sister; to all sons of all sisters or to all sons of the eldest sister who was married to the eldest brother. A wide-range of other possibilities can be suggested by comparison with other ancient and more recent states [15]. Lineal succession and lateral succession can be qualified by patriliney and matriliny, but also by other criteria of acceptability. In many cases appointment may be made by the dying ruler with the advice of various palace officials, often including the Queen Mother. In some instances the kingship may rotate through a number of lineages of the royal house. In other cases a conquering tribal group or elite family might accommodate the conquered population by marriage: so in Cameroon the conquering Fulani rulers were always sons of former chiefs by wives who belonged to the conquered Mboum population.

The available evidence is insufficient to support the theory of brother succession as elaborated by Macadam. Evidence might yet be
forthcoming which does confirm that Piye was a son of Kashta, but the relationship of Shebitqo and Tanwetamani to Shabaqo, still makes the brother-succession theory untenable. A number of very tentative alternatives are proposed below.

Alara and the foundations of Kushite power.

Alara, the earliest Meroitic king named in texts, is usually assumed to have been an elder brother and immediate predecessor of Kashta, although the evidence for this is negligible. Indeed, all the monuments of 25th-dynasty date which speak of him, belong to the family of Piye and Taharqo, and not to the descendants of Kashta. The significance of this, and possibility that the Piye and Shabaqo were members of different, albeit closely inter-related, families, is considered further below.

Alara is referred to in the inscriptions of Taharqo, Irike-Amanote and Nastasen and in a funerary text of queen Tabiry. The Taharqo inscriptions give family relationships, but also the information that Alara dedicated his sisters as chantresses of Amun at Kawa.

In Kawa Inscription VI (11 23-24), Taharqo quotes a prayer of Alara to Amun of Kawa, in which Alara says "thou didst thwart for me him that devised evil against me and didst set me up as king (nswt)". The prayer continues with a wish that his sister's descendants will also assume the kingship. Clearly, there is a strongly propagandistic motive - Taharqo legitimises his rule by association with Alara, and that king's actual or attributed wish that the throne should pass to his sister's children. Nevertheless, the obscure allusion to an opponent of Alara hints at circumstances at that earlier time. Alara may well have overcome an already reigning monarch, or himself faced opposition after he had seized power.

The Nastasen stela describes that king's journey from Meroe to Napata, across the Bayuda. He arrived at Ast-reset, perhaps the Fura wells, then, in a day's journey arrived at T3 k3t whence he crossed

- 225 -
the river to Barkal. Macadam suggested that the name meant 'the high sandhill' and that it lay in the vicinity of Nuri. Priese thought it was perhaps Sanam. The Nastasen stela qualifies the town with the additional name P3-m3i-C3t [16].

The texts, all posthumous, refer to Alara as s3 R^, the usual designation for a dead ruler. Kawa Inscriptions IV (1 17) and VI (1 22), of Taharqo, prefix this with the title wr-Chieftain. Kawa VI also refers to him as having been set up as mswt by Amun. There is, however, no clear evidence as to whether Alara adopted the Egyptian royal style, or not.

There might be a case for identifying Alara with king Ary of the Kawa stelae. It is certainly possible that in rebuilding the Kawa Temple B, Harsiyotef thought that he was reconstructing the works of Alara. Alara was supposed, in later tradition, to have had a long reign, and the Kawa Inscription XV, probably to be ascribed to Ary, is dated to year 23. Kawa XIV refers to the building of temple at Kawa, described as 120 cubits in length.

The writing of the name Ary on the Kawa Stela XIV is similar to that used for Alara in Kawa Stelae IV and VI of Taharqo and the much later Nastasen stela. The differences could be attributed to the ability - or choice - of the scribes in writing a foreign name.

Taharqo states that Alara had committed his sisters to the protection of Amun of Gematen (Kawa) [17]. Török proposes that the wife of Kashta, Queen Pebatma, was one of the sisters of Alara.
dedicated at Kawa, since she held the title ihyt n Imam-Rc nsw ntw. Pebatama is also called s3t nsw and snt nsw, and consequently either Alara - or in most reconstructions of the genealogy, both Alara and Kashta - must have been a son of an earlier "king". There is always a problem in interpreting titles such as s3t and snt nsw, but in this case they do seem to conflict with the tradition that appears to regard Alara as the founder of the monarchy.

Although it is assumed [19], there is no supporting evidence that the burial of Alara was in one of the 'ancestral' graves at el-Kurru. Kendall [20] reproduces a photograph from the Reisner archive of a hitherto unpublished block from Kurru (supposed to be the burial place of Alara). The figure wears a form of helmet with a loop over the brow, which Kendall regards as imitative of a uraeus. Kendall comments that [21]:

This clearly suggests that the owner of the tomb had virtually identified himself as a king in Egyptian mold.

The headdress has no parallels and bears no resemblance to Egyptian regalia, nor is the loop similar to a uraeus. The whole fragment remains enigmatic.

If Alara was a member of the 'Kurru dynasty' with his power-base in the 3rd-4th Cataract region, he may have been responsible for bringing the Butana under their direct authority, so that it dominated not only the transmission of products, but also their acquisition. Alternatively, he may have been a ruler of the central Sudan, perhaps based at Meroe, who was attempting to expand his power northwards into the Dongola Reach.

Kashta.

Kashta's reign is presumed to have followed that of Alara. He is accredited with bringing the Kurru dynasty into pre-eminence in Lower, as well as in Upper Nubia; from the use of a prenomen ([Ne]-Maet-Re), and his dedication of a stela in the Aswan region. Whether
Kashta achieved, or even attempted, the expansion of his rule into Upper Egypt is a debated issue.

Very few contemporary monuments attest Kashta, but sufficient to make it certain that he assumed the Egyptian royal style. Kashta's nomen and prenomen are preserved and he probably adopted the full five-fold titulary. A bronze aegis [22] carries the nomen, and depicts the king being suckled by a goddess (probably Mut). Such scenes are indicative of coronation or sed-festival rituals, but are frequently used in the prospective sense: one simply cannot assume that it is an object attesting Kashta's coronation at Thebes.

The stela fragment from Elephantine [23] is the only inscription to carry both nomen and prenomen. Usually read as $\text{M3}^c\text{-t-R}^c$, Priese [24] argued that it should actually be read as $\text{Ni-M3}^c\text{-t-R}^c$, taking the reversed $\text{=} (t)$ as $\text{= \LARGE{\text{(m3}^c + n)}$. 

Following his interpretation of the Elephantine stela cartouche Priese identified the badly preserved cartouche in Karnak Priestly Annals 31 [25] as Ne-maet-re, and accredited it to Kashta. Dated to year 1, Priese assumed that the king began to date by regnal years only after his conquest of Thebes [26].

Both the Elephantine and Karnak cartouches are uncertain readings, as Priese concedes. He notes the originality of the prenomen, as that of Amenemhat III, rather than the Ramesside forms generally preferred throughout the Third Intermediate Period. By analogy with the forms used for the name of Amenemhat III in the Manethonic derivatives he argues that "Ammeris the Aithiops" placed at the beginning of the 26th Dynasty in some versions, is to be understood as Ne-maet-re Kashta [27]. It seems unlikely that the fragment of a faience "chalice" with cartouche perhaps to be read as "Ne-Maet-Re" should be added to the corpus of Kashta's monuments [28].

These documents apart, all the inscriptions and building works from Egypt carrying his name are demonstrably posthumous, and
associated with his daughter Amenirdis I as God's Wife of Amun. Earlier writers suggested that Kashta himself installed Amenirdis I as heiress to Shepenwepet I, but current opinion favours Piye as the most likely protagonist [29], and probably before his campaign of year 19/20. This is equally uncertain, and founded upon a number of premises, most importantly, that Amenirdis I and Piye were brother and sister [30]. There are number of factors which suggest that the older idea is, after all, right, and that it was Kashta who installed Amenirdis as heiress to Shepenwepet I [31]. The adoption of Amenirdis by Shepenwepet I was an act of great significance. Just as the installation of Nitoqert marked the transition of power from the Kushites to the Saites, so the adoption of Amenirdis must have recognised the rising power of Kush. Unfortunately, the event cannot be precisely dated.

Kashta was buried at el-Kurru, assumed to be Ku 8 [32], and the only surviving fragment of the burial furniture [33] carries the king's name within a cartouche.

It is impossible to ascribe any reliable absolute date to Kashta's floruit: all calculated dates derive from preconceptions about the length of the reign of Piye. A conspectus of the dates suggested demonstrates this, spanning almost the entire 8th century [34]:

Leclant and Yoyotte [1952] c 780
von Beckerath [1969] reign 772-753
Baer [1973] reign 772-753
Arkell [1961: 121] 751
Dunham [1950: 3] tomb 760-751
Wenig [1979] reign 760-747
Török [1986; 1992] reign 760-747
Reisner [1923: 75] reign 750-744
Albright [1956: 25 n 10] death 735
Petrie [1918] reign c 725-715
The absolute dating of Kashta's reign depends on many factors, and at present cannot be determined. Nor can the events of his reign be outlined. It can be said with some certainty that he extended Kushite power to the Egyptian frontier, and very probably into Upper Egypt itself.

The chronology of the 25th Dynasty.

As the first period of major intervention by Egypt in Western Asia since the collapse of the New Kingdom, and the first to be firmly set against the Biblical and Assyrian records, the 25th Dynasty, and its chronology, has generated a voluminous literature.

In all of this literature Manethon's legacy has played a major role, and the actual monumental record has been rather subordinated to it. What emerges as the crux is the length of the reign of Shebitqo, the highest documented year for which is Karnak NT 33 of year 3. Many biblical scholars, following Macadam's discussion of the Kawa stelae, have adopted both a generally low chronology for the dynasty, and a long co-regency between Shebitqo and Taharqo to accommodate the minimum 10 years usually allowed to the elder ruler [35]. Kitchen has fiercely defended his high chronology, and castigated Biblical scholarship for its failure to consider the Egyptological criticisms of Macadam [36]. Much of the concern voiced by the Biblical scholars has been focussed on the reference to Taharqo's presence at the battle of Eltekeh in 701 BC and its chronological implications. Kitchen [37], is certainly correct in his challenges to some of Macadam's interpretations, but also argues from his own preconceptions and interpretations.

The exact chronology of the dynasty, from the accession of Shabaqo onwards, is dictated by external factors deriving from the firmly established dates of Late Period Egypt and the contemporary Near East [38]. All reconstructions of the dynasty's history, and interpretations based upon them, are set against a background of events in Western Asia: moving events in Egypt by even a year can
entirely alter the complexion of interstate affairs [39]. This
emphasises the necessity of a sound chronology; seeking explanations
of 'policy' when the events are misplaced creates entirely false
perceptions. Although this is self-evident it seems too frequently to
be forgotten, or ignored.

1. Manethon and the classical tradition.

Despite its existence as only "much edited extracts" and "garbled
abridgement" [40] Manethon inevitably served as the basis for
reconstructing Egyptian history and chronology, even after the
decipherment of hieroglyphics. Scholars seem never able to desist
from discussing Manethon's regnal years, even when they are flagrantly
contradicted by the monumental record. This has particularly applied
to the 25th Dynasty. Even Gardiner, always aware of the curse of this
source, thought that "[h]ere at last we are heartened by some
resemblance to authentic history" [41].

The sequence of the 25th Dynasty kings as preserved in the extant
versions of Manethon [42] names only three kings: Sabacon, Sebichos
and Tar(a)kos. The regnal years ascribed to the kings in these
versions bears no relation to the monumental evidence. Indeed, in
refuting their validity as a source Kitchen [43] was at his most
uncompromising (his emphases):

As these figures stand in the text, NOT ONE FIGURE IS CORRECT.
They are WRONG. It is, therefore, preposterous to claim to base a
sound, factually-based chronology of the 25th Dynasty upon these
faulty data. Only by emendation can any plausible chronology be
wryned from them. And emendation automatically removes objectivity
and reduces the whole set of adjusted numbers into modern
hypothesis having no ancient authority whatsoever.

Despite this, Kitchen concludes his lengthy diatribe by proposing a
manipulation of different versions of Manethon, since "it has the
advantage of fitting all the first-hand data, without inventing any
imaginary coregencies". This solution requires us to take the 14
years attributed by Africanus to Sebichos-Shebitqo and give them
instead to Sabacon-Shabaqo:

and the 12 years for Shebitku from the Eusebius figures, and assume no coregency. The dates for the two kings are then 716-702 and 702-690 B.C., as arrived-at in this work originally. After the preceding invective this conclusion is rather extraordinary.

The Manethonic and classical traditions maintain that it was Shabaqo's invasion which brought Egypt under Kushite rule, the king burning his opponent, Bocchoris-Bakenranef, alive [44]. There is no direct evidence that Shabaqo did slay Bakenranef, and although earlier scholarship generally accepted the tradition, it has recently been treated more sceptically [45]. Irrespective of the classical traditions, Shabaqo's triumph over the Saite ruler is apparently affirmed by the inscription added to the burial of an Apis bull made in Bakenranef's year 6 [46]. The classical record of conflict between Shabaqo and Bakenranef is thus generally accredited with some foundation in real events, although the oft-cited Apis text remains unpublished.

It is important to observe that Shabaqo in the classical record stands for all of the 25th-dynasty rulers [47], and the remote possibility that the conflict between Tefnakht and Piye has been transferred to Shabaqo and Bakenranef, should not be discounted.

The disparity between the classical, literary, sources and the monumental evidence of the Piye stela has never presented a major problem to Egyptology. Piye has always been seen as an elder contemporary of Shabaqo who initiated the Kushite expansion, but after the defeat of the Libyan rulers confined his sphere of influence to Upper Egypt. Gardiner [48] found it extraordinary that Piye receives no mention in the Graeco-Roman literature, but Leahy [49] emphasises that the Manethonic king list records only those rulers who were "officially acknowledged in the area providing his source material", possibly Sebennytos or Memphis [50]. Earlier scholars thought that there were several kings called "Piankhy", but were unanimous in their placing of the conqueror as the first.
The accepted sequence Piye-Shabaqo has affected all recent interpretation of the history of the dynasty, particularly the arguments for the exact chronology, and the consequent dating of the late Third Intermediate Period rulers. A considerable number of factors challenge the accepted characterisation of the early 25th Dynasty, and suggest that a radically different interpretation is viable, if not preferable.

2. The monumental evidence.

Any attempt to establish a firm chronology for the Kushite domination of Egypt must begin with the Egyptian monumental evidence and the synchronisms with Western Asia. Too many preconceptions have influenced scholastic interpretation, such as Kitchen's intransigence in refusing to accept the ineluctable conclusion of the Iamani text (deriving from his insistence that the Eltekeh campaign indicates a new ruler), rather than any monumental evidence.

The system of back-dating regnal years during the 25th Dynasty, and also in the reign of Bakenranef, has been well-discussed by Redford [51].

The evidence is here considered working back from the certain dates of the later years of the dynasty, and since much of this material has been amply discussed [52], it is dealt with briefly.

A short co-regency between Taharqo and Tanwetamani has often been proposed on the evidence of the 'Dream Stela' [53] and the Karnak chapel of Osiris-Ptah-Nebankh. Schäfer [54] argued on the basis of the stela, that Tanwetamani was "caused to appear as king" by Taharqo and that the accession as sole ruler is indicated later in the text. The chapel [55] was decorated by both rulers, the most notable feature favouring a co-regency being the lintel with symmetrical decoration of both rulers. Kitchen notes that the chapel may have been completed by Tanwetamani as an act of legitimation.
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In advocating a co-regency, albeit brief, Schäfer was followed by a number of writers [56]. Kitchen [57] observed that the co-regency was unlikely to have been more than a few months, and was chronologically insignificant. Murnane [58] noted that there was no decisive evidence but did not rule it out.

Tanwetamani was acknowledged in Upper Egypt until his 8th year, and is attested by a number of dated inscriptions [59]. Kitchen [60] cogently argued that the transfer to Saite rule was negotiated, the diplomatic manoeuvres taking place between year 8 peret 3 of Tanwetamani and year 9 akhet 2 of Psamtik I, when Nitokert arrived in Thebes to be adopted by the Kushite princesses as eventual God's Wife of Amun.

The chronological relationship of Taharqo with Psamtik I is stated in the Serapeum stela 192, recording an Apis bull installed in year 26 of Taharqo which died, aged 21 years in year 20 of Psamtik I [61]. Since the dates for the 26th Dynasty are certain [62], this allows the accession date of Taharqo [63] to be placed at 690 BC.

Taharqo's reign is well-documented, particularly from the Theban region, and lists of dated monuments have been published by Spalinger [64] and Leclant [65]. The years attested by monuments or documents are: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23?, 24, and 26.

The succession Shebitqo-Taharqo is inferred from Kawa V, 15: "I received the crown in Memphis after the falcon flew to heaven". The falcon is assumed to have been Shebitqo, since in Kawa IV, 8 it is Shebitqo who is named as the king who summoned Taharqo and the royal brethren to Egypt. On the basis of the Kawa texts, Macadam [66] proposed that there had been a 6 year co-regency between Shebitqo and Taharqo. This idea was widely accepted by Biblical scholars [67], but not by Egyptologists. Kitchen [68] and Murnane [69] have both discussed the evidence and arguments at length, and have rejected Macadam's proposal. The Kawa text, as Kitchen emphasises, is clear
that Taharqo's coronation took place after Shebitqo's death, and there is no evidence for the co-regency.

The length of Shebitqo's reign is not yet known, and upon this hangs the absolute chronology of the early-25th Dynasty, and the date of Shabaqo's invasion. The highest certain regnal year is 3, recorded by Karnak Nile Level Text No.33 [70]. Kitchen [71] argued from his calculation for the accession date of Shabaqo that:

it is unimpeachably clear that Shebitku must have reigned for not more than 13 years and not less than 8 years. Therefore, this low date of Year 3 is of not the slightest value in estimating the length of his reign. (his italic)

Kitchen rightly emphasises that the few monuments so-far known for Shebitqo cannot be invoked as evidence of a short reign although for other kings Kitchen is happy to cite lack of monuments as indicative of short reigns (eg Amenemnisu).

Considerable confusion has been caused by the donation stela at New York, cited by Redford [72] and Leclant [73] as dated to year 10 of Shebitqo. This can only come from a mis-reading of Meeks [74] where the date is given as "x" for year-unknown. This stela, from Horbeit, is in the name of a king's son and prophet of Hormerty, Patjenfy, surely the same as the Great Chief and Leader, prophet of Hormerty, Patjenfy who dedicated a stela at Horbeit in year 2 of Shabaqo [75].

Despite the Karnak year-3 text being his highest-known regnal year, Shebitqo is accredited with between 8 and 12 years, principally on the basis of the Manethonic sources. Kitchen [76] commented that 3 years "is nowhere near his real length of reign on any calculation", revealing his own preference for calculating downwards from the accession date of Shabaqo as 716.

A co-regency between Shabaqo and Shebitqo has been rejected by Kitchen [77], but is advocated by Murnane [78], Yurco [79], Redford [80] and Spalinger [81]; indeed placing Shabaqo's invasion after 712, a co-regency is unavoidable, unless the reign was much briefer than - 235 -
has normally been allowed. Kitchen [82] observes that the Karnak Nile level text is not evidence of a co-regency, but does allow one.

A stela at Turin [83] depicting Shabaqo and Shebitqo with Shepenwepet and Amenirdis, was accepted by a number of writers as evidence for a co-regency and filiation [84]. Petrie [85] brusquely dismissed the stela as a fake and has been followed by those few writers who mention it [86]. The stela is indeed a fake.

Part of the sole rule of Shebitqo must be placed after the beginning of the co-regency of Osorkon III and Takeloth III which began in year 24 of Osorkon III, on the evidence of the Osiris Heqa-Djet chapel at Karnak. There, the outer court, an addition to the original shrine, was decorated by Shebitqo and Amenirdis I. It should be noted that in Kitchen's estimate, Shebitqo's reign began 52 years after Osorkon III's year 24.

The problem of Shebitqo's reign is thus manifest: its length has always been calculated on suspect sources, either Manethon or the presumed accession date of Shabaqo. Until further dated monuments can be confidently attributed to Shebitqo, all that can be said is that his reign was not less than three years.

Shabaqo's reign is recorded by dated documents, official and private, from all over Egypt. At Karnak, Nile level texts are dated to year 2 [87], and year 4? [88]: a further text [89] has no surviving year number. A stela from Horbeit, of year 2 [90] and another, probably originally from Bubastis, dated to year 3 [91], demonstrate an early acknowledgement of Shabaqo's rule in the Delta. From the western Delta are stelae of year 4 [92], probably from Sais, and of year 6 from Buto [93]. Year 7 is referred to in a papyrus of Taharqo [94], and year 10 by a contemporary document [95]. Inscriptions of Amenirdis I in the Wadi Hammamat are dated year 12 of Shabaqo [96] and the Wadi Gasus text may also belong to this reign [97]. An abnormal hieratic text of a year 13 [98] attributed to Shabaqo on palaeographical grounds is fairly certain, but the evidence for an
Apis bull burial in year 14, proposed by Vercoutter [99] is insubstantial. The statue of Iti [100] is dated late in Shabaqo's last full year, 15 (2 shomu 11).

The text of the statue of Iti refers to a kny-cult of Piye, and Hall suggested that this "possibly implies that Piankhi was still king in Shabaka's 15th year" [101]. This idea and the possibility of co-regency between Piye and Shabaqo was disputed, on chronological grounds, by Leclant and Yoyotte [102]. Murnane [103], sees no evidence that Piye was alive during the reign of Shabaqo, and Kitchen gives no consideration to the possibility. The issue depends on the nature of the kny-cult, recorded by the text of Iti's statue. The kny-cult may have served only dead kings, but the evidence is limited, and inadequately studied [104].

Recent analyses of the 25th Dynasty chronology have reached a loose consensus on the general framework, if not the exact dates. A number of problems which earlier writers, such as Petrie, noted, have been resolved, but the absolute chronology prior to the accession of Taharqo remains uncertain.

Given that the accession date of Taharqo is certain as 690 BC, the absolute minimum chronology for the dynasty—not necessarily to be preferred—must be:

690 accession of Taharqo
690 = year 3 of Shebitqo
692 = year 1 of Shebitqo
692 = year 16 (very brief) of Shabaqo
707 is the absolute minimum date for the accession of Shabaqo.

Assuming that there were no coregencies, and that the campaign of Shabaqo followed closely upon the Iamani incident, a higher chronology can be advocated. The maximum length for the reign of Shebitqo in this scheme is 8 years (longer with co-regency). The maximum dates for the dynasty are thus:
690 accession of Taharqo
697 accession of Shebitqo (no co-regency)
712 accession of Shabaqo

How long was the reign of Piye?

The length of the reign of Piye is a matter of some dispute. It is however, a subject of major significance, not only in its purely chronological implications, but also for any attempt to understand the nature of Kushite policy and expansion into Egypt.

The Victory Stela of year 21 [105] apart, there are few certain, documented, regnal years of Piye. Two Theban papyri of years 21 [106] and 22 [107], and the Dakhla stela of year 24 [108], are all dated by the reign of 'Py si-Ese mery-Amun' [109]. No monuments in Egypt certainly record earlier years, although the Wadi Gasus graffito is usually attributed to his year 12 [110]. The king's titulary on the Mutirdis stela implies a date preceding the Victory Stela, and could be ascribed to an earlier invasion of Egypt. Unfortunately, the stela's text is concerned with entirely different matters, and it might equally be a monument contemporary with the campaign recorded by the stela of year 21. The fragments of a second granite stela, published by Loukianoff [111] and reconsidered by Priese [112], carry a reference to year 4 associated with the celebration of the Opet festival.

With the exception of the Dakhla Stela of year 24, there are no regnal years from Egypt that are later than year 22 and unproblematic. A bandage text [113] is argued by Kitchen [114] to record a year 30 of Piye, which falls within his own estimated 31 years minimum derived from "external evidence" [115]. Redford [116], discussing the same text, concludes that the remains of the signs indicate two possibilities; a 'regnal year 20 [+ X]' (but not '30') or 'regnal year 40'. The problems and uncertainties associated with this text negate its value as a source.
This lack of certain regnal years has presented historians with a major problem: after Piye's victorious campaign in Egypt, which is presumed, following the date of the Victory stela, to have taken place in his 19th and 20th years, the king retired to Napata never again to be seen in Egypt. The advocates of a long reign (as much as 40 years) have never offered any entirely convincing explanation of this situation; and the most credible assumption is simply that any monumental or documentary evidence is destroyed, or awaits discovery.

Kitchen [117] calculated the reign at 31 years, assuming that Tefnakht did not adopt the royal title until after Piye's invasion, since on the Victory Stela he is called 'the chief of Sais'. Redford [118] argues that Piye deliberately refused to acknowledge Tefnakht's rank in his inscription, and that it was hardly likely that a defeated prince would then assume the royal title [119]; "In sum, nothing militates against placing the campaign [of Piye] later, rather than earlier, in Tefnakhte's career as king". Kitchen's view was that Tefnakht, as the only one of the dynasts not to submit to Piye, was 'pure' and hence could assume the kingship [120]. Tefnakht did not go in person to Athribis, but he did take the oath of allegiance to Piye. Since no real parallels exist, it is impossible to make a decisive comment: if Tefnakht retained power in Sais there would be no reason why he could not assume the royal style. It therefore remains uncertain whether the monuments attributable to King Tefnakht belong to Piye's opponent, or a later ruler [121].

In his chronology Redford [122] adopted 24 as Piye's highest regnal year. Piye's invasion (his year 20) Redford suggests, was in Tefnakht's 8th, and last, year; Bakenranef ascending the Saite throne in the same year. Redford's chronology thus does not affect the acknowledged synchronism of Shabaqo's year 2 and Bakenranef's year 6.

Redford's argued chronology would seem to have much in its favour: Shabaqo's invasion could then be interpreted as a direct sequel to the activities of Piye. However, the extensive building works of
Piye at Gebel Barkal might favour a longer reign length as proposed by Kitchen.

Piye's enlargement of the temple of Amun was achieved in three stages: the first enclosed the original temple of the 19th Dynasty (rooms B 503–519) with a wall which also created a new hall with altar or dais (B 520–21); the second phase extended the temple by adding a vast colonnaded hall and entrance pylon (Pylon II and B 502), and the last phase added a colonnaded forecourt with entrance pylon (Pylon I and B 501). Kendall's epigraphic work at Barkal has added considerably to our knowledge of the decoration of the court 501, and the 2nd pylon, and has demonstrated their close relationship with the account of the invasion of Egypt recorded on the king's stela. A scene depicting the obeisance of the princes before Piye [123] was apparently an expanded version of the lunette scene on the stela itself [124], and the accompanying texts were almost identical, even to spelling mistakes [125]. The decoration of the pylon's internal faces (B 502) seems to have shown the capture of Hermopolis, and a battle (interpreted by Kendall as the capture of Memphis with the flight of Tefnakht) [126]. The outer court was thus decorated, and most probably built, after the campaign, which, following the usual interpretation, means after year 21. The fragment of a scene showing Piye running alongside the Apis bull [127] is indicative of sed-festival scenes, but whether the record of a celebration, or simply prospective is, as yet uncertain.

Placing the entire, and lengthy, reign of Piye before the attested 15 years of Shabaqo, creates a number of problems, some of which have not been considered in literature. Not least, the generations of this supposed family are seriously over-extended [128], as are those of their contemporaries in Egypt [129].

If the reign of Piye was substantially longer than 24 years, the lack of evidence from Egypt needs to be explained: did the Kushites lose control? Or was some sort of loose control established without
the use of regnal years and without building works? Or is the documentary evidence simply undiscovered?

Kendall [130] now advocates a reign in excess of 30 years for Piye based on the unpublished reliefs at Barkal. He refers to "elaborate" heb-sed scenes, and assumes that Piye celebrated the festival in his 30th year, although it should also be noted that the lavish celebration by Osorkon II was performed in his 22nd year.

The Piye problem.

All of the recent discussions have assumed that Piye's reign and Egyptian campaign preceded those of Shabaqo. Until the excavations of Reisner at el-Kurru, most Egyptologists had a fundamentally different interpretation of the available information.

Petrie allotted the material to between two and seven individuals, Gauthier thought four or five [131]. Two of Petrie's were kings: Usermaatre 'Pankhy I', to whom he ascribed the Victory stela and a reign ca. 748-725 [132], and Sneferre 'Pankhy II', whom he made father of Taharqo [133]. On the evidence of the Ward scarab [134], Petrie proposed that Pankhy II was co-ruler with Taharqo.

Reisner initially followed the others [135] and proposed that Piankhy I was king of Kush and Thebes 740-720, and from 720-710, king of Egypt. Piankhy II he considered a successor of Tanwetamani ruling 653-633. Following his excavations at el-Kurru, Reisner abandoned the earlier scheme and repeatedly emphasised that there was evidence for only one ruler named Piankhy (Piye) [136]. His revised interpretation was followed by Dunham and Macadam [137] and by Leclant and Yoyotte [138] and is now universally acknowledged.

Whilst there are no grounds for allotting the material to more than one ruler named Piye/Piankhy, a number of problems remain with its interpretation. Hall's proposed co-regency of Piye and Shabaqo was rejected by Leclant and Yoyotte [139], largely on chronological
grounds: consequently all of Piye's reign, and his extensive building works must predate the accession of Shabaqo.

The erasure of Piye's figure and name on a number of monuments [140] has been variously interpreted, generally as a sign of conflict during the 25th Dynasty, perpetrated by either Shabaqo or Shebitqo, or, more specifically, as an indicator of an insurrection between year 21 and the completion of B500 and B800 where Piye's cartouches are intact [141].

The Campaigns of Piye.

There can be little doubt that the Kushites were politically and militarily active in Upper Egypt before the campaign attributed to year 19. Kitchen [144] suggests the possibility of Kushite garrisons in Upper Egypt.

Priese has suggested that the sandstone stela from Gebel Barkal should be dated to year 3, and, since the fragments of the 'second historical stela' carry a reference to a "year 4", that Piye established his authority in Upper Egypt early in his reign. Although there are no major activities known for the period between then and the conflict with Tefnakht, attributing the Wadi Gasus inscription to Piye's year 12 (as many would do), would indicate his continued authority.

The narrative of the year 21 stela records no opposition to Piye in Thebes, where he celebrated the Opet festival in person. The inscription also indicates that Kush was in alliance with a number of the Middle and Lower Egyptian rulers. The opening of the narrative - "one sent to me and said..." - could be seen to imply an unnamed representative of Kushite power in Egypt itself, but is also the conventional opening for texts of 'rebellion'. More significant are the names of Piye's generals. One, Purem, bears a Libyan name, and may be identifiable with a like-named Chief of the Ma [145]. The other, Lemersekny, is surely Meroitic [146]. The inference drawn is
that Piye had allies amongst the Libyans who were working for him, and that his power extended into the central Sudan [147].

Attributing monuments to Piye's earlier activities in Upper Egypt is more difficult. The Mutirdis stela [148], the titulary of which is certainly that of a conqueror, and the remaining section of the sandstone stela from Barkal are suggestive, but not detailed. There is, as yet, no detailed victory inscription recording the conquest of Egypt by Kush which is dated before Piye's year 21.

The campaign of Piye was the response to the Saite expansion into Upper Egypt: the Kushites certainly had allies amongst the Delta and Middle Egyptian dynasts, some of whom remained loyal, whilst others went over to the side of Tefnakht. The initial expansion of Kushite power into Egypt by Kashta, documented by the Elephantine stela (and perhaps also by Karnak Priestly Annals no 31), probably brought Thebes under Kushite rule. There is no evidence that the Kushites had attempted to seize control of Memphis or Lower Egypt and it was probably the two expansions of Saite power which forced them into the north.

The early activities of Piye.

The broken sandstone stela discovered at Gebel Barkal [149] is usually regarded as the earliest-known monument of Piye, and served Reisner as the starting-point in his analysis of the development of Piye's titulary. That the change of prenomen was from Menkheperre to Usermaatre is clear from the use of the second in the later parts of B 500.

The sandstone stela carries no year-date. This might have been expected at the beginning of the main text (Reisner's line 25), but Priese [150] proposed to read a date, year 3, in the fragmentary line 29. The surviving parts of the text itself can be seen as a victory stela, with references to Piye himself as ruler of Egypt, and as the
establisher of other rulers. Priese [151] read the ruler-
determinatives in lines 18-19 as wr with the feather of the Libu.

In line 3 Piye is called [hk3 n Kmt] by Amun, and in his own speech
line 19 Piye says that Amun in Thebes [Imn n W3st] has made him king
of Egypt [hk3 n Kmt] and that [lines 17-18] "Amun of Napata has given
to me to be ruler of all lands [hk3 n h3s(w)t nb(w)t]". Piye is also
given the power to establish rulers, or not:

He to whom I say "You are wr", he shall be wr
He to whom I say "You are not wr", he shall not be wr
He to whom I say "Make yw-appearance (as king)",
He shall make yw-appearance.
He to whom I say; Do not make yw-appearance (as king),
He shall not make yw-appearance.

The text thus provides us with a hint of the situation after the
establishment of Kushite power in Egypt. Piye must have confirmed
some rulers in their office, perhaps removing others and replacing
them with his own vassals, just as the Assyrians did later. That the
Kushites had done something of this nature is clear from the year 21
Victory stela, which makes it clear that Nimlot of Hermopolis and
Peftjauawybast had been closely allied with the Kushites. It is also
clear that Piye retained the prevailing system of kings and wr-
chiefs. Implicitly, the Kushites accepted a system in which there
could be more than one king.

In the titulary of the sandstone stela Piye uses the typically New
Kingdom epithets "king of kings, ruler of the rulers" nsw nswyw [hk3
hk3w [152].

Further evidence for an early campaign by Piye was claimed by
Priese when he attributed the Berlin fragment 1068 [153] containing a
reference to the Opet festival in year 4, to Piye. This fragment has
long been recognised as an account of an invasion of Egypt, although
usually assumed to belong to the post-25th Dynasty period, perhaps
the reign of Aspelta [154]. It was Loukianoff [155] who pointed out
that the form and size of the hieroglyphs were almost identical to
the Cairo fragment 47085, which carries the cartouche of Piye. Cairo 47085 [156], unlike the other stela fragments recovered by Reisner [157] does not fit the year 21 Victory stela.

A further fragment [158], recovered by Reisner from B 507-520, preserves the end of a line, with the name [Khmu]nu followed by the cartouche of Nimlot. This fragment could not be fitted by Loukianoff [159], although the names would be relevant to the narrative of the broken section, lines 35-50. If, however, this fragment belongs to the 'second historical stela', then it would be a strong indication that, either the campaign recorded by the year 21 stela actually took place in years 3 and 4, or that another campaign had preceded it.

As Redford [160] has already observed, the date which introduces the text of the Victory stela "has no explicit connexion with the narrative which follows". The stela is dated to 1 akhet 1, ie New Year's day, year 21. This date is immediately followed by the king's command, which is to publish the record of his deeds, and only then the narrative of the campaign. It has been universally assumed that the reference to Piye's leaving Napata after the celebration of the New Year Festival, was the New Year of year 20 and, therefore, that the army had been sent to Egypt in year 19. Whilst there is nothing in the surviving fragments of the 'second historical stela' to prove that this recorded the same campaign as the year 21 stela, the possibility does exist. Placing the campaign in years 3 and 4, allows a whole new chronology for the reign, into which the extensive building works at Barkal and the changes in titulary may be more easily fitted.

The Victory stela might therefore be a second record of the campaign, which Piye chose to set in a prominent position in B500 at the temple's completion, around year 21. The phases of work on the temple would thus belong the period between year 4 or 5 and year 21, a more realistic time-scale than in the short period between years 21 and 24, and avoiding the necessity for extending the reign to year 30+, with all of the problems that that introduces. It is also
possible, as earlier scholars originally suggested, that Piye suffered some opposition in the middle years of his reign, and that the original stela was damaged or destroyed, requiring a new version to be carved.

If the Egyptian campaign was indeed early in the reign, the changes in titulary would be spread over the whole reign, rather than the frequent changes, all late, which are required by the conventional interpretation.

The major objection might be the evidence of the Theban papyri of years 21 and 22, and the Dakhla stela of year 24, which appear to follow the presumed year 19-20 campaign, although do not militate against earlier activities.

Piye's titulary and the construction of the Barkal temple.

There is no reason to suppose that Piye's assumption of a full, five-fold, titulary was later than his accession. The style he adopted, following that of Thutmose III's Barkal stela, indicates a Napatan model, rather than an Egyptian type; he did not wait to be crowned at Thebes or Memphis, but assumed the kingship in Nubia.

This first titulary appears only on the sandstone stela, which Priese attributes to year 3, or shortly after. The prenomen is erased on the stela, but by analogy with the Thutmosid model, Menkheperre is likely, and known to have been used by Piye.

Horus: Mighty Bull Arising in Napata
Two Ladies: Established of kingship like Re in heaven
Golden Horus: Holy of appearances, powerful of strength
Prenomen: [Menkheperre]
Nomen: Piye

The Golden Horus name uses the same order as Thutmose III's Barkal stela.
The Egyptian campaign saw the adoption of a specific militaristic titulary, but retaining the prenomen:

Horus: Sm3-t3wy "Uniter of the Two Lands"
Two Ladies: Ms-hmt "Creator of crafts (?)"
Golden Horus: S^s3-knw He who makes warriors numerous
Prenomen: Menkheperre
Nomen: Piye

After the campaign Piye commenced building works at Barkal, the initial phase of which, was the enclosure of the Ramesside temple and the construction of B 520. The 'altar', which Reisner noted [161] must have been in position before the walls were built, carries only a Horus-name, shftp-t3wy.fy, and the nomen.

In B 502 Piye adopted the prenomen Wsr-M3^t-R® taken from that of Ramesses II, which is found in the original temple (rooms B 508-511). On the later monuments the epithets s3-B3stt and mry Imn, sometimes together, are added to the nomen within the cartouche. These are typical of the late Libyan period, and again serve to indicate that these forms belong to the period after the conquest. The Egyptian documents, dated to years 21, 22 and 24, use the epithets s3 3st mry Imn.

The latest prenomen, Snfr-R® is found in B 501 and B 800.

The royal progress which accompanied Piye's campaign probably also saw the king placing two of his daughters in important positions in the hierarchy of Thebes. The Louvre stela [162] records the installation of Mutirdis as hm ntr of Hathor and of Mut. The king's titulary, with the prenomen Menkheperre, Horus Sema-tawy, and Golden Horus "Who makes warriors numerous" (S^s3 knw) is indicative of a conqueror. The name Mutirdis was doubtless adopted by the princess at this time, replacing her Kushite name [163]. There is no reason to identify her with Shepenwepet II, who may also have been adopted at this time by Amenirdis I. Kitchen [164] proposed that Shepenwepet II had been adopted in the reign of Shabaqo or Shebitqo, since she
was still alive in 656 BC, some 60 years after her father's death on his own calculations. Kitchen, accepting the Dunham-Macadam genealogy, argued that the princesses were installed by their brothers, by analogy with the brother-succession theory. Shepenwepet II was not, however, a sister of Shebitqo [165]. Furthermore, the Nitoqert Adoption Stela implies that it was Piye himself who installed Shepenwepet II [166]. Piye must have ensured that Amenirdis I adopted his own daughter as her eventual successor, just as she had been made heiress to Shepenwepet I (who was almost certainly still alive in the reign of Shebitqo).

Of Piye's wives, Pekareslo appears in the earliest Piye reliefs at Barkal (B 502 E side of N) "where she repeats Amun's declaration of Piye as king" [167]. Pekareslo must therefore be the earliest of the Great Royal Wives.

On the Louvre statuette of Bastet [168], Piye uses the prenomen Usermaetre, indicative of a date later than the Egyptian campaign. This object also names Khensa, who here and elsewhere [169] has a series of titles and epithets which signal her as the most important of the king's wives at this later point in the reign. She is hmt nswt wrt, rt p^t, hnwt hmnt nbw and hnwt t3wy.

The lack of precise chronological information has resulted in a range of dates being suggested for the campaign of Piye against Tefnakht.

Lichtheim [1980] c 734
Gardiner [1961: 335] c 730
Petrie [1918] c 728
Kitchen [1973] c 728
Albright [1953] c 720

It is, on the currently available evidence, impossible to come to any conclusion on the date of the campaign - there are simply too many unknown factors. Two alternatives may be suggested for Piye's
invasion. Assuming that there was no co-regency with Shabaqo, that Piye reigned for 24 years and that the accession of Shabaqo was c 712/709. If the campaign was launched in Piye's 3rd regnal year, this would be approximately 733/730; if in the 19th year, c 717 BC.

The conflict of Shabaqo and Bakenranef.

Redford [170] raises the problem of the relationship between Kush and Sais: he accepts that Tefnakht had sworn the oath of fealty, but points out that there is no evidence as to whether Bakenranef renewed the oath at his accession. He further comments that "if his assumption of the kingship had thus been construed as an act of rebellion, how strange it is that the Napatan authorities had failed to mete out punishment for over five years". Redford proposes that the New Kingdom model of oath taking was followed, in the reigning king's name. Therefore Shabaqo's "perceived justification for his invasion was most likely either (a) a refusal by Bocchoris to renew the oath, or (b) some action by Bocchoris which could be construed as treason".

Shabaqo's invasion took place in his first or second regnal year, apparently confirmed by the additional text in the burial of the bull of Bakenranef's year 6. Despite the confusion attending this document, Shabaqo's control of Egypt in his year 2 is affirmed by the Nile level text at Karnak (possibly marking the army's northward progress) and by the Horbeit stela [171]. For his acceptance in the Delta, or at least by some of the Delta rulers, the Sais stela of year 4 and the Buto stela of 6, are further evidence.

The burial of the Apis bull by Bakenranef, with its additional text, allied with the classical tradition, has formed one of the key synchronisms for the history of this period. There are, however, a number of problems associated with the text.

Whilst earlier scholars assumed two bulls, one buried by Bakenranef, and a second by Shabaqo, Vercoutter [172] argued that the
text of Shabaqo honoured the bull buried in the name of Bakenranef. This has been generally accepted [173].

Kitchen [174] following Vercoutter [175] refers to the Shabaqo text as a "wall inscription", whereas Redford [176] citing Mariette [177] refers to a graffito on the wall of the chamber dated to year 6, and to a "stela crudely written in black ink and dated to year 2" of Shabaqo. Whilst there is here clearly a confusion in the reporting of the text, the distinction is significant: a stela could be intrusive, a wall-text (whether painted graffito or inscription) is more likely to be contemporary. The Shabaqo text remains unpublished.

Mariette [178] was certain of only two bulls buried in the 25th Dynasty, in year 2 of Shabaqo and year 24 of Taharqo. However, he also noted [179]:

"J'ai copié dans la chambre où la stèle précédente a été trouvée la fin d'une légende royale dont ce fragment de cartouche ///|\ etait seul lisible. Je n'ai pas osé, sur un document si incomplet, attribuer un Apis au règne de l'Ethiopien Schabatoka, successeur de Sabacon."

Further problems are caused by the two different attributions of the chamber itself. Redford [180] cites Mariette [181] that the chamber had already been used for the bull buried in year 37 of Shoshenq V. This conflicts with the attributions as published by Malinine et al. [182] on the basis of Mariette's original plan, where the burial of year 37 of Shoshenq V is accorded Chamber S/10, and that of Bakenranef and Shabaqo Chamber R/9. If the chamber had indeed contained two bulls, it is always conceivable that the Shabaqo text could refer to that of Shoshenq V, since it is only the classical tradition which otherwise associates the king with Bakenranef. There is always the remote possibility that the bull of year 37 of Shoshenq V was the same as that of year 6 of Bakenranef. Only one of the stelae of Bakenranef is dated (other than by regnal
year), to 1 akhet day 5; three of those of Shoshenq V are dated to 3 akhet day 27, and one to 1 akhet day 18.

Discussions of the Apis material have, it seems, been considerably influenced by the status accorded the bull and its burial during the 26th Dynasty. It is only with the bull of year 21 of Psamtik I that the Apis was given an official, royal, stela recording the details of its life. Throughout the Libyan period the stelae were private dedications made by the Memphite clergy, frequently dated by a king's reign and sometimes giving more information. The nearest to official stelae are those of the High Priests Pediese, Peftjaauawybast and Harsiese, but not all bulls had a stela dedicated by the High Priest. Whilst there was undoubted royal devotion to the Apis, a number of factors may have affected the recording of the burials: in the later Libyan period, it may have depended on which of the Libyan rulers actually controlled Memphis.

Shabaqo's rule in Egypt.

There is no evidence that the Kushites fundamentally altered the internal political geography of Egypt, and there is every reason to believe that the Delta princedoms were left in the control of Libyan dynasts. Leahy [183] notes the parallelism of the Piye list and the Rassam cylinder, and acknowledges that, if not exactly confirmation, it is a strong indication of a continuing system. Leahy's objection, that for confirmation we need monuments, works on the assumption that most of the material is correctly allocated within the Third Intermediate Period. There are, in any case, a number of monuments which shows the continuing authority of the dynasts.

Both Piye and Shabaqo may have replaced rulers with their own nominees, as the Assyrians later did. The Piye inscription clearly indicates that oaths of fealty were exacted from the dynasts who were reconfirmed in office.
There is unfortunately little evidence for the detail of Shabaqo's reign. He may have adopted Memphis as his chief residence city in Egypt, as his successors certainly did. A few fragments survive from his building-works there [184] and demonstrate the high quality of work, much of it in the 'archaising' style. Most Kushite work in Memphis was later dismantled or re-used by the Saites. Shabaqo certainly built a new Apis embalming house [185], but this does not mean that he was responsible for the burial of an Apis bull (although that is usually the inference). Vercoutter [186] suggested that a bull was buried in Shabaqo's 14th year, but again, the evidence is slender.

The date of Shabaqo's invasion.

The flight of Iamani of Ashdod, certainly dated to 712 BC, is a key point in the absolute chronology of the 25th Dynasty [187], and has consequently occupied an important place in the literature [188]. Iamani sought aid from 'Pir'u of Musri', who, as Spalinger [189] argued, cannot be a Kushite ruler, but must be a Delta dynast. The later Assyrian texts always call the Kushite rulers Šarru Kusu Musri or Šarru kusu, and never sarru Musri alone, nor pir'u.

Sargon II led an expedition to crush Iamani's rebellion, and Iamani fled to Meluhha "which borders Egypt" whose ruler deported Iamani to Assyria. The incorrect reading of the text [190], as Meluhha "which now belongs to Egypt", formed the foundation for dating Shabaqo's invasion prior to 712 BC [191]. Meluhha is generally accepted as a term for Kush, although Colombot has suggested that it designates the region of the Eastern Desert [192]. The ruler of Meluhha is not named in the text, but assumed to have been Shabaqo. If this identification is accepted, 712 BC would be the year of Shabaqo's accession, the invasion of Egypt taking place in Shabaqo's second year, 711 BC.

Kitchen [193] concedes that Pir'u must be a Delta dynast, but defends his original argument, and insists that Shabaqo's conquest
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must be dated to 712 BC at the very latest [194]. As Redford [195] countered, there is no alternative but to read the text as clear evidence that in 712 BC the Kushites had not conquered Egypt; there is not even the indication that they were in control of Thebes. Redford identifies Pir'u with Bakenranef because he is "referred to" (sic!) implying uncertainty as to his throne - war impending or in progress.

Since the accession date of Taharqo, 690 BC, is certain, this interpretation has a radical effect on reconstructions of the early chronology and policy of the dynasty. Arguing that the Eltekeh campaign of 701 BC marked a change of policy on the part of the Kushites, Kitchen placed Shabaqo's death, at the end of a full-15 years reign, and Shebitqo's accession, in 702 BC: the new aggressive policy, he claimed, was the action of a young king. Kitchen also argued strongly, and cogently, against Macadam's proposed long co-regency between Shebitqo and Taharqo; and, faced with a possible 10-year reign for Shebitqo, ending before 690, advocated a high chronology. Since the year 10 of the Horbeit stela does not actually exist, and Kitchen has himself rejected the authority of the Manethonic derivatives, there are no valid objections to a low date for Shabaqo's conquest more concordant with the evidence.

Redford [196] adopts a lower chronology, but dating Shabaqo's invasion to the highest possible year, 711 BC, since the campaign must have taken place in his second year. With the reign of Piye at 24 years, Redford arrives at 716 BC as the date of Piye's invasion, and 735 for his accession, considerably lower than Kitchen, who places these events in 728 and 747 BC, respectively. In the Manethonic tradition, of 44 full years and some months for the length of the dynasty, Redford sees the period from Shabaqo's conquest to Assurbanipal's 1st invasion [197].

On the internal, monumental evidence, the lowest possible date for the accession of Shabaqo is calculated at 707 BC, but the Assyrian evidence indicates that Shabaqo's accession must have taken place
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earlier. As Redford [197] observes; by the time the Display inscriptions and annals had been composed for publication at Dur-Sharrukin [198] in 707 BC, Iamani had been extradited to Assyria and Egypt was in Kushite hands. A treaty must have been drawn up between Sargon and Shabaqo [199], and the time involved for such a treaty, and the extradition, suggests that Shabaqo's invasion had occurred at some distance in time prior to 707 BC.

In the light of the re-readings of the Assyrian texts it must be accepted that Shabaqo's invasion occurred after 712 BC. This, in turn, means that Shabaqo was the ruler at the time of the Eltekeh campaign. It also makes a co-regency between Shabaqo and Shebitqo inevitable, as Yurco [200] proposed; unless Shebitqo's reign was much shorter than is usually accepted.

The important re-assessments of this period by Redford and Spalinger have not questioned some of the other premises, now firmly rooted in literature: notably, the family relationships. Re-examination of all of the available evidence seriously questions the validity of Dunham and Macadam's reconstruction of the Kushite royal genealogy. If these family relationships are questioned, then so must the historical assumptions derived from them: that Piye installed "his sister" Amenirdis I as God's Wife; that the royal succession passed from brother to brother and thence to the children of the eldest brother. If Shebitqo was the son of Shabaqo, and not of Piye, the succession theory is again challenged.

Redford [201] emphasises that there is no mention of Kush in Assyrian texts relating to 722, 726 or 713. Kush is also absent from the parallel Biblical description of the fall of Samaria [2 Kings 17:4], at the defeat of Gaza and in Isaiah 19, although it is invoked in Isaiah 20 referring to the fall of Ashdod. This cannot in itself be considered strong evidence for dating the Kushite invasions, since Kushite expansion into Upper Egypt need not have involved the kings in events in western Asia. It was the conflict with Sais which was the decisive factor in Kushite northward expansion. The defeat
of Tefnakht and then of Bakenranef saw a (temporary) eclipse of Saite influence and the acknowledgement of Shabaqo and his successors as overlords of the Delta.

The inference to be drawn from the surviving material is that Shabaqo was establishing himself as a Pharaoh in Egypt; he may have maintained his residence at Memphis. Strikingly, most of Shabaqo's family carry Egyptian names: with the exception of a wife, Mesbat, and Shebitqo, all of the known children (Haremakhet, Istemkheb, Amenirdis C (?)) and wives (Tabekenamun) possessed, or adopted Egyptian names. It is quite likely that Shabaqo and his family contacted marriage alliances with the Libyan dynasts, and probably also with the elite families (eg Amenirdis C, wife of the Vizier Monthuhotep, and Nes-Bastet-rud daughter of Akunosh).

Most recent historical reconstructions have been based upon the assumption that the rise of the Kushite kingdom was a straightforward expansion by one state against another. The very size and nature of the territory ruled would render it difficult for one person to maintain total control. Internally, Kushite social and economic organisation was doubtless different from that of Egypt, considerably less centralised and possibly with a number of rulers. The emergence of the Kushite state may have involved more than one significant family, perhaps closely allied by marriages, but also vying for power. The 'disappearance' of Piye after the war against Tefnakht might be explained by internal crises in Kush and perhaps opposition to his rule. Of course, the evidence is elusive, but it would be foolish to oversimplify the reconstruction of early Kushite history.
The foundations of the state.

Although many of the details of the emergence of the Kushite state remain obscure, there must have been a period during which individual rulers, or a family, achieved the control of economic and military resources and the established some sort of political hegemony and state centralization.

The military base of Kushite power.

The military capability and warfare techniques of the Kushites have been discussed by Spalinger [1]. He suggests that during their campaign in Egypt the Kushites used a system of sieges with assaults, preceded by combat on an open field. Chariot warfare is not recorded in the Piye text, chariots presumably being used to convey the leaders to the scene of the battle and for ceremonial functions. Spalinger [2] draws attention to the Barkal scenes depicting the conflict, as recorded in the Bankes and Wilkinson MSS [3]. Here the Nubian soldiers lack body armour and helmets, appearing to wear only a simple kilt and a fillet around the head; their weapons are bows and spears. The enemies wear helmets which, in the copies, resemble a white crown, and which Spalinger compares with the Assyrian type in use during the period from Tiglathpileser III to Sargon II. There are some indications that contemporary innovations were being adopted, in the use of the round shield and of the heavier eight-spoked chariot [4]. Spalinger argues that the Kushites were ill-equipped to successfully combat the Assyrian armies, as at Eltekeh [5], but that their resources were quite adequate for campaigning in the Nile valley against the Libyans in which the type of warfare was of a different type.

The narrative of the Piye stela places great emphasis upon the horses, and this has excited some comment from writers on the period, although judgments of character and taste have usually superseded
attempts at explanation [6]. There has been similarly little explanation of the horse burials at el-Kurru. Török [7] discusses the assessments of the Piye Victory stela's references to horses, with the depictions at Barkal and on the stela itself. He claims a Ramesside prototype and, arguing that the reliefs of Meroe temple M 250 are modelled ultimately upon destroyed scenes of Piye's campaign at Barkal, proposes the use of cavalry in the Piye campaign. Cavalry are also depicted at Kawa. Within the constraints of the archaeological evidence and the historical assumptions, there has been little attempt by Nubianists to discuss the origins and extent of equestrianism in Nubia.

Horses were introduced into Egypt in the early New Kingdom [8], and, with the rapid development of chariotry, there was a continuing import of horses from western Asia [9]. There is no indication whether horses were successfully bred in Egypt during the New Kingdom. Epstein has observed that in more recent times horse-breeding (even from good Arab stock) in the lower Nile valley has been such a failure, that horses have had to be imported [10].

Störk, on a mis-reading of the Buhen stela of Akhenaten, assumed that horses were bred in Nubia in the New Kingdom [11]; nevertheless, it is likely that the local rulers and the chief administrative officials of the Viceroyal bureaucracy were given chariots and horses as part of their gifts as they were in Egypt, although there is relatively little iconographic or archaeological evidence [12]. There is no evidence that horses were known to the nomadic peoples of Nubia before they were introduced into Egypt [13]. Neither is there any indication that the particular breed known as Dongolawi (Equus caballus africanus) was indigenous to Nubia [14]. Manuelian [15] noted that in the "tribute" scene in Shrine 4 at Qasr Ibrim, the chariots brought were captured in battle. A chariot is also shown amongst the Kushite tribute presented by Huy to Tutankhamun [16]. The horses stalled aboard the two Viceroyal barges, also in Huy's tomb [17], can safely be assumed to be the viceroy's teams: there is no reason to understand this as horses being imported to Egypt from
Nubia [18]. The graffito of Merymose at Umm Ashira [19] is, rather unusually, flanked by figures of horses, presumably contemporary with the text, and again presumably the Viceroy's.

Although frequently depicted in battle-scenes showing Egyptian forces fighting in Nubia, as at Beit el-Wali, they are not shown being used by Kushite opponents. Chariots are limited to the king, princes and elite troops, the majority of the army being infantry. Here a contrast with the Libyan battle scenes may be noted; at Medinet Habu the Libyan wars show major conflict between two armies well-equipped with horses and chariots [20]. The Nubian battle scenes might have been conceived within a much longer-standing genre, and it is therefore notable that these scenes do not seem to show Kushite chiefs.

With little evidence of the extent of horse-breeding and equitation in New Kingdom Nubia it is difficult to assess its development in the post-New Kingdom. Evidence from Egypt during the Third Intermediate Period is equally scanty, due to a lack of reliefs depicting military action and to a change in burial practice, with considerably less goods being interred. It is certain that the Libyans were well-equipped with horses and chariots prior to their rise to supremacy, and they are hardly likely to have abandoned their use [21]. Trade in horses came to be dominated by Israel in the 9th century BC, and still in the time of Assyrian expansion Samaria seems to have been a particularly important centre. Solomon's trade in horses was discussed in detail by Ikeda [22]. Solomon supplied all "the kings of the Hittites" and the kings of Syria [23] with horses imported from Que, and horses and chariots from Egypt. As Ikeda [24] commented, most writers have found it difficult to believe that the Egyptians exported horses, and have therefore emended the reading to understand the land of Musri in Anatolia [25]. Ikeda shows that, beyond any doubt, that the Egyptians were sending horses and chariots to various rulers in Western Asia. Many of the specified chariots were certainly for ceremonial, rather than military, use; but
doubtless the more functional war-chariots were not so worthy of mention in the diplomatic record.

Although there is no strong evidence regarding breeding and use of horses in Libyan period Egypt, they are frequently depicted in the Egyptianizing decoration of the so-called "Phoenician" bronze and silver bowls, many of which date to the Late Bronze-Early Iron Age [26]. The decoration of these vessels is closely related to the major groups of ivory carving, also, very loosely, dated to the same period [27]. Bowls and ivories share a number of iconographic features such as the smiting figure followed by the figure with victim, and the griffin and lion combat. The motif of horses in marshland was discussed by Markoe [28] who related it to the browsing or grazing cervid and the suckling cow and calf. An "Egyptian" [29] silver bowl from Golgoi [30] shows a marsh scene with four papyrus boats carrying banqueters and musicians, with horses, cattle and fowl, the whole decorative scheme being very similar to that on a gold bowl from Nimrud [31]. Although there is little to indicate an Egyptian origin for any of the metal bowls [32], there is a close relationship between their decoration, and that of the ivories, and faience amulets and vessels of the late New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period.

Despite the difficulties of rationalising the material for equestrianism during this period, horses figure prominently in the narrative of the Piye stela. Yet, in discussing these references, most writers have made subjective comments. Spalinger [33] however, sees in it a dependence of the Kushites upon horses - their economic and military value - rather than "humane qualities" of Piye which some scholars had emphasized [34].

In his (1. 11) exhortation to his army, Piye tells them to harness the best steeds of the stable. Later, (1. 21) it is noted that many horses of the enemy were killed at the battle of Per-Peg. Peftjaawybast brought the best horses of the stable (1.71) as did Pediese (1. 110) and the other dynasts (1.113), including,
ultimately, Tefnakht himself (1.138). The most celebrated incident, and subject of the lunette scene of the stela, is that of Nimlot of Hermopolis. In chastising Nimlot, Piye several times refers to "my horses", but whether this should be interpreted as an indicator of Piye's having given the horses to Nimlot originally, or simply as their possessor now that Nimlot has capitulated, is impossible to know. Since Piye and Nimlot had formerly been allies, it is conceivable that Piye had supplied his vassals with horses and chariots.

Török interprets these references in the Piye stela in the light of New Kingdom models of kingship, and argues that Piye is representing himself as an ideal pharaoh [35].

The text of the stela had its visual counterpart in the decoration of the temple B 500. Here, a large scene shows the bringing of horses from the stables of Nimlot [36]. Elsewhere, fragments of military scenes survive. The surviving reliefs are incompletely published [37], but Török suggests that the reliefs at Barkal were influenced by, or modelled on, Ramesside prototypes.

Török discusses the evidence to be gleaned from the fragmentary Barkal reliefs which suggests that cavalry was used by the Kushites. Török proposes that the reliefs of Temple M 250 were modelled on an earlier, Napatan, temple at Meroe, itself modelled upon the Piye reliefs at Barkal [38]. The Meroe reliefs include a contingent of four cavalrmen. No comparable scene survives at Barkal, although one figure on horseback was preserved [39]. Kendall identified this as the figure of the fleeing Tefnakht, although Török points out that this is part of a battle scene [40]. A mounted horseman was depicted at Kawa in a military procession [41].

Török cautiously suggests that the presence of cavalry in the Kushite army "may also indicate that the use of cavalry was developed in Kush long before this tactic was employed in Egypt" [65]. The evidence of the Kushite texts rather indicates that the type of
warfare which characterized the confrontation between Libyans and Kushites was a continuation of that practised in the Late Bronze Age. The period of Assyrian expansion certainly witnessed changes in military tactics in Western Asia, with an increase in the ratio of cavalry to chariots. Chariots had dominated Late Bronze Age warfare, dictated by the type of rather small horses available. A number of texts give indications of the ratios of chariots to cavalry. Dalley [66] calculated that at the battle of Qarqar, in 853 BC, the ratio of chariots to cavalry was 1:1. By the time of Shamshi-Adad V's campaign against Babylon the ratio had changed to 1:2 ie one chariot with a pair of cavalry. The campaigns of Sargon II also reveal a majority of cavalry; at Babylon 1:10, at Carchemish chariots:cavalry 50:200 ie 1:4 (with 300 infantry giving a ratio 1:4:6) and after the conquest of Hamath 200 chariots to 600 cavalry, a ratio 1:3. While there is thus some evidence for the riding of horses in Kushite scenes, there is inadequate evidence to propose large-scale use of cavalry, as by the Assyrians, at least at the time of the Kushite expansion. The conflict with the Assyrians may well have led to changes in warfare technology and practice in Kush.

A further group of material - the burials of 24 horses at el-Kurru - suggests the importance of horses to the early Kushite monarchs. Two groups contained inscribed material which identified them as belonging to Shabaqo and Shebitqo, the others are presumed to have been for Piye and Tanwetamani [42]. Groups of 4 (Ku.221-224), 8 (Ku.201-208, Shabaqo), 8 (Ku.209-216, Shebitqo) and 4 (Ku.217-220) horses suggest burial by chariot-team. Kendall [43] proposed that there were one or two teams for a four-horse chariot. There were no traces of bits, bridles, or other practical harness, only faience amulets and remains of bead nets which might have been purely funerary. Remains of silver collars [44], and a gilt-silver plume-holder [45] were parts of the trappings, which are paralleled in the Barkal reliefs. The examination of the skeletal material suggests that the horses were of a breed similar to the Arab, but slightly smaller [46]. As Spalinger argued there is no evidence that the Kushites had adopted the heavier form of chariot until the end of the
25th Dynasty, and their chariots were usually harnessed with two, not four, horses. No chariots or equipment was recovered from the Tanis tombs, owing to the differing funerary customs of the period.

This evidence is unfortunately circumstantial but shows the enormous importance placed upon horses by the Kushites. It could be argued that they were important because horses were rare in Kush, but Assyriologists such as Dalley have been struck by references in the Assyrian texts which seem to indicate a Kushite connection, if not origin, for horses, in the mid-8th century BC. This is, of course, especially significant since these references seem to pre-date the Kushite invasions of Egypt. The possibility emerges that Kush may itself have been a breeding ground for horses. The export of horses to Egypt and western Asia would thus have been an important factor in the emergent state.

A number of Assyrian texts designate horses as "kushite", KUR ku-sa-as. Postgate [47] discussed the term, and noting that there "is a natural reluctance to connect this gentilic with the land of Nubia (and Ethiopia?)", observed that there was "no adequate evidence for the existence of another land with the same name, with the possible exception of a town (uru ku-si) mentioned in ABL 575". He concluded:

It therefore seems to me safer to take the term as meaning 'Nubia'; naturally this would not imply that all of the horses of this kind (some of which come from East of Assyria) were bred in Nubia, any more than today Arabian horses come from Arabia. All that is necessary, is that the type of horse was, rightly or wrongly, associated with that country.

These horses are specified as yoke-horses (ša niri) [48] and no cavalry horses are given this designation (they came from Urartu).

The securely dated Assyrian references come from the period of Kushite domination of Egypt, or of the conquest, although some seem to antedate this, as do references to Kushites in Assyria.
Shilkanni gave Sargon II a tamartu ("gift in honour of a special event") of 12 "large" horses, which, Weidner pointed out, the annals specify as "trained to the yoke" [49]. Also of the time of Sargon, Nimrud letter NL 16: 33-34 [50], dated by Cogan [51] to after 712 records that:

"the LU.MAḪ-(foreign) chieftains of the Egyptians, Gazaites, Judahites, Moabites, Ammonites arrived in Kalhu on the 12th (of this month) with their mandanatu-tribute" which included 45 horses, and 23 horses from the Gazaites.

Dalley infers the Nubian breed [52]. Eph'al [53] assumes here that the Egyptians in question were not residents of Egypt proper, but of the "sealed-off harbour" which was actually in the area of control of the Assyrians, [54].

Pfeiffer [55] published a letter (Harper 372 (80-7-19, 26)), which he dates to reign of Esarhaddon [56], which records the sending of:

13 horses of Ethiopia (Ku-sa-a-a), and 3 additional (?) horses of Ethiopia (Ku-sa-a-a), making a total of 16 draft horses ... 6 horses of Ethiopia and 3 additional (?) ones of Ethiopia, making a total of 9 draft animals ... 19 horses of Ethiopia, 38 cavalry horses: making a total of 57, (from the) city of Kullania ...

This makes a total of 44 horses of Ethiopia (and) 104 cavalry horses.

Assurbanipal's booty from Egypt similarly included "large horses".

As well as the horses specified as Kushite, a form of Assyrian harness is also known with this designation [57]. This may, as Dalley [58] suggested, be a particular method of harnessing, imported along with the horses, or it may be through association with the Kushite horses. A number of examples of ivory harness with Egyptian designs were discovered at Nimrud. Although not necessarily of Egyptian origin [59], this also suggests an association. Similar types are shown in the Assyrian reliefs [60]. These do not, however, resemble the types of harness or trappings found at el-Kurru, or depicted in the Barkal reliefs [61].
The situation is further complicated by the apparent presence of Kushites in Assyria, and at an early date. The earliest reference seems to be Nimrud wine list no. 9, of 732 BC, during the reign of Tiglath-pileser III [62]. Dalley [63] proposed that they might be best interpreted as horse experts. "Horse traders" appear in the later 8th century [64], a term apparently not used before the time of Tiglath-pileser III. Samaria seems to have been especially important in the trade.

The Assyrian evidence is tantalising, but inconclusive. It is certain that the Assyrians were acquiring a particularly fine breed of chariot-horse from Egypt during the Kushite period. It also shows that there was an association in the Assyrian mind between Kush and a certain type of chariot-horse, and also a certain type of harness. The presence of Kushites in Assyria could be explained in many ways and is not necessarily indicative of strong, or even direct, contacts between the emergent Kushite state and Assyria: it is quite possible that there were, as there had been at all periods, individual Kushites employed in Egypt, and from there in western Asia. Nevertheless, this Assyrian evidence does provide an intriguing background to the emphasis placed upon horses in the text of the 'Victory inscription' of Piye - belonging to this early phase of Kushite expansion.

The Dongola Reach certainly provided the right sort of environment for horse-breeding - attested by mediaeval and early modern evidence. Horses were also used in Nubia in the later Meroitic period. Although the evidence has yet to be studied in detail, there are Meroitic depictions, including soldiers on horseback [68] and horse-trappings from the royal cemeteries [69]. Sacrificed horses were also found in the tumulus burials of Ballana and Qustul [70], with elaborate ceremonial trappings denoting their prestige. Although the graffito of Silko shows him riding a horse [71], and horses appear in the frescoes of the Christian period, there is inadequate evidence to denote numbers, or whether these were indigenous or imported animals [72].
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The most significant evidence is from the later periods. The origin of the 'Dongola' breed is unknown [73], but it was widespread in Upper Egypt and the Sudan in the early centuries of the Christian era and the Middle Ages. It was introduced into West Africa from Sudan by the Fulani in the 13th century AD. At the time of Bruce's visit to the Funj sultanate, in 1772, the mek of Sennar maintained 1,800 horse troops. Many of these came from his vassal, the mek of Dongola whose tribute was paid largely in horses [74]. Slightly later, Burckhardt [75] commented that Dongola was noted for the breed of its horses, and that the breed came originally from Arabia, although the Dongola horses were of greater size.

While the Dongola breed may have been a late (ie post-Meroitic) introduction, the evidence for quite extensive horse-breeding during the mediaeval period certainly allows the possibility that horses provided the Kushites not only with the basis of their military power, but may also have been significant in the economy of the emergent state.

The economic base of Kushite power.

However the Kushite state expanded and developed, its rulers - whether one or more chiefdom - must have had control of substantial economic resources. There are enormous problems in trying to understand the economy of Nubia during the 'Napatan' period, and the lack of material forces us to supplement the data by comparison with other phases. Lower Nubia, even if not totally depopulated, is unlikely to have had much more than a subsistence economy, and the major productive regions would have been the Abri-Delgo and Dongola reaches of Upper Nubia and the savanna of the central Sudan. In Mediaeval times Nubia was largely self-sufficient in foodstuffs from agriculture and it is likely that local craftsmen supplied most of manufactured articles [76]. Trade was, therefore, mainly luxury oriented. A very similar situation seems to have prevailed in Meroitic times. It has been argued above that under the Viceregal
administration a local, largely self-sufficient agricultural economy was established very similar to that in Egypt, but the main trade, certainly cross-frontier, was luxury oriented.

The question must arise of why an increasingly centralized political entity with a self-sufficient agricultural base expanded in the way that the Kushite state apparently did? Was international trade important? Was Kush already involved in international trade?

The collapse of the palace-based states of the Late Bronze Age saw a change in the main axes of trade in western Asia and the east Mediterranean, although it should be noted that many features of the internal economies of, for example, Egypt and Assyria appear to have continued functioning in very much the same way as they had in the Late Bronze Age [77]. The new powers controlling trade were now those at the centre, rather than the edges: the Levantine or Phoenician cities, and the states of Syria-Palestine, notably Israel and Aram-Damascus. As outlined above (in Chapter 10), the history of the 10th to 8th centuries is dominated by the rivalries and expansions of these various states. This period of change saw the fragmentation of the old empires of Egypt and the Hittites and the emergence of the Aramaic and Neo-hittite successor states in north Syria and along the fringes of the fertile crescent, and the appearance of nomadic Arab tribes from the south. Israel under Solomon dominated the trade routes for some time, exploiting the Red Sea ports and exacting dues from the Arabian tribes. Later attempts to re-open the Red Sea routes apparently failed.

Liverani has discussed the economic implications of the "end" of the Late Bronze Age. The growth of nomadic and semi-nomadic groups may have been a result rather than a cause of the crisis [78]. This was also the period of camel-oasis-desert expansion, which saw the rise of the Aramaean states and of the Arabians [79]. Trade was no longer entirely palace-centred [80] and gift exchange gradually gave way to commerce, with, ultimately, the profit motive coming into play. Significantly, there was a shift in the gold routes from the
LBA to Iron I [81] which saw the breaking of the Egyptian monopoly and the development of the South Arabian routes exclusively by land. It seems likely that this change in the trade axis to the east of the Red Sea and an Assyrian desire to control these land routes had a major impact on the political situation in Syria-Palestine during the 9th-7th centuries. Frankenstein suggests that the problems encountered by Wenamun at Byblos may already reflect this new regional configuration, and the first major expansion of Assyria into western Asia under Tiglathpileser I (c 1115-1077 BC) [82].

Although it is widely accepted that the north-south trade axis moved from the control of Egypt to the eastern side of the Red Sea, coming under the power of the emergent Arabian states, the development of these Arabian trade routes is still a matter of considerable obscurity. The direct archaeological evidence from south Arabia does not indicate the formation of major states there until the 6th and 5th centuries BC. The 6th and 5th centuries were also the time of Arabian activity in Ethiopia which was significant in the emergence of the Aksumite state. There is a little evidence from around 600 BC for Egyptian contacts with Arabia, although it is uncertain whether these were direct or not [83].

There is evidence for the increased use of the domesticated camel for carriage and transport in the 10th-8th centuries BC [84], and this would certainly have made the routes along the west coast of Arabia easier to use. The biblical record has usually been cited as evidence that these routes began to function during the reign of Solomon [85], but Groom has questioned this, arguing that the biblical Queen of Sheba was not a south, but a north Arabian ruler [86]. As such she would have been leader of another people called Sabaeans who lived in northern Arabia and who are mentioned in a number of sources [87]. Groom identifies It'amra the Sabaean, of the reign of Sargon II, as ruler of the same people and not of the south Arabian state [88]. Solomon's visitor would thus have been an earlier representative of the Arabian female rulers attested by the Assyrian texts of the late 8th century. Groom points out that the
commodities brought by the queen—gold, spices and precious stones—were more typically northern than southern Arabian and contests the assumption that the Arabian incense trade was itself highly developed so early [89]. Incense may have been included in the commodities brought to Solomon, and small quantities exchanged through networks to the south, but there insufficient evidence to support the idea that it was being exploited on a large scale until the first two centuries AD.

Specific information on the Arab tribes appears for the first time in the annals of Tiglathpileserser III. Zabibe Queen if the Arabs paid tribute along with Radyan of Damascus, Menahem of Samaria, Hiram of Tyre and others [90] in 738 BC. Zabibe was probably, more specifically, Queen of the Qedarites [91]. At this stage the Assyrian expansion had not reached Transjordan and southern Palestine. However, Zabibe was paying tribute along with other rulers who depended on the Syro-Arabian trade passing principally along the King's Highway. This led to Damascus and thence through Israel to Tyre [92].

Another Arabian queen, Samsi, took a vassal oath perhaps at the time of Tiglathpileserser III's Palestinian campaign of 734. This oath was later broken, an event connected with the anti-Assyrian activities of Radyan of Damascus and his allies such as Hiram of Tyre [93]. Tiglathpileserser III's campaign against Samsi [94] killed many men and took a large quantity of booty—camels, sheep and spices, forcing Samsi to become tributary once again, but with an Assyrian qepu set over her [95]. Eph'al suggests that she may have fled from the desert margin to the Gebel Druze region of the Hauran. Samsi was apparently still influential in the reign of Sargon, when she paid tribute along with the Pir'u of Egypt and It'amara the Sabaean. These circumstances again suggest that Samsi had a role in the trade routes.

The Assyrians were not yet campaigning into the deserts of the Arabian peninsula, but were primarily concerned with the nomadic
peoples of the desert margin, who had strong connections with the states which controlled the trade routes, Damascus and Israel. The defeat of those powers, in the 8th century BC, had a significant effect on the Arab penetration of the pasture lands and their increased role within the Arabian trade. Assyrian control of the northern termini of the Arabian trade routes ensured that the Arabian rulers became tributary in order to protect their interests [96]. This seems to have been effective, and It'amara the Sabaean is usually recognised as a South Arabian ruler who paid tribute to Sargon II with the same motive [97]. The Transjordanian rulers, Sanib of Beth-Ammon, Salaman of Moab and Qausmalak of Edom, paid tribute in 728 [98].

The Assyrian acceptance of Samsi's repeated submission shows great concern with maintaining stability on the borders and with international trade, and also that the Assyrians did not want to become directly involved in the trade, but preferred to receive the commodities as tribute. Assyria's relations with conquered cities and states reflect a similar attitude: the provinces seem to have retained a measure of economic self-sufficiency and freedom to accumulate wealth - as long as the tribute demands were met [99]. The relative independence of Phoenician cities such as Tyre, Sidon and Byblos in the late 8th century can be related to Assyrian recognition of economic potential of these commercial cities [100]. The Assyrians expected the merchants of the Levant and Babylonia to carry on with their mercantile activities, while they exerted direct control in only limited spheres. The vassal treaty of Baal of Tyre (after the defeat of Sidon and Egypt in 671) [101] deals with the obligations of Baal to the Assyrians and role of the Assyrian governor at Tyre [102]: controls were put upon Tyrian relations with ports under Assyrian control, but were otherwise free to operate; direct Assyrian involvement was limited to the cutting of timber. The goods acquired by the Assyrians as tribute were the same as those which could be acquired through trade. This extended even to Babylonia, where the tribute of the vassal rulers to the Assyrians would have been acquired initially from Phoenician cities through the
Babylonian merchants [103]. Thus, Frankenstein argues, tribute relations allowed – even encouraged – trade relations and encouraged security in which trade could take place.

Control of the trade routes was certainly not the only cause of the interstate conflicts of western Asia during the 9th - 7th centuries. Nevertheless there does seem to a considerable bulk of evidence to suggest that the control of the trade routes running from northern Arabia through Transjordan and thence to the Mediterranean coast was vitally important to Israel and Damascus. Until further evidence is forthcoming from Arabia it must remain uncertain whether incense was, at this time, a significant export. If it was not, we must ask what commodities were exported, where did they come from and who controlled the trade in Arabia?

Although it seems likely that there was an increasing use of the Arabian land routes, there were also sporadic attempts to re-open trade along the Red Sea. The biblical texts name the intended destination as Ophir, which is argued by some to be Oman [104], India [105] or even Malaysia [106]. Others prefer to see Ophir as the same as Punt [107], or possibly somewhere on the Red Sea coast of Arabia that itself had contacts with East Africa.

Fattovich [108] relates the end of Egyptian trade contact with Punt to the sudden dryness in Northeastern Africa and the socio-political weakness of Egypt during Third Intermediate Period. Fattovich notes the disappearance of large villages in the Atbara-Gash region (suggested to be the archaeological equivalent of part of Punt) at this time, which is suggestive of a local breakdown. The collapse of the Egyptian trade with Punt also seems to be correlated with the rise of the South Arabian trade routes [109]. Although there is evidence for activity by peoples from south Arabia in Ethiopia during the 6th-5th centuries BC, there are no archaeological indications, so-far, that the Arabs of south Arabia were beginning to exploit the resources of the Ethiopian highland at this early date. Is it possible that the emergent Kushite state in the central Sudan
was exploiting, directly or indirectly, the resources of east Sudan and the Ethiopian highland and establishing contacts with the Western Asiatic powers via the Red Sea avoiding Egypt?

Whilst the exact nature of Arabia's role in international trade remains unclear, that of the coastal cities of the Levant is much better documented. The Phoenician cities came to specialise in the production of luxury goods, or the acquisition of luxury raw materials [110]. As tribute of the sea coast Assurnasirpal II received "gold, silver, tin, copper, copper containers, linen, garments with multicoloured trimmings, large and small monkeys, ebony, boxwood, ivory from walrus-tusk" [111]. That received by Tiglathpileser III was very similar, specifying in addition garments of dark purple wool, blue-dyed wool, iron, ivory and elephant-hides [112]. Some of these imports certainly originated in Egypt, and others - such as the ebony, ivory and elephant hides - certainly had an East African origin.

Unfortunately, there is remarkably little evidence to illuminate what the role of Egypt in the international trade of the 9th to 7th centuries BC was. There is equally little evidence as to what commodities were imported and exported.

In Late Bronze Age Egypt the luxury trade was controlled through the palace. Nubian commodities such as ivory, ebony, incense and gold figured largely in this. If, as is usually accepted, the Nubian trade was severed at the end of the 20th Dynasty, Egypt must have been forced to export different commodities. In the Ptolemaic and Roman periods cloth, particularly fine linen, and papyrus were major exports. Egyptian artefacts have been excavated in graves throughout the Mediterranean, from Spain and Carthage, Etruria and the Aegean islands, which suggests that these were goods traded with the Phoenicians. Notable amongst these objects were alabaster vessels and faience amulets. Neither of these manufactures was new in Egypt's international exchange [113]. Even if there was disruption to the luxury trade, which is doubtful, there were products which
there is good reason to believe were royal monopolies: cloth and papyrus.

Egyptian linen was in great demand for the eastern trade in the Roman period, according to Pliny being exported to Arabia and India [114]. During the Ptolemaic period the finest quality linen (byssos) was a royal monopoly, and there is evidence for its manufacture in temple workshops earlier [115]. Although the Assyrians probably did not import bulk goods like plain cloth which could have been produced in their own manufacturing centres, plain cloth may have been acquired by the Phoenicians, notably Tyre, then dyed in Phoenician centres and turned into fashionable Western style garments [116]. The Phoenicians must have imported large quantities of cloth, since they had little possibility of producing it.

There was also a royal monopoly on certain types of papyrus in the Ptolemaic period, and probably limits and taxes on other types [117]. Lewis suggests, by analogy with the production of linen, that producers were probably required to deliver certain amounts of acceptable quality to government authorities, after which they could produce for their own account, but only so long as they did not go into channels of trade where they would compete with the state supply [118]. There was a general relaxation of the controlled economy under Roman rule [119].

The bulk of the papyrus came from the Delta, although some was harvested in the Fayum [120]. In the Ptolemaic and Roman periods Alexandria was the main manufacturing centre [121] – and it was the second of the three main industries of the city. Lewis points out the necessity for manufacturing near where the reed was cut [122], so there were production centres throughout the Delta, at Sais (Saite was a cheaper type of paper) and in the region of Tanis [123].

The plant does appear to have been indigenous in Syria in ancient times, but only in certain areas [124], and there is no evidence for its local use for paper [125]. It was not native to Mesopotamia.
Consequently the use of paper instead of clay for documents necessitated the import of the paper. Lewis suggests that the alphabet developed to adapt to the use of paper [127] although it is equally possible that there was an increased use of paper because of developments in the alphabet. The increased use of paper instead of clay tablets in western Asia belongs to the 8th-7th centuries BC. Enormous quantities of paper were exported during the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, indeed until 677 AD the Merovingian chancellery was still being supplied from Egypt. The value of this trade cannot be estimated [128].

How early the large-scale export of paper began is unknown, but the Report of Wenamun suggests a fairly early date. Whilst in Byblos Wenamun received 500 rolls of papyrus from Nesubanebdjed and Tentamun along with vessels of gold and silver, and garments of "royal linen" and "fine linen" [129].

Egypt under Libyan rule continued to have a close relationship with Byblos and other Phoenician cities such as Sidon [130], Tyre and Ashdod [131]. Alabaster vessels, probably originally diplomatic gifts [132] have been excavated at Samaria [133] and Almunecar in Spain [134]. Other vessels, almost certainly of Egyptian origin have had cartouches added [135]. Scarabs carrying the names of these late-Libyan kings have been found at Carthage, Spain and in Italy [136], and the 'Bocchoris vases' from Tarquinia and Lilybaeum along with other faience give some indication of the types of manufactures exported [137].

In the later years of the Libyan period there may have been a number of centres which were particularly involved in international trade. Tanis, both a royal residence city and situated on the sea, must have been one of these, and one notes the connections of Shoshenq I, Osorkon I and Osorkon II with Byblos. Memphis too must have remained important, and probably continued as a major royal residence city. It was certainly the northern residence of the Kushite kings and a temple of Baal of Memphis is attested in the 25th
Dynasty, which might suggest a well-established Phoenician presence [138]. In the western Delta, Sais may well have established early contacts with the Phoenicians. The Phoenician expansion along the north African coast would have required staging posts (as earlier at Bates's Island), and doubtless contacts would have been made with major towns nearby. Certainly the 'Bocchoris vase' and scarabs suggests that Sais had contacts with the Phoenician traders.

It has been assumed by Török and Kendall that such trade contacts as might have existed between Kush and Egypt during the pre-25th Dynasty would have been with Thebes rather than the Delta. The presence of Theban marl wares certainly supports a direct contact with Thebes, but this does not preclude connections with the Delta rulers. The presence in the Assyrian record of commodities which surely must be of Nubian origin, suggests that such commodities were reaching the Egyptian Delta from whence they were 'traded' to the Levant.

The exports of the Pharaonic period - gold, ivory, ebony, skins feathers and slaves - may also have been those of later times. The scanty evidence available from the Achaemenid period suggests that ivory, and perhaps ebony, continued to be important [139]. There was probably an increase in the slave-trade during the Roman period, and later the Baqt refers only to slaves, although it is possible that gold and ivory were also exported [140].

One document not usually cited as evidence of Egyptian-Kushite trade contacts is the inscription of Crown Prince Osorkon at Karnak [141]. Prince Osorkon, served as High Priest of Amun at Karnak during the reign of his father, Takeloth II, and may have eventually ascended the throne as Osorkon III [142]. In some sections listing Osorkon's benefactions to Amun during the reign of Takeloth II are products specified as Nubian. These include gold, or "fine gold" of Khenthennefer, and dry myrrh "of the best of Nehes-land" [143]. Fresh incense and dry myrrh are listed elsewhere, but not as from
Nubia. It is possible that the gold was acquired directly from Lower Nubia, but the incense must have been of more southerly origin.

Further indication of the continuance of the 'luxury' trade is provided by Assyrian sources. An Assyrian document records the receipt of elephant hides, rolls of papyrus, and garments made of byssus from Ashdod and another kingdom, probably Gaza or Ashkelon [144]. The papyrus and byssus were certainly Egyptian manufactures (and probably a royal monopoly) but the elephant hides must surely be of central Sudanese origin. If elephant hides were being exported then it is reasonable to assume that ivory was as well. The ivory working of the 9th-7th centuries is one of the most notable productions of western Asia [145]. It is generally accepted that Syrian elephant was, by this time, extinct [146] and although some of the ivory worked in Assyria probably came from India via Babylonia, it is certain that some of the ivory excavated at Nimrud was African [147].

The origin of many worked pieces in the Phoenician cities again suggests that the ivory was imported, probably from Africa and, of course, ivory had for long been one of the most notable of the Nubian exports. Nubia must be the most likely source of this ivory, the size of some pieces indicating that it comes from the Bush elephant [148]. Although elephants were hunted in north-west Africa, they were of the forest type, with smaller tusks. It is unlikely that the Phoenician expansion into the western Mediterranean actually brought large quantities of ivory, at least early enough to coincide with the major periods of Phoenician and Syrian ivory carving [149]. Although late tradition dated the foundation of Carthage to around 814/813 BC there are reasons to suppose that it was not actually founded until sometime in the later 8th century [150].

Rather surprisingly, ivory working is almost completely unattested in Egypt during the Third Intermediate Period [151], but this may be due to accident of survival and changes in burial custom. The iconography of the western Asia ivories shows strong Egyptian influence, some of which is certainly of the Third Intermediate
Period (rather than being a new Kingdom residue), and it seems likely that faience amulets served as the model for many of the designs.

There are enormous problems in attempting to understand the economy of the Kushite kingdom, but there is sufficient evidence to suggest that trade continued. Indeed, the evidence from the period following the 25th Dynasty, another phase when relations between Kush and Egypt are suggested to have severely restricted, shows that there was considerable 'trade'. There is a remote possibility that there were contacts between the Kushites - perhaps, rulers in the central Sudan, rather than the Kurru chiefs - and the Red Sea coast. Any contact from there with Arabia or the Phoenicians is undocumented, but perhaps worthy of consideration. Probably most exports continued by the Nile routes.

The obvious evidence relates to the 'luxuries' which had always been Kushite exports, and which can be certainly said to have a Sudanese origin. The possibility of the breeding and export of horses has already been discussed. The control of such northward trade would probably have been, as it was in heyday of the Kerma kingdom, based in the Dongola-Napata reach. Undoubtedly, the Kurru chiefs came to control this trade, although they were not necessarily the original power. One explanation of the emergence of the Kushite kingdom would be that the Dongola/Kurru chiefs expanded their power southwards into the central Sudan in order to control of the source, as well as the transmission, of such commodities. It has always been assumed that the Kerma kings acted as middlemen in the trade with Egypt, rather than dominating the central Sudan. This may have been the case, but now, in the 8th century BC, the Kushites formed a large kingdom covering both the Butana and the Nubian Nile valley.

In return they probably received corn and cloth, which are not preserved in the archaeological record. It is more certain that pottery was being imported from the Theban region, presumably for its contents. Likewise, the the Levantine storage jars were probably acquired through Egypt, either for their original contents, or re-
used. In the later Meroitic period, wine was also imported. The archaeological evidence inevitably emphasises luxury manufacture, either jewellery, faience or stone vessels, amulets and the like. However, there is still no firm agreement on the dating of the calcite and faience vessels from el-Kurru, and whether they should be considered as contemporary, or as "attractive 'antiques' of types no longer produced" in Egypt [152]. They could even be pillage from New Kingdom burials rather than contemporary imports.

The military potential of the Kushite state and its economic base have proved difficult to quantify, but even more elusive is its ideological foundation.

The Ideology the early Kushite state.

The ideological base of the kingdom of Kush is by far the most difficult of the major factors to discuss. Adams [153] epitomised the generally accepted view when he stated that the Kushites "retained from their earlier contacts a complex of religious and political beliefs, including divine kingship, a state religion, and a dominant priestly caste".

Whilst there is a bulk of evidence attesting the introduction into Nubia of Egyptian deities and cult-practices and Egyptian kingship ideology during the New Kingdom, it is impossible to decide how much persisted as a 'legacy' to be adopted by the emergent state. The problems are increased because our knowledge of indigenous religion and kingship ideology among the C-Group and Kerma peoples is so limited. It is certain that there were hereditary monarchies in Nubia during the Early and Middle Nubian phases, but the mode of succession, the regalia and attributes of kingship, the excercise of royal authority and its control of economic and religious institutions remain elusive. Also, any idea of a 'legacy' must address the vexed issue of how the late New Kingdom relates chronologically to the appearance of the indigenous Kushite kingdom.
While there is extensive evidence for the worship of Egyptian deities in Nubia, it has to be conceded that there is, as yet, little evidence for the widespread worship of Nubian deities in Egypt. The chief Nubian deities head the procession of Upper Egyptian gods on the roof terrace at Medinet Habu, but this, as temple decoration, represents official theology - and also emphasises that Nubia was considered part of Egypt. In the tomb of Tutankhamun's Viceroy, Huy, funerary prayers are offered to the "(three) Horus gods of Wawat". The letters of Dhutmose on his journeys in Nubia during the latter years of Ramesses XI show that he recognised the local gods (notably Horus of Kubban and Horus of Aniba) and offered prayers to them for the health of his family in Thebes, as well as for his own safe return.

It is clear that, during the later New Kingdom, Amun was the chief deity of Upper Nubia. As such he is depicted on the roof terrace at Medinet Habu. The Amun of Napata is first depicted during the reign of Ramesses II, in the Thoth chapel at Abu Simbel. What forms of the deity were shown in the earlier temple at Gebel Barkal is presently unknown.

Breasted [154] proposed that priests from Thebes were instrumental in the processes which started up the Kushite state. This idea gained some currency and Kendall has now argued in favour of a modified version of it. In his model, the temples at Gebel Barkal were abandoned at the end of the New Kingdom and the power base of the chiefs of Kurru did not pay any attention to them, but about "Generation B" (c 865-825 BC) the chiefs, having come into contact with Thebes, began to adopt Egyptian religious style again. The activities of the Crown Prince Osorkon caused Theban priestly families to flee to Kush where they became highly influential, perhaps intermarrying with the Kushite royal house. Kendall has proposed that the pinnacle of Gebel Barkal - variously to be interpreted as an uraeus wearing the white crown, a phallus and a statue of Osiris - assumed a significant role in the ideology of the New Kingdom.
Kendall has argued that central to the ideology of the early Kushite kings was the myth of the solar eye. The solar eye had come to rest in Kush, whilst Egypt itself was torn apart by foreigners, and the Kushites, in returning the eye to Egypt, acted as the legitimate heirs of the New kingdom pharaohs and thus justified their conquest of Egypt. Certainly the statues of the Kushite kings from Gebel Barkal depict them wearing the four-plumed crown of Inheret-Shu. The earliest of these statues, however, belongs to the reign of Taharqo.

An ideology promoted as the justification of an act may come very swiftly after the act, or the decision to act has been made. Ideology is not necessarily the cause of the act: there may have been far more practical reasons why the Kushites wished to invade Egypt, sooner - or later - justified by ideology.

Unfortunately, the decorative scheme of the earliest Kushite temples remains virtually unknown. There is little surviving from the reign of Piye, and almost nothing in Nubia from the reigns of Shabaqo and Shebitqo. Kushite monuments in Egypt tend to continue trends already established. We are thrown back onto iconography and interpreting from such fragments as survive.

The cult of Amun which is such a marked feature of the Meroitic state, is given considerable prominence in the early Kushite inscriptions. In the text of the Barkal stela, Piye says that it was Amun who made him king and gave him the power to make and unmake kings. The Kawa inscriptions of Taharqo emphasise that it was Amun of Kawa who was instrumental in making Alara king, and stresses Alara's devotion to the god.

There has been considerable scholarly emphasis on the importance of the Gebel Barkal temples as a possible vehicle for the Egyptianisation of the emergent monarchy. This has assumed that contact between Thebes and its 'daughter shrine' continued throughout the Third Intermediate Period, and that the priesthood was always of
Egyptian origin. There is little firm evidence for this type of relationship between temples, although it has been suggested that it existed between some other Nubian temples and their Egyptian counterparts. It is also very unlikely that the Nubian temples would have been staffed entirely by Egyptian priests.

The importance of Amun in Nubia might actually have been through less obvious influences. It is possible that the emergence of the pharaoh with Amun in the New Kingdom temples may have been influential in giving the god a Nubian persona. At Abu Simbel, forms of Amun carry the title nb T3 Sti [155]. Bell has closely studied the cult of Tutankhamun at Kawa, and presented good evidence that he was worshipped there as an hypostasis of Amun, in the form of the crio-sphinx. Ramesses II is also shown in this form at Abu Simbel. It is therefore significant that one of the chief deities of the 25th Dynasty was the Amun pry ib Pnubs, a crio-sphinx seated beneath the mbs-tree. This deity is invoked in the inscriptions of Piye at Gebel Barkal, although the earliest surviving depictions are from the reign of Taharqo.

Pnubs has been identified with Tabo on Argo island, where the ruins of a temple survive, closely similar in plan to those of Taharqo at Sanam and Kawa [156]. Kerma has also been suggested: Pnubs might actually have embraced both areas. The Amun of Pnubs was depicted in reliefs of the reign of Taharqo at Sanam [157] and at Kawa [158], in both temples in the chapel south of the sanctuary. At Barkal the god appeared on the pylon of B 700, associated with a cartouche of Atlanersa [159]. The deity is also invoked in texts and depicted on amulets [160].

The continuance of an Amun cult at Kawa during the transitional period following the 20th Dynasty is implied in the Taharqo inscriptions referring to Alara and his dedications to that god. If the kings Menmaetre and Usermaetre are accepted as also belonging to this phase, then the continuance of the cults, notably that of Amun, is confirmed. The iconography of Amun at Kawa during the reign of
Taharqo identifies the deity with Khnum. He appears accompanied by Anuket and Satet, as well as by Mut. The equation of the two deities may be of longer standing. The worship of Khnum was certainly widespread in the temples of viceregal Nubia.

Although there is little evidence for the cult of Horus the Bull later than the mid-18th Dynasty, there is another striking parallel in the 25th Dynasty. The temple of Sanam was dedicated to Amun-Re k3 m T3-sti [161]. Taharqo's fragmentary dedication inscription seems to parallel the Kawa stelae [162], implying that his new temple was a rebuilding of an older, ruinous structure. The text also refers to the removal of statuary from Shaat (Sai), which had been the original cult-centre of Horus the Bull. Whether a New Kingdom temple, or chapel, dedicated to Horus the Bull had existed in the region of Sanam is a matter for future survey to consider. There is the possibility that the cults of Taharqo's temples owed much to the 'archaising' and research which characterise the Kushite period [163].

The Sanam temple was badly ruined and although the reliefs of Taharqo and Aspelta doubtless depicted this form of Amun, none survive completely [164]. The stela of Madiqen [165], depicts the deity as the typical Theban form of Amun, human-headed with solar-disk and plumed crown, accompanied by Mut and Khonsu. The god is called Imn-R® k3 n T3 Sti or Imn-R® k3 m St [166]. Griffith read the second title as "Bull of the Place", which is otherwise unattested, and could perhaps be an abbreviated (or erroneous) writing of Ipet-Sut.

The temple of Sanam was one of the four main Amun shrines of the Kushite state along with Barkal itself, Kawa and Pnubs. It was, like Kawa and Pnubs, built by Taharqo, with additions by later kings. An architrave block of Senkamanisken was found there, and Anlamani [167] dedicated one of his four sisters there as chantress. Aspelta himself erected a shrine within the hypostyle, as he also did at Kawa [168]. Griffith believed that the temple ceased to be important.
shortly after this reign and was then used as a faience workshop [169]. The latest reference to the deity is in the stela of Nastasen, which says that the king "opened the doors of the temple of the Bull of Gold, which is the image of Amun of Napata", in the town [170]. No inscriptions of the later Meroitic period attest Amun as a bull, although the story of Setne-Khaemwas (Setne II) refers to "Amun the Bull of Meroe" as the chief deity of the Kushites [171].

If the religious influence of the viceregal period is elusive, the impact of the pharaonic monarchy is even more so. In the model adopted here, whereby there was an intermediate successor state before the dominance of the 'Kurru' dynasty, these rulers continued a form of Egyptian pharaonic monarchy. It appears, however, that the Egyptian elements of the ideology promoted by the Kushite rulers from Piye onwards, were much more closely modelled upon practices of contemporary Egypt. The main evidence comes from the time after the conquest of Egypt, and hence cannot be seen as evidence for the motives for the conquest. It is a later justification.

The reliefs of Kawa temple B are destroyed above shoulder-level and thus give no indication of regalia, other than the end of a streamer. The stela of Ary shows either a close wig or cap-crown, again with streamer. The relief from el Kurru, identified by Kendall as Alara, shows an extraordinary form of helmet with streamers and a loop on the brow, which Kendall regards as a proto-uraeus.

The earliest representation of Piye is that on the sandstone stela from Barkal [172]. The original image of the king was erased, and later replaced with a much smaller figure. This later figure wears a cap crown with fillet and streamers. Amun presents two crowns to the king, one is the Red Crown, the other a cap crown; both have a single uraeus. These crowns are part of the original decoration, so, early in Piye's reign the cap-crown apparently represented the White Crown of Upper Egypt. Török points out the names of the cap-crown as found in Kushite texts [173], one of which, the 'Election' stela of
Aspelta, calls it sdn apparently derived from the Egyptian stn.w [174], one of the names of the White Crown. As early as the 2nd Intermediate Period, the kushite kings were occasionally depicted wearing the White Crown [175], but one should not assume any continuity.

The sandstone stela of Piye provides evidence for the cap-crown from the time of the Kushite conquest of Egypt, but, due to the survival of the monumental record, other features of regalia are not attested so early. The ram-head earrings and triple ram-head cord, are worn by Shebitqo, Taharqo and their successors on statuary, bronzes and relief. Shabaqo wears the cord on a bronze figure at Athens [176], but is not depicted in surviving reliefs wearing it [177]. Nevertheless, it may be assumed that the earrings and cord formed part of the Kushite regalia from this period, if not earlier. Such problems can only be resolved through greater archaeological knowledge of the formative stage of the monarchy.

The main centre of population in Upper Nubia in the post-New Kingdom phase was almost certainly in the Kawa-Dongola area, with satellites as far as Napata. There was probably at least one other major power centre in the central Sudan. The Upper Nubian bend was in many ways Egyptianised, but doubtless retained many - if not a predominance of - indigenous cultural characteristics. The Amun cult may have continued at Kawa, but indigenous forms of worship - which would not have vanished (and indeed persisted through Meroitic times) may have had influences on the practice. In the central Sudan there would be no major Egyptian influence from New Kingdom times and the construction of the large Amun temple at Meroe can probably be attributed to the 25th Dynasty, as a way of incorporating the southern part of the kingdom into a whole. The Apedemak cult is only known from much later, although may have had ancient origins.

Exactly how Egyptianised the Dongola Reach was during the New Kingdom, and how Egyptianised the postulated successor state was, it is impossible to assess. The iconography of the rulers - just as
that of the Kerma rulers of the 2nd Intermediate Period may have owed something to the Egyptian model, but this does not necessarily indicate that the whole Egyptian theory of kingship was adopted. Similarly in Western Asia, the Egyptian, and later, Assyrian, monarchies provided the imagery of rulership. The iconography — and perhaps some aspects of kingship — must have been adapted to local circumstances. The same must have happened in Kush. Whether the earlier indigenous Kushite monarchies were 'divine kingships' is, as yet, unclear, although it might be assumed that they were.
Conclusion: economic and cultural exchange and the emergence of the state.

The central issue of this study is the relationship between Nubia under Egyptian control and the independent Kushite, or Meroitic, state. In what way did the five-hundred-year domination of Nubia by Egypt influence the successor-state?

In an attempt to address this question, various aspects of the economic and cultural interaction between Kush and Egypt have been examined, along with the scholastic interpretation of the evidence. Much of the literature has treated the end of the viceregal administration as a rather convenient cut-off point and the cemetery of el-Kurru as the beginning of the later phase, without considering the complex problems of the relationship between the two phases.

The older interpretation of Egyptian 'imperialism' in Nubia saw Egypt as an active-progressive centre subordinating and transforming a passive and backward periphery, Nubia, which then - with the end of Egyptian involvement - reverted. This view has been challenged and modified by a number of more recent writers, but the idea of 'reversion' to some form of nomadic or 'tribal' society has persisted. Adams is one of the few archaeologists to have characterised the 'Napatan' period as a 'successor state'. Adams follows the historical theories of Arnold Toynbee, and views the emergence of the Kurru kingdom as one of Toynbee's "heroic ages", in which Nubia - Egypt's "external proletariat" - becomes "a classic example of a successor state: a barbarian people assuming the mantle and the burdens of empire from the hands of their former overlords". Kush undoubtedly may be seen as a successor-state, but the difference between this and other successor states is the two-hundred years it took between the collapse of the colonial system and the supremacy of the "barbarians": "it took some time for the lesson of the pharaohs to sink in".
Recent years have seen archaeological work in areas surrounding the Nile Valley which have forced us to re-examine our preconceptions about Nubia and the way in which it related to Egypt and the rest of north-east Africa. A number of historical studies, and the publication of much material from the UNESCO campaign, has similarly caused a re-assessment of the Viceregal period.

The view that Nubia was a "corridor to Africa" is now demonstrated by recent survey and archaeology to be a misconception. The Nubian Nile valley must be considered within the context of a much broader belt between the fertile north African littoral and Egyptian Nile valley, and the sub-Saharan savannah and Ethiopian highlands. This belt, although desert, was certainly not devoid of population. The Nubian Nile was one of the main routes between north and south - but it was not the only route and not necessarily always the most important or frequently used route. The political and cultural importance of Egypt has tended to dominate the north-south perspective, a view emphasised by the relatively limited knowledge of the archaeology of the surrounding regions. Considerable work in the western Oases and re-assessment of the evidence for the Libyans has considerably advanced our knowledge, although many questions remain. The recent excavations in the Gash Delta, by Fattovich and Sadr, and the surveys in the Wadi Howar and Eastern and Western Deserts of Nubia, by Kuper and the Castigliones have begun to reveal the complex archaeology of those regions. Gerharz's re-assessment of the Jebel Moya cemetery has begun the process of understanding the long cultural traditions of the regions farther south.

Although archaeology in the surrounding regions has created these new perspectives, nothing has yet been excavated in the central Sudan which relates to the New Kingdom and early Meroitic ('Napatan') phases. Re-examination of textual material, notably by O'Connor, has, however, challenged our assumptions about Nubia during that time. The existence of significant powers in the central Sudan must now be acknowledged, and this in turn must lead us to ask, how far did Egyptian control extend? The evidence suggests the possibility
that the riverine border was at the Third Cataract, with a buffer zone extending to the 4th Cataract - which itself formed a natural border. Leaving this region under the rule of local princes would have given the Egyptian-controlled regions some protection from potential threat from further south, and also meant that local rulers could acquire the luxuries of the central Sudan which were then paid as \textit{inw} and \textit{b3kw} to the Viceregal administration. Such local rulers would have been culturally Egyptianised and have depended upon Egypt for support for their regimes.

This proposed buffer-zone is not, of course, clear from the archaeological evidence, and, it has to be conceded, since there has been relatively little excavation in the Dongola Reach, there is no evidence from that region which bears on the issue. Nevertheless, given the importance of the Abri-Delgo towns - especially considering the clearly more productive land to the south, in Dongola - there is a body of evidence in favour of this interpretation. In any case, the existence of 'Egyptian-type towns' and temples in the Dongola Reach, would not necessarily indicate that they were Egyptian 'colonial' centres - they could as easily have been the residence towns of Kushite rulers (as it is suggested Kawa may have been), as in Syria-Palestine, with an elite court-culture modelled on that of Egypt.

O'Connor and Kemp have argued that some of the territories referred to in Egyptian texts, and foci of campaigns were actually situated beyond Upper Nubia, in the Berber-Shendi Reach. O'Connor, particularly has closely examined the evidence for and the implications of this location for Irem. As he concedes, the evidence is inconclusive. In one sense, it does not matter whether Irem was in Upper Nubia or Berber-Shendi: if it was in Upper Nubia, then Egyptian control of that region was less secure than normally allowed; if in the Berber-Shendi reach, then the Egyptians were campaigning much farther south than we have usually assumed. Irrespective of whether Irem and Miu were actually in the Berber-Shendi reach, there were certainly significant states - whether
'chiefdoms' or 'kingdoms' - in that region. It must also be acknowledged that, during the Ramesside period, Irem posed a major threat to the southern frontier. It should be asked whether activities by indigenous rulers of the central Sudan or Dongola Reach were actually responsible, at least in part, for the downfall of the Viceregal administration. Attention has always focussed on the presence and activities of the Viceroy, Panehesy, in Egypt under Ramesses XI, but there is strong reason to think that the Egyptian frontier had already been redrawn at the 2nd Cataract slightly earlier, under Ramesses IX or X. While, at present, there is no direct archaeological or historical evidence for an indigenous threat to the southern part of the Viceregal domain, that possibility should not be discounted.

The importance of the indigenous elites has also been emphasised, here and in other recent literature. The evidence for local princes in Lower Nubia continues into the 19th Dynasty, and the rulers of Upper Nubian regions are referred to into the 20th Dynasty. It is certain that members of the indigenous elite were employed in the viceregal administration; indeed, it is argued above that the bureaucracy, itself a relatively small number of people, was drawn largely from a small number of related elite families, with only the Viceroy appointed directly from Egypt.

Egyptian support for local elites would have aided the domination, with a corresponding reliance of the elites on the Egyptians. There may even have been dynastic ties and treaties to regulate relations with each other and to minimise conflicts of interest. If we accept that the majority of the Nubian officials were indigenes then we raise a number of questions about what would have happened at the end of the New Kingdom: would they have attempted to carve out a separate state for themselves?

There was undoubtedly 'Egyptianisation' and 'acculturation' of both elite and ordinary people during the New Kingdom. But what does that mean for the immediate post-viceregal period? It has generally
been argued that following the 'collapse' of the viceregal system at the end of the 20th Dynasty, people returned to a nomadic way of life, or "retreated" into Upper Nubia. While, for some elements of the population, this might not have been too difficult, how do people who are settled with all of the luxuries and power of an elite abandon this? Would it have been possible to absorb the elites into the Egyptian bureaucracy, especially at a time when hereditary rights to office were being claimed by the Egyptian elite? The issue must be more complex than is normally allowed.

If the administration remained largely in the control of the indigenous elite, so too the internal economy must have. Kemp argued that, given the extensive investment of the Egyptians in temple-building, military defence and so-on, Egyptian 'imperialism' was not wholly exploitative. The model of the 'redistributive economy' also provides an explanation for the 'disappearance' of the C-Group population of Lower Nubia during the 18th Dynasty: as the range of home-produced artefacts was replaced by centrally supplied goods. There must, at some point, perhaps in the mid-18th Dynasty, have been a re-organisation of land-holding in Lower Nubia. It is argued here that the building of temple-towns of the Abri-Delgo Reach does not reflect 'urbanisation' or 'colonisation', but that they should be seen as comparable with the 'Houses-of-Millions-of-Years', and that the land allocated, for example, to Soleb, was later re-allocated to Amara. So, instead, of a greatly increasing population in the Abri-Delgo Reach, the administrative centres simply moved.

Beyond the Third Cataract local economies would have continued, the most important aspect of the economy being the acquisition of 'luxuries' from the central Sudan which would have been paid as inw and b3kw to the administration and pharaoh.

The importance of Nubia to the economy of New Kingdom Egypt has long been recognised, its 'luxury' products were essential to the international trade of the Late Bronze Age. This is amply demonstrated by the Amarna letters, and archaeologically by, for
example, the Kas (Ulu Burun) wreck, where Nubian commodities - one (relatively small) piece of elephant ivory, incense, ostrich eggs and ebony - were found in association with Cypriote copper, Baltic amber, Mycenaean LH IIIA 2 and Cypriote wares, a Kassite seal and a reused Old Babylonian cylinder. There is also evidence that Nubia's importance was not restricted to the 'luxuries', but that it also provided cattle and a number of fruit and vegetable products.

It has often been assumed that the trade in luxury commodities ended with the collapse of the viceregal administration, and the apparent breaking of contacts with Nubia in the Libyan period. Since most of the commodities originated in the central Sudan, it is reasonable to ask whether the controllers of the source would have attempted to establish contact with Egypt, to ensure the continuing supply of Egyptian commodities. The Egyptians themselves would have still required - or desired - many of the products. If, as argued here, a successor-state immediately appeared in Lower Nubia, the continuance of trade is even more likely.

There has been an emphasis on the royal-cult in Nubia as Aussenpolitik. This is, in a sense, undoubtedly true - but Habachi quite clearly showed that the royal cult functioned in the same way in Egypt and Nubia. Contrary to Frandsen, the local variants in Nubia are not really different from local variants in Egypt itself. One could even argue that - from the point of view of the pharaoh - foreign enemies were no greater threat to the cosmic order than the rekhyt-people themselves.

The role of the Egyptian cults remains one of the most difficult areas to interpret the 'legacy'. Türök [1], although he acknowledged that there was no supporting evidence, was convinced that the survival of Egyptian traditions in Kush should be attributed to the continuance of the temple and cult of Amun at Gebel Barkal (with "perhaps eventual Egyptian supply of its priesthood"). Whilst it is probable that cults did continue, perhaps at Kawa, the forms of worship under the 25th Dynasty show the strong influence of
contemporaneous Egypt rather than having persisted *in vacuo*. The cult of Amun-Re-the-Bull, Lord of Nubia, at Sanam might be a creation of Taharqo, rather than residue from the New Kingdom: the inscriptions of Sanam refer to the transport of sculptures from Sai, one of the main cult-centres of Horus the Bull, and the cult might thus be another example of the 'archaising' of the period.

Perhaps more significantly, Egypt provided a model of kingship in the Late Bronze Age which was emulated throughout Western Asia, and probably in similar manner in Nubia. Some aspects of the Egyptian model of kingship were adopted and adapted to local circumstance, and some of the outward trappings could have been supplied through gift-exchange. But the whole Egyptian kingship ideology could not have been adopted. The evidence from Western Asia shows local rulers in Egyptian style [2] - but, even with the overwhelming cultural influence of Egypt the effect on kingship appears to have been rather limited. Local power structures, the traditional roles of rulers, the relationship of rulers to local deities, priesthools and elites, would have acted as a control on the ambitions of local rulers. So, later the Assyrian iconography of kingship dominates western Asia [3] and later still, that of Persia [4]. There is some evidence that earlier Kushite kings had assumed an Egyptian style [5], but in Kush as in western Asia, the local traditions and power relations would have exercised some control over the way in which Egyptian kingship models were adopted. Although subordinate rulers assumed some of the outward trappings of Egyptian kingship, they did not, apparently, adopt the whole kingship ideology. The assumption of full pharaonic style - titulary, regalia etc. - reveals a significant change in attitude, and doubtless in the power and ambitions of those rulers.

It is argued here that the Egyptians viewed Nubia in much the same way that they did their 'empire' in Asia, and that consequently Nubia functioned in a different way than has often been assumed. With greater emphasis on the role of indigenous elites, and a more complex society and economy in Nubia, the rise of an indigenous successor state is more easily explicable. Lower, and perhaps part of Upper
Nubia at the end of the New Kingdom had a developed state system with an organised and trained bureaucracy, hierarchies, military forces (formidable, apparently), control of local resources and agricultural subsistence. In addition, there were, certainly in Upper Nubia, and probably still in Lower Nubia, local organised political entities - 'chiefdoms' or 'kingdoms' - which controlled the 'luxury' trade of the central Sudan and which had their own military forces.

This system seems to have been functioning in the late Ramesside period, how then did it 'collapse'? Rather than disintegration, followed by depopulation, such a system had the potential for secession as one or more coherent and organised units. This might then have been followed by internal fragmentation. Parallel examples of such a situation are legion - and living.

One major difference between the model proposed here and the conventional view of the extent of Egyptian Viceregal control, is the status of Upper Nubia from the 3rd to 4th Cataracts. Conventional interpretations have assumed that this region lay within the Viceregal domain, and that it was, consequently, Egyptianised, in the same way as the rest of Nubia. Indeed, some Egyptologists have argued that Napata was the main centre of the Viceregal administration. The model argued here would see this part of Upper Nubia as remaining under the direct control of indigenous rulers throughout the New Kingdom. These rulers, most probably raised at the Egyptian court, would have been Egyptianised, and may have introduced elements of Egyptian culture and religion into their states, but the majority of the population - even if they acquired some Egyptian objects, would have remained largely unaffected by Egyptian culture. Within this model, the 'problem' of Egyptianisation is reduced. Following on the end of the Viceregal period, Upper Nubia would have not 'reverted', but simply continued the Kushite traditions.

The two main problems still remaining are the depopulation of Lower Nubia and relation of the end of the New Kingdom to the
beginning of the Kushite period.

It was widely agreed that there was a gradual depopulation of Lower Nubia during the New Kingdom, followed by an extended period in which the region was devoid of a large settled population. This view has been modified in recent years by evidence which shows the acculturation of the indigenous population during the 18th Dynasty, although it is still widely assumed that there was a depopulation following the 20th Dynasty until the Ptolemaic period. B.B. Williams has now argued that a body of archaeological material from Lower Nubia should be attributed to the 'Napatan' period. This material might actually have a wider chronological range, throughout the Egyptian Third Intermediate Period, rather than belonging specifically to the 25th Dynasty. Recent excavations at Qasr Ibrim have shown that there were fortifications there earlier than the 25th Dynasty. This evidence contradicts the earlier interpretations of the archaeological material, although it is quite clear that the population would have been quite small. Similarly, in the post-25th Dynasty, the inscriptions of Harsiyotef and Nastasen, belonging to the 4th century BC, indicate that there were 'chiefdoms' in Lower Nubia, whether the population was settled, or nomadic. Again, the numbers of people involved were probably small and they may have been semi-nomadic.

It has been attempted above to demonstrate that there is a substantial amount of evidence for the period contemporary with the Egyptian Third Intermediate Period in Nubia, and, based upon a model for the New Kingdom activities there, that the process which resulted in the development of the Kushite state began immediately upon the collapse of the viceregal administration, if not before. This group of materials and theories must be set within a chronological context: here it will be discussed against the conventional chronology for the Third Intermediate Period as presented by Kitchen, but including the many recent revisions to his scheme. The implications of the radically revised chronology proposed by James and his collaborators are also noted.
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The 'end' of the Late Bronze Age saw changes in the control of trade and trade-routes: Egypt was far less important than it had been whilst the western Asiatic powers - the Phoenician cities, Israel and Damascus became dominant. The increasing use of the camel opened up the Arabian land routes, although there was some continued use (or attempted use) of the Red Sea routes by Israel, at times in alliance with Tyre.

There is some evidence for the continued transmission of commodities from Nubia to Egypt, and it is unlikely that it would have completely ceased, even if there was political hostility. It is unclear what effect the rise of the Arabian trade routes may have had on the luxury 'trade' from Nubia. It is possible, although there is no supporting evidence, that much of the ivory used in western Asia at this time came from the eastern Sudan, but via the Red Sea/Arabian routes rather than the Nile valley.

The conventional chronology would suggest perhaps a rather slow development in Kush - or that much still remains unknown about events, perhaps to be discovered at sites such as Amara West, Kawa and in the central Sudan. At some points there may have been a limited amount of contact with Egypt. The recent discoveries of material from this period at Qasr Ibrim may well eventually demonstrate whether this was an Egyptian military outpost or a Kushite stronghold. The major problem presented by the material would be the interpretation of the Kurru cemetery, as detailed above: whether it should be stretched out over the period, or regarded as two groups of graves. The radically lower chronology advocated by James et al. requires some fundamental reinterpretation of Egyptian history during the Third Intermediate Period.

Within the broader context, the rise of Kush should be examined against the background of the collapse of the late Bronze Age states and the eventual ascendancy of the Assyrian empire in the mid-8th century. Also following in the wake of the late Bronze Age the increasing importance of the Phoenicians and Arabs and the changes in
trade patterns at this time. Whether the expansion of the Arabian trade routes was related to the collapse of the Egyptian domain in Nubia remains, for the time being, obscure. It is also uncertain when the Arabians began to cross the Red Sea; although the middle first millenium has been suggested, it may be as early as the 8th century BC [6] and there is some evidence for trade across the Red Sea in the 2nd millenium. Jacqueline Pirenne has proposed that the earliest wave of Arabian migration was caused by the Assyrians in the 8th-7th centuries. Fattovich suggested that the Gash Delta cultures ceased about the same time as the end of the New Kingdom. He has also suggested the possible influence of Nubia on the pre-Aksumite cultures and detailed finds of Kushite material in pre-Aksumite contexts [7]. While our knowledge of the archaeology of western Arabia, Ethiopia and the Eastern Sudan is still limited for this period, knowledge has considerably increased in recent years, and it is important to consider the possibilities of contact and influence, insubstantial though the evidence may be.

There is some evidence that the commodities of Kush continued to pass to western Asia, either through Egypt, or by the Red Sea-Arabian routes. In addition to the more usual products, the Assyrian evidence suggests that horses may have been brought from Kush and that there were Kushites in Assyria from mid-8th century. Although not in itself necessarily indicative of Kushite expansion, it shows that Kush was not entirely cut off from the western Asiatic world and that individuals were still going to Egypt and farther afield.

Re-assessing the evidence for the early 25th Dynasty has questioned some of the accepted bases of the historical reconstructions, but has provided no solid evidence for alternatives. A number of possible schemes for the expansion of Kushite power into Egypt thus present themselves, all with their individual merits and problems. The minutiae of chronological and historical problems have been discussed above. Until there is more evidence all that can be said is that, although activities by Kashta in Egypt remain without firm evidence, they must be assumed, and he must have extended his
power into Upper Egypt. Kush must have been actively involved in Upper Egypt by the third quarter of the 8th Century.

There has been a reluctance on the part of Nubian studies to consider the possibility that the Kushite monarchy involved more than one family. Emphasis has been placed on the Kurru cemetery and evidence relating to the 25th Dynasty royal family – following the interpretation of Dunham and Macadam. It is possible that there were actually two, three or even more elite families which intermarried, rather than one single family unit. Nubian studies have similarly not questioned probably the most important single assumption – that the kingdom was the result of a process by which several already existing 'states' were united. The existence of many different regions in Nubia during the New Kingdom – each with their own rulers, makes it highly unlikely that these had vanished. The Kushite state must have resulted from civil war and political alliances amongst the various regions. Whether Irem, the most formidable of the Kushite states in the Ramesside period, was active in the events which resulted in the Kushite kingdom, must, of course remain unknown. Even when the kingdom had achieved its greatest extent, from the Delta to the confluence of the Niles, or even farther south, it may not have been the united monarchy which is usually portrayed. Just as Egyptology has tended to regard the four uraeus-wearers as a sign of decadence – rather than as a perfectly acceptable form of kingship in Libyan terms, so also Kush is assumed to have been a kingdom united under only one ruler. Graeco-Roman tradition regarded the Meroitic ruler as the most important of the Aethiopian monarchs – but not the only one. Given the Kushite traditions, and geographical magnitude and divisions of Kush, it is quite likely that there were other local rulers, in addition to those buried at Kurru, Nuri and Meroe. Despite the assumption of the pharaonic style, and the apparent continuity of the monarchy, we should be very wary of imposing the ideal pharaonic model on the Kushite state, which may not have been as centralised, hierarchical and institutionalised as Egypt.

Even if the Kushite state was the result of the coalescence of
already existing political units, there must have been political, economic or other factors which caused this.

Population movement has been noted as a prime factor in the process of state formation elsewhere. It is possible that some movement took place following the end of the Viceregal period, but there is no indication that - for example - there were large numbers of people forced into the Nile Valley or central Sudan by climatic changes (nomadic population continued in the Eastern Desert through Roman times). There may have been political events elsewhere - the Ethiopian highlands, Darfur-Kordofan, southern Sudan - which forced people into the Butana and Dongola Reach. Fattovich has suggested that the recession amongst the Gash cultures was caused by climatic change, and this may have resulted in population movements, but if so they are undocumented. While population movements may have been a factor, they are without evidence, and other factors might have been more important. Since it has been argued here that states already existed throughout the region, the emergence of a more centralised and cohesive power may have been the result of conflict within Kush itself.

There is little in favour of the theory that the Egyptian priesthood at Gebel Barkal was influential in the rise of the Egyptianised state. The continuance of Egyptian cults further north in Upper Nubia, probably at Kawa, is quite likely, but that does not imply that they were influential in the process of Egyptianisation or state-formation.

Economic factors were doubtless significant, but exactly how remains elusive. Struggle for the control of the trade with Egypt might have been an important, if not the sole, motive for expansion. Any connection with Ethiopia and the Red Sea is still without solid evidence.

The periodicity in Egypt's relationship with Kush is often noted: Kush was powerful when Egypt was weak. In the past this has usually
been seen as opportunistic: Kush was powerful because Egypt was weak. As with many other successor states, rather than simply filling a power vacuum, the increasing power of the frontier "barbarians" may have been a contributary factor to the collapse of the old power. So, might it not have been the rising power of the Kerma kingdom which eventually led to the end of Middle Kingdom power in Nubia? So, we might legitimately ask whether we are right in seeing the emergence of Kush as a world power as Adams and others have done— an opportunistic successor-state, eventually filling the power vacuum— or whether in fact, the rising power of a Kushite state in Upper Nubia or the central Sudan— perhaps even Irem— was itself a contributary factor to the collapse of the Egyptian New Kingdom?
Appendix 1

The Commodities of Nubia.

[Part of paper to be delivered at the International Conference for Nubian Studies, Lille, 1994.]

Source materials.

The source materials are varied in type and cannot be considered in the same light as the economic documents which survive from Egypt. The temple scenes are usually connected with military activities, although these may have little bearing on the actual commodities presented (as Beit el-Wali). The tomb scenes doubtless allude to presentation on important royal occasions, but are not specific records. Others, such as the Ibrim Shrine 4 scene, do seem to be specific records. The sources emphasise certain commodities or manufactures and this has been reflected in the literature on the subject: greater emphasis has been put on the 'luxuries' than on the more commonplace items. The following list is not intended to be exhaustive.

Temples

Armant Pylon [Mond and Myers 1940: 26-28, pl.ix; with EES negs 1484a, 1485a-b, 1486a-b, 1488, 1493a, 1707 (dupl.1486a), 1708]. This scene is probably to be related to the campaign of Thutmose III known from the Armant stela.

Ibrim Shrine 4 [Caminos 1968: 59-75, pls.26, 28, 30, 32; Manuelian 1987: 92-93] Presentation of the imw to Amenhotep II upon the great dais in Thebes. Apparently related to a campaign. The produce includes: gold, ivory, garnet, ebony, perfumes, chariots, live panthers, tsm-hounds, iw3w- and wndw-cattle. All are reckoned in man-loads, and as Caminos (1969: 69) observes, this cannot be used to
gauge the actual quantities or numbers of animals or other substances.

Beit el-Wali [Ricke Hughes Wente 1967]. Related to a campaign, but it is clear from the depiction of the military action that this is not 'booty', and that the 'campaign' justifies, or requires, tribute. The scene, includes raw materials, wild and domestic animals, animal products, manufactures and people.

**Tomb scenes**

The presentation of tribute occurs in a number of Theban tombs. In the tomb of Amunedjeh (TT 84, Thutmose III) [N.M. Davies 1942], the accompanying text calls this the tribute of the beginning of the year. Davies (1942: 51) thought that this scene was "freely imitated" from that in the tomb of Rekhmire (TT 100), of the same reign. Nubian tribute is also depicted in the tombs of Amenmose (TT 89) and Ineni (TT 81). The most important is the tomb of Huy (TT 40: Davies and Gardiner 1926), where the presentation to Tutankhamun takes place explicitly in Thebes, but no occasion is mentioned. Outside Thebes, the most notable scene is the presentation of year 12 of Akhenaten in the Amarna tomb of Meryre II (Davies 1905a).

**Documentary**

There are few texts which can be considered 'administrative documents'. The annual 'tribute' of Kush and Wawat is listed in the Annals of Thutmose III (years 31-42). A list of Nubian tribute occurs in pKoller [Berlin 3034: Caminos 1954: 437-446] and in pTurin 1896 [Zibeliu-Chen 1992]. Of considerably later date, and very uncertain value are: the Sehel Famine Stela [Lichtheim 1980, 95-100; Torok no.47, 231 ff], acknowledged as pseud-epigraphic, but containing a list of stones and minerals which were, presumably, available in Nubia; the Nome-list of Ptolemy VI Philometor at Philae [Junker 1958, 263 ff; Török 1986: no.51 236-238].
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The commodities.

The depictions make it impossible to estimate the quantities involved. The Amarna Letters [Moran 1992] include large quantities of furniture which is described as made of ebony and ivory, and the evidence of the tomb of Tutankhamun would suggest that the late 18th Dynasty did see large-scale exploitation of these materials. The relatively small piece of ivory from the Kaš (Ulu Burun) wreck might be more typical. It has been demonstrated that one tusk was sufficient to produce all of the panels used to decorate the headboard of a bed from Ugarit.

Gold [Vercoutter 1960] is shown brought in rings, nuggets and as dust; it comes from different areas of Nubia (detailed in the Luxor list) and is of different types or qualities. Lower Nubia, principally the Wadi Allaqi, is thought to have been the major area of production, although Janssen has doubted whether production was greater than in the mines of Upper Egypt. Although numerous graffiti record the officials and expeditions to the mining regions, the archaeology of the sites is not well-known. Janssen's questioning of the importance of the mines would challenge the usual view that it was control of Nubian gold that enabled Egypt to maintain its hegemony in the Near East.

Ivory. There has been some debate as to the type of elephant involved, whether the 'Bush elephant' or 'Forest elephant'. The size of some of the ivory objects cut from a single section indicates large tusks and hence Bush elephants (eg Tutankhamun water bowl di 17.5 cms and headrest).

Ebony was supplied in small logs. Some idea of size may be gained from pieces cut closely to the confines of a block such as the chair or bed legs [London BM EA 24656 and Louvre 17333].

Incense. It has generally been assumed (eg Dixon 1969; Groom 1981) that the incense imported from the southern regions was frankincense
and myrrh.

The animal products include skins of 'panther' (perhaps cheetah and leopard) and fox (Amunedjeh), ostrich feathers and ostrich eggs, and giraffe tails.


Wild animals are depicted in many scenes (notably Beit el-Wali). Some of the animals, such as the monkeys, were frequently depicted as pets; doubtless some of the others were displayed as symbols of the pharaoh's universal power: ghs gazelles; m3-ḥd oryx; nyw/n3w ostriches; my (n) Miw "cats of Miw" (pKoller 4, 3); i6n baboons (Amunedjeh; pKoller 4, 3); g3f monkeys; tsm hunting dogs (Rekhmire; Amenmose; Beit el-Wali); my giraffe (Rekhmire; Amunedjeh; Huy; Beit el-Wali); lions (Beit el-Wali); 3by cheetahs or leopards (some depictions are certainly cheetahs) (Amunedjeh; Beit el-Wali); nr3w/ny3w ibex.

Of domestic animals, various types of cattle are frequently depicted in scenes. The Annals of Thutmose III records between 89 and 114 per annum from Wawat and 275-306 from Kush.
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Humans also appear in the "tribute" scenes. Males are usually shown as fettered captives and women come accompanied by children, frequently carried in a basket on the back. Interpretation of these scenes, is, of course, difficult and although military action and presentation of tribute are viewed as inter-dependent historically, this was certainly not the case in reality. Prisoners-of-war were certainly taken to Egypt as slaves, but whether the Egyptians conducted slave-raids (ie the purposeful acquisition of slaves by use of military force), is far from clear. It is possible that the campaigns described in texts really had the function of a slave-raid, even if the excuse given is 'rebellion' or attack on the gold-mining stations. Captives may have been acquired by the kushite rulers of southern Nubia and sent as slaves with the inw. Specific groups named in pKoller are Iram and Trk. Nhsyw to be fan-bearers are referred to in the 'preparation for the arrival of pharaoh' (pAnastasi IV).

Another group of products has received far less attention than the luxuries and minerals already cited. These are mainly fruits and similar products, but were doubtless important, as they occur in Egyptian administrative documents rather than in 'tribute' lists.

Christ's thorn nbs and 'bread of Christ's thorn' [pKoller 4, 1]; are well-attested. The hkk-fruit [pKoller 4,2; Caminos 1954: 438] is not the dom-nut [see Caminos 1954, 206; Janssen 1991: 85 n.j], but perhaps the argun-palm. It occurs in a number of texts, such as the pAnastasi IV, where 100 dishes are noted (although not specified as Nubian). Dom nuts were imported from Nubia and also grown in Upper Egypt. byy-vegetables and dkw [Janssen 1991: 86 n.m] are also Nubian products. ps-packs of fan-shaped palm-leaves [pKoller 4, 3; on reading see Caminos 1954: 442-443] were flabellate leaves of dom and other palms used as fans. Fans made of palm (ṭ3w (?) bht) are found in pTurin 1903 rt.5. Janssen (1991: 85 n.k; 91) notes that they came from the Khnum temple at Elephantine which strongly suggests a Nubian origin (also Janssen 1991: 85-86 n.h). nhsyw-rods of palm occur in pAnastasi V, 16,6. Other items occur in lists, such as that of
P. Koller, the identification of which remains uncertain: skrkby; k3t3.

Manufactures appear in the 'tribute'-scenes in the later 18th-dynasty, the earliest being the stools and staffs depicted in the tomb of Amunedjeh. The later scenes, notably the tomb of Huy and the Beit el-Wali temple include furniture. These may have been manufactured in Nubia, or might be depicted to indicate the use of the raw materials. The furniture includes elaborate chairs with lion legs and heads, some without arms, some with side panels; stools of various types; with a hole in middle (Amunedjeh); with 'turned' legs (Huy); folding-stools (Huy); beds with lions legs and head-rests (Huy).

Weapons include bows (Beit el-Wali) and bows and arrows (Huy). Shields of cattle-hide, and of leopard skin Those depicted in the tomb of Huy, are decorated with cartouches, and with images of the king as a crio-sphinx trampling foreigners, and as a human smiting. Chariots are referred to in the tribute in the Ibrim Shrine 4 (see discussion of Caminos 1968: 68-69), but were probably captured in the battle (perhaps already gift from pharaoh to the local rulers) and depicted in the tomb of Huy.

šwt/bh-fans are depicted (Beit el-Wali). Staffs and tisw-wands of ebony are depicted, and named, in the tomb of Amunedjeh [N.M. Davies 1942: 51 and pl.5]. The same word is used for gold and silver-tipped wands in the tomb of Kenamun.
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Appendix 2

The Archaeology of early Meroitic Nubia.

NB. The original analysis of the archaeological material was based, for Lower Nubia, very largely on the publications of the First Archaeological Survey. These included a number of objects which could be safely attributed to the Third Intermediate Period. The work of Vila in the Dal-Abri reach, and the excavations at Mirgissa supplemented the material. Williams's analysis and re-examination of the whole material was available only at a very late stage, and necessitated the total revision of this section. Given the significance of Williams' work, and necessary reference to it, I have felt it appropriate to substitute the original section with this Appendix.

Philae
A granite altar or barque-stand, now in the court of the Mammisi, carries a dedication by Taharqo to Amun T3-km[3]ps (Griffith 1930). Sethe (1901: 6) thought that this was the Tachompso of Herodotos (II 29). Ptolemaic and Roman inscriptions place Kemso, Takemso or Metakompso in the neighbourhood of Maharraqa. Griffith (1930: 129) suggested that Takompso was Philae in Taharqa's time, had moved southward by 450, but that the tradition lingered to confuse the issue.

Blocks, possibly from a 25th Dynasty temple were recovered from the foundations of the Philae temples.

Shellal Cemetery 7
7-2/3: deep pointed-convex bowl (Reisner 1910: fig 326: 17 (see also 16); pp.62-63. see Williams 1990: 7, Form Group III).
7-7: amulets (Reisner 1910: 66-67, pl.70: c4).
7-10: pierced udjat, udjats and probably a deep-convex bowl (Reisner 1910: 68, pl.70: c3).
7-181: pierced udjats (Reisner 1910: pl.72).
9-9: deep pointed convex bowls; two Kushite type amulets
(Reisner 1910: 93-94; see Williams 45 n.6)

Williams (1990: 31) concludes that there were 25th Dynasty/Napatan burials in the related cemeteries 7 and 9 and possibly also in the destroyed cemetery between them.

**Tafa**

West of Tafa, half a mile back from river.
Rock inscription of Taharqo year 19: PM VII, 10; Roeder 1911: 211 pl.93.a, 127.b; Weigall 1908: 105.

**Khor Hanushiya**

Rock inscription of Taharqo year 19: PM VII, 10; Roeder 1911: 215-216 pls 94, 127.a; Weigall 1908: 68 pl xxvii.4; cf xxii.4.

**The Wadi Allaqi Region.**

Williams (1990: 31) comments that the seven sites near the mouth of the Wadi show its importance at this time even if the region as a whole was not densely settled.

Cemetery 119; north of Qurta contained simple shafts and shafts with chambers.

119-10: Hathor head beads and Bes amulet (Firth 1927: 151 pl.28: a2 and 28; cf. Griffith 1923: pl.LXV, 13 and LV, 10-11; Dunham 1963: W 493 (2-5) fig.1: d; W 643 (4-5), fig.28, ten examples; W 846 (4-8) fig.36: e-f; later examples are quite rare and probably re-used).


scarabs and other glyptics have parallels in Kushite contexts (Firth 1927: pl.36, 124-29 from 119-10); see Griffith 1923: pl LIII: 6 for examples of other rectangular fish plaques.

Cemetery 120

120-1: plaque with fish
120-2: gold earring damaged but same as a type from Sanam (Griffith 1923: pl.XL: 10-11; Firth 1927: pl.28b, 12 see Williams 45 n
two scarabs and fish amulet comparable to examples from Sanam.

Other tombs were similar in contents and character (Firth 1927: 152-153, Tombs 1, 2, 7, 9, 12, 18, 19, 21, 26); most lacked pottery, as did some of the Qustul tombs and the Mirgissa cemetery.

Cemetery 121

At Qurta. Six tombs of similar size, shape (shaft with side-chamber) and orientation: two contained bed-burials.

Most of the pottery is unpublished. Williams comments that the pilgrim flasks from 121-2 are not of New Kingdom type; nor is the faience figurine (Firth 1927: 15-56; cf. pl. 27, d2 with Griffith 1923: pl. XXVI, 34 and LV, 12) and parallels for both were found at Sanam.

Cemetery 122

Shaft graves with side chambers, most apparently X-Group.

122-22: udjat plaque in Kushite 'bold style' (Firth 1927: 164; pl. 36, 149 see Griffith 1923: pl. XLIX, 3, 4, 7-10).

122-18: crescent shaped earring (Firth 1927: 164).

122-26: Although attributed to the X-Group, Williams notes that this tomb also material of 25th Dynasty/Napatan type (Firth 1927: pls 36, 152-155 and 28b: 11, a close parallel for aegis Petrie 1906: pl. XXXII ("amulets of XXII Dynasty" from Tell er Retaba; see also pl. XXXIVA: tomb 20 (with Bes figure and Sakhmet)). Large barrel beads also listed from this tomb, also apparently of Kushite type.

Cemetery 123

Sixteen shafts with side chambers, these tombs and contents most closely resembled Sanam.

publication incomplete, but included pilgrim flasks of the same type as found in Cemetery 121, and similar amulets. Necklace of Hathor-head pendants/amulets in Kushite 'bold style' (Firth 1927: 166-67; cf. pl. 28, a5 with Griffith 1923: pl. LXV, 13 see Williams Chapter 3, p 16 and Dunham 1963: W 567 (3-6), fig 14:c).
Maharaqqa: Cemetery 131

131-1: Amulets, scarabs, bronze vessels and iron weapons. The burial is shown as if in coffin but Williams suggests that this may have been a bed. Date assigned by excavator disputed because iron weapons believed to be inconsistent with such an early date.

Iron weapons (Firth 1927: 186-187 and nos 215-20 on pl 36). Williams (1990: 46n 18) says that probably later than Qustul and other groups noted here, but probably Napatan. It is the latest burial in a New Kingdom tomb, with bones probably of disturbed earlier burials.

Plaque with ram's head (Firth 1927: pl 28d, 5, e 5; Griffith 1923: pls XLII, 15; XLVI, 1-2, 4-8).

Large scarab (Firth 1927: pl 28d, 6, e, 6 parallels Firth 1927: pl 28d, 1-2 and 28e, 1-2 with Griffith 1923: pl LVII, 9-13 and 15-18).

131-5: Similar group of amulets including glyptic with kushite themes (Firth 1927: pl 36, 221 and 223 see Williams 1990: 46 n 22 cf Griffith 1923: pls XLI-LIV).

Kubban

Cemetery 110 (Firth 1927: 60-97).
Williams suggests tombs 110.54, 94, 125, 128, 308 should be assigned to the Napatan phase.

Amulets of New Kingdom appearance and small figurine amulets of later type (Firth 1927: 95-96, Tomb 110.308. Williams 1990: 46 n 23 gives extensive comparative refs.).

Bes-Ptah figurines (Firth 1927: pl 28c:26-27).

Pierced faience rings (Tomb 110.308 parallel Tell er-Retaba, Petrie 1906: pls XXXII, XXXIII, 60-61).

Two pottery vessels later than New Kingdom.

Masmas

A New Kingdom cemetery, but one tomb contained a deep, almost pointed bowl with a darkened rim associated with a flexed burial. The shape of the bowl parallels Williams (1990) VA 7-2.
Qatta
Cemetery 267 (Smith 1962: 56-57, fig 12).
Four graves, the burials surrounded with boulders.
267-1: deep pointed bowls; two vessels red-coated, one red rim;
pilgrim bottle of same shape as those found in Cemeteries 121
and 123.
Two other tombs deep pottery bowls of same type as grave 1; one with
beads that closely resembled those from similar tombs at Toshka.

Cleft graves of same type as dug at Qatta, unexcavated.

Toshka
Cemetery 260 (Smith 1962: 49).
Oval grave with two coarse brown wheel-made bowls red-coated
interiors and exterior rims same type as Reisner's number 15 (XXV-15)
also found at Qustul.

Qasr Ibrim.
The temple of Taharqo: JEA 51: 28, pl 12.2; JEA 56: 17-18 pl 25.3;
JE A 61: 16 pl 9; JEA: 63 pl 6.3.
A cartouche plaque of Taharqo ("probably") found opposite Qasr Ibrim
[PM VII 75; Emery and Kirwan 1935: 532, pl 58 [34]].
Shrine 4 at Ibrim, of the reign of Amenhotep II, contained two
paintings of a king, which could be 25th Dynasty, or (perhaps more
likely) Meroitic (Caminos 1968: 73-75, pls 34, 35).
Recent excavations have revealed evidence for pre-25th Dynasty
work at the site, in the region of the southern defences (Horton
1991). The first construction was a terrace made of stone and mud
mortar (Horton 1991: 265) and a second terrace was probably an
extension of this. A substantial mud-brick defensive wall with stone
inner face was probably later than the terraces, and may have had two
phases of modification. Over the entrance to this wall a circular
tower of cut sandstone was built, itself later encased in mud-brick,
creating a polygonal bastion. Horton regarded the next phase of work
(phase 7) to be contemporary with the temple built by Taharqo. There
was difficulty giving a precise date to these early levels. There was no diagnostic New Kingdom pottery, and all of that found was 'Napatan', the sequence of which, as Horton noted, has not yet been clearly established. Analysis of the chaff temper of the mud-bricks in phase 3 provided a radio carbon date of 2690 BP ± 90, which to one standard deviation is 920-800 cal BC. Samples of camel dung yielded a similar date 1040-770 (two standard deviations) (Rowley-Conwy 1988).

Horton concluded (1991:268) that phase 3 belonged to the period 920-800, with phases 1 and 2 immediately preceding it, and considerable work continuing until the Taharqo phase. Far more work on the material, and on the site, is needed before any historical conclusions can be drawn. No archaeological material was found sealed beneath the earliest walls, which indicates that—at least in that sector of the site—there was no previous construction. It failed to provide any terminus for the constructions. It may be safely concluded that they are post New Kingdom, but whether they belong to an early phase of Kushite independence (such as defences by Panehesy against Piankh), Egyptian military activities (of Piankh against Panehesy, or later), the earliest phases of Kushite expansion northwards (in the reigns of Alara and Kashta), or all belong to a rapid development of the site dating only from the time of Piye onwards.

**Aniba**

New Kingdom tombs were re-used in the 25th Dynasty/Napatan period. The pottery was presented by Steindorff with the New Kingdom material which, Williams (1990:34) comments, may have led to the assignment of many later contexts to the New Kingdom. Some vessels are types which occur at Abri and Sanam, as well as at Qustul (Steindorff 1937: pottery bowl type 6b4 (pl 69) see pl 87: types 47-1 (SA 34.7), 47-2 (SA 33.19), 49-2 (SA 36.14), 49-3-6 (SA 37.20-23)). All tombs had superstructures, which, Williams suggests, may have played a role in the kushite readoption of the pyramid.

SA 33 (Steindorff 1937: 234-35) SA 34 (Steindorff 1937: 235-236) SA 36 (Steindorff 1937: 238-39) SA 37 (Steindorff 1937: 239-40). SA 33 seems to have been constructed in the 19th Dynasty, but 36 and 37
contained earlier material. S1 may also be added to the list also with vessel 6b4.

Qustul
Cemeteries W and V (Williams 1990).

Faras
Verwers (1961: 15-29; 23-8 fig 5-7 pl IV-V) published a series of graves at Faras which lay to the south of the C-Group Cemetery (24-D-1; 24-E-12, 13; 24-I-10, 11, 12, 13). They were identified by him as New Kingdom. The graves were irregular pits lined with sandstone slabs usually against a rock cliff which served as one wall (Verwers 1961: fig 4) with a preferred orientation n-s; the burials were extended on the back. Similar grave types had been noted by Garstang and Junker at Arminna and Kubanieh. Williams suggests that these stone-lined pits may be a variation of the brick-lined pits at Sanam (Griffith 1923: pl XIV) or a local cultural variant (see Vila 1980: 176 (4)).

The pottery included simple bowls and beakers, some with red, streak-burnished exteriors and others with red rim-bands, pilgrim flasks and small jars. Verwers thought that the pottery indicated a date in the 18th-20th Dynasties. Williams comments that some of the pottery types (Verwers 1961: fig 7, carinated bowl and larger jar) are New Kingdom types but continued into the 25th Dynasty/Napatan period (cf Williams 1990: 7-9; Griffith 1923: pls XVII-XVIII).

The amulets (Verwers 1961: pl Vc-d (except c3)) included a Bes, pataikos and scarabs [d-e] which more closely resemble TIP types than New Kingdom. Williams notes the parallels from Sanam.

Serra West
Three burials sites 24-H-3, 24-H-4, 24-M-8 (Verwers 1962: 25) of the same type as Faras and with similar objects.

Argin
Two sites contained graves lined with sandstone and granite blocks 6-B-11 and 6-B-12 (Nordström 1962: 42-43).

see also Almagro et al 1965: 82 pls XIV: c, XV:b.

West Bank near Matuga Island

A large structural tomb with large transverse outer chamber, smaller longitudinal inner chamber, ramp-like dromos with thirty-eight burials (Adams and Nordström 1963: 23-24). Williams (1990: 47 n 44) suggests that the plan may be an incomplete version of multiple-chamber tombs at Sanam (Griffith 1923: pl XIV and pl XIII). The pottery was not described in detail (but see comments of Williams 1990: 47 n 45). A scarab in the 'Kushite bold style' (Adams and Nordström 1963: pl II, b3) also suggests post-New Kingdom date.

Buhen

Taharqo made additions to the temple. The South temple was restored with a new intercolumnar screen wall and possibly a new pillared portico (Smith 1976: 217; Caminos 1974: I 82-86). The stone floor was relaid and figures of the king added to the door reveals of the temple proper. There is no evidence for reoccupation of the town, although presumably some part was occupied by a garrison.

Two papyriform columns (22 and 23: Caminos 1974: I 59-60, pl 71) formed an entrance on the main axis, in front of columns 31 and 32. Adjacent was a gateway with jambs placed before columns 32 and 33 (Caminos 1974: I 57-59, pls 69, 70). It is assumed that a number of relief fragments formed intercolumnar screens somehow related to this structure. The fragments were not found in situ and it now impossible to reconstruct the design. They comprise relief fragments 51 (Caminos 1974: I 82-83 pls 99; 100.1) 52 (Caminos 1974: I 83-84, pls 99; 100.2) 53 (Caminos 1974: I 84, pl 101.1) 54 (Caminos 1974: I 84, pl 101.2) 55 (Caminos 1974: I 84-85, pl 102.1) 56 (Caminos 1974: I 85, pl 102.2) 57 (Caminos 1974: I 85, pl 102.3).

Figures of the king were added in the main temple, to door reveals 4 and 5 (Caminos 1974: II 11, pl 13, 14.1-2) and 50 and 51 (Caminos 1974: II 54, pl 47.3-4). Part of a barque-stand (fragment
58: Caminos 1974: I 86, pl 103.1) was recovered, which may originally have stood in the sanctuary. Other fragments originally associated with the structure included an architectural element, probably a door-jamb (fragment 59: Caminos 1974: I 86, pl 103.2-3) and a loose block with an added Greek inscription, under which was a painted scene of a black king harpooning in front of Isis (Inscr 1613: Smith 1976: 131 and n.1).

New Kingdom tombs were re-used at this time (Randall-MacIver and Woolley 1911: 169-170, J 13 see Williams 1990: 47 n 46) and should perhaps be associated with a garrison here.

**Mirgissa**


The amulets are typical Third Intermediate Period, with quadruple-udjats (Vercoutter 1975: 484, fig 4, no 9); open-work udjats (Vercoutter 1975: 485, fig 7, no 22 and 9) Bes amulet; multiple udjat with no details (Vercoutter 1975: 488, fig 10.2; 491, fig 14.2) and others (Vercoutter 1975: 494, fig 19.1, 2; 495, fig 23.4, 5); sow amulet (Vercoutter 1975: 493, fig 17.17); incised solid udjat (Vercoutter 1975: fig 17.11); ram-head pendant (Vercoutter 1975: fig 17.16). A group of Sakhmet amulets in yellow and blue faience are identical to a large group from Sanam (Vercoutter 1975: 496, fig 24.24, 25; cf Sanam 1.927B (Oxford Ash. 1921.712, 1921.713) Griffith 1923: p1 XXII.4).

**Dorginarti**

Heidorn's (1991) re-examination of the material from Dorginarti has demonstrated that the fortress belongs to the Saite and Persian periods. There is every possibility that it represents an Egyptian position south of the Dodekaschoinos (which appears to have been an administrative creation of the 26th Dynasty). There are no indications that the site has any earlier Napatan or pre-25th Dynasty remains.
Semna

The mud brick temple, with indications of alterations to floor and roof dates to the reign of Taharqo (Dunham and Janssen 1960: 12-13, pls 35-38). Additional features in stone: lintel (Khartoum SMN 449: PM VII.149; Budge 1907: I opposite p 483); lintel (Dunham and Janssen 1960: pl 38.C); jambs (Budge 1907: I opposite p.483) and papyrus columns. The temple contained an altar dedicated by Taharqo to Senusret III (Dunham and Janssen 1960: pl 37B) and a number of Middle and New Kingdom statues. Close-by was a mud-brick structure of same date (Dunham and Janssen 1960: 32-45, plan VII A-C).

Cemetery S 500 (Dunham and Janssen 1960: 74-105) contained several NK tombs with 25/Napatan pottery and objects.


515: Dunham Janssen 1960: 78, fig 37, jar 24-2-477 with shoulder and handles (described on p 74 as an "anomalous" 18th dynasty grave with Kushite pottery).

520: Dunham Janssen 1960: 80, fig 41 24-2-574, 577 deep bowls red rim tomb and contents early 18th dyn.

523: Dunham Janssen 1960: 82-84, fig 45 24-3-233 ram amulet; 24-3-223 amulet; fig 46; 24-2-647 bowl red rim.


553: Dunham Janssen 1960: 94-96, fig 55-56, 24-3-316. 325 handleless jar otherwise like tall Kushite jar, 170 (small) fig 56 "kena ware" ; 24-3-319 fig 56 and 172, deep bowls, one ribbed.

The region of Gamai

The Gamai region was first inspected by Bates and Dunham, with more intensive surveys during the UNESCO campaign (Mills 1965: 1-12; 1968: 200-210; Mills and Nordström 1966: 1-15). Williams suggests the possibility that some of the sites surveyed by Mills may have included 25th Dynasty/Napatan graves. Particularly the cleft graves on the island of Kaganarti, which the report identified as New
Kingdom. Here 250 graves were made in crevasses in rocky outcrops, similar to those in the Qatta and Afya regions.

Cemetery 100: a small plot of graves attributed to the "Christian" period (Gardberg 1970: 38-39). 100D Grave I contained a small Napatan amphora (Gardberg 1970: 38, pl.62, 4). The grave was originally a shaft with a side chamber (Gardberg 1970: pl 15.1). 100D:3 (Gardberg 1970: pls 15.3, 62.4) appears to be early Meroitic but the pottery it contained is not very distinctive (see Williams 1990: 48 n.56).

Gamai

Cemetery 500 was dated to the NK by Bates and Dunham (1927 14-15). It comprised only three graves, one a circular chamber and shaft, the others rectangular.

Of the pottery, some storage jars resembled New Kingdom prototypes (Bates and Dunham 1927: pl LXIX fig 53) but the remainder was characteristic of the 25th Dynasty: bowls open and conical (pl XI.2f, 3A-E); one large jar short neck and shoulder (pl LXIX: fig 39); pilgrim flasks with candlestick rims do not resemble New Kingdom types, but close to later examples from Soleb (pl LXIX fig 44, 43; LXIV fig 9, 13 from cemy E see Holscher 1954: pl 47: U3 esp U4; Schiff Giorgini 1971: pl 15.28 also p.196 fig 346).

Tumulus E contained five burials (E2 E20 E34 E42 E81) which Williams attributes to the 25th Dynasty/Napatan period on the evidence of tall conical cups with rim-band, bed burial and Kushite bold glyptic (Bates and Dunham 1927: 54-60; see list El pl LXIV: fig 13; see pp 16-17 for other graves attributed to the New Kingdom, but probably of other periods).

Upper Nubia.

Dal-Abri

The survey of the region south of the Dal Cataract, directed by Vila, located a number of cemetery sites which were assigned to the phase
between the end of the New Kingdom and the 'Napatan period'. The most important was the cemetery at Missiminia (PASCAD 9: 42 2-V-6) where Vila attributed 140 graves to a phase covering the pre-25th Dynasty to the end of Napatan period. Williams (1990: 37, 39-40) suggested the addition of a number of sites from Vila's survey to the 25th Dynasty/Napatan period by analogy with the Lower Nubian material.

**Firka** 3-L-26. PASCAD 3: 96-99 tomb 2 (see Williams 1990: n.66).

**Amara West**

2-S-35 (PASCAD 7: 100-107) 30 graves.

The EES excavations at Amara West were limited, and remain largely unpublished (Fairman 1938; 1939; 1948; PM VII 157-164), but the site is certainly important to the New Kingdom-Kushite transition. The excavators reported (Fairman 1948: 6) that the debris separating levels 3 and 2, both of Ramesside date, and level 1, which they suggested might have been 25th Dynasty (Fairman 1948: 10), "was never much less than one metre thick". The Ramesside roofs had collapsed, and there was a "layer of wind-blown sand, succeeded by a thin layer of squatters' occupation debris and then a second layer of wind-blown sand". They concluded that "there must have been a considerable lapse of time" between the levels. Whilst the Amara region is notoriously windy, and sand accumulates rapidly if not cleared, the available evidence indicates abandonment of the town in the late 20th Dynasty, or immediately following. Importantly, a 'Saharan' sherd was found in an apparently sealed context, below level 1 (Fairman 1948: 6). Sherds of this type had already been noted elsewhere on the site (Fairman 1939: 143), but are an archaeological enigma requiring further research. Surface finds of chalcedony arrow-heads suggest the possibility of other pre-25th Dynasty presence (Fairman 1948: 10).

**Ginis E.**

Ginis W.
2-T-58 Kashasha (PASCAD 5: 119-122), contained pilgrim flasks (fig. 53, 1 and 2) and a pataikos amulet with winged goddess on back (fig. 53, 8) headless, but closely similar to examples from Kurru 52 and 53 (Dunham 1950: pl. L, LIV), both attributed to wives of Piye. 3-P-50 (PASCAD 5: 145-159), a large tomb with remains of painted wall decoration, shabtis of a nbt pr Isis, which suggests a New Kingdom origin. Some of the amulets are of TIP type.

Attab E. 2-S-2 Saadlin (PASCAD 6: 24-27) Vila thought that these were New Kingdom, probably in earlier graves.

Attab W. 2-S-42B (PASCAD 6: 64-65). Although Williams (1990: 48 n. 68) suggested this tomb might belong to the Napatan period he regarded it as "less certain". 2-T-67 (PASCAD 6: 93-96); a complex of basins and canals attributed by Vila to the New Kingdom.

Amara East. (PASCAD 8: 68-73 2-R-43; 2-R-44) 25 e-w and 5 larger collective tombs, brick-lined. 2-R-47 (PASCAD 8: 77-87) NK and later. 2-S-31 (PASCAD 8: 126-127), NK or TIP 2 brick-lined tombs n-s.

Abri E. 2-V-17 (PASCAD 9: 50-57) NK-TIP/25.

Missiminia (Abri E) 2-V-6 (PASCAD 9; PASCAD 12)
Vila suggested a small population (approx 30) throughout the period of occupation. No settlement was noted. Vila suggested that settlement remains were either in the same as modern (and hence destroyed) or where later cultivation had destroyed most of the remains. This explanation satisfied Shinnie [1985: 56] but not, apparently, Kemp [1991: 241].

Sai
A late pharaonic at Sai (Vercoutter 1958: 168 and fig 15; Geus and Reinold 1975: 21-42).

Sedeinga
Blocks with the name of Taharqo (Schiff Giorgini 1965: 116-123 figs 2-5; more Orientalia 53 1984: pls 31-32), found here led to a suggestion that he was buried here. The blocks are probably from a temple in the region which were re-used in the later meroitic pyramids. The final publication of the Schiff Giorgini excavations is in preparation.

Soleb
Williams added to the list of 'Napatan' graves, commenting that this was "certainly not exhaustive". Schiff Giorgini 1971: figs 735: 8c 12; 346: T 15 p13; 368: T 17 p3; 372: T 17 p7; 382: T 17 c1; 380: T 17 p20; 660: T 46 s1; pl. XII: T 18 c21, T 35 p3, T 20 p13; pls. XIV: 7; XV: 28.

Apart from the major sites of Kerma, Kawa, Sanam and the 4th Cataract (Kurru, Nuri and Barkal), survey and excavation in the Dongola Reach are still in their early stages. With the notable exception of Kerma, excavation at these sites has focussed on the temple structures, and the royal cemeteries. Whilst this leaves a notable gap in the available material, it may, ultimately be of benefit to archaeology, as the exemplary work at Kerma has revealed the complexity of the sites.

As a fertile region (Edwards 1989: 93-95), between the known major sites of the Kerma Basin and 4th Cataract, and with a number of important desert routes joining the Nile here, ancient occupation is to be expected. A few monuments and objects of 25th Dynasty date have been recovered from the Letti Basin (PM VII 192), and a temple, possibly Meroitic, identified at Bugdumbush (Crawford 1951: 38). A 'town', Krtn, occurs in texts, and has been identified with the district of Korti [Crawford 1951]. Although a large number of
archaeological sites have been reported, few have, as yet been identified as pre-Meroitic (Edwards 1989: 99-111 details 107 sites).

Tabo
The large temple, probably to be dated to the reign of Taharqo (Jacquet-Gordon et al. 1969), had blocks built into its pylon carrying the cartouches of Thutmose III or IV, Amenhotep II and III (Maystre 1967-1968: 196; Jacquet-Gordon et al. 1969: pl. 23.1), and a column drum with those of Ramesses II (Maystre 1967-1968: 194; Jacquet-Gordon et al. 1969: 107). The site was originally suggested to be the ancient Pnubs (Jacquet-Gordon et al. 1969), although this has now been questioned. Unfortunately, little more is known of the site, the settlement and cemeteries not having been excavated.

Kerma
Recent excavations at Kerma have revealed Napatan settlement sites (Bonnet 1988: 19-20, VI) and graves. One building giving C-14 dates 800-300 (600-500) (Bonnet and Mohamed Ahmed 1984: 35-42, XVII-XX). A burial of a Priest of Amun of Pnubs [Bonnet and Valbelle 1980] also belongs to this phase. There is a possibility that Pnubs is to be identified with Kerma. Pnubs itself is referred to on an abacus of Piye in B 502 (Dunham 1970: 55 fig.40 column E side B).

Kawa
The excavations at Kawa concentrated on the temple precinct, and despite the evidence from there of New Kingdom and pre-25th Dynasty occupation, there is a lack of archaeological material to expand upon this. Walls and part of a pylon belonging to an earlier temple were discovered beneath that of Taharqo (Macadam 1955: 226, pl 7-8, pl CVIIG) and there were suggestions that the building had been destroyed by fire. The textual evidence indicates that the town was, in some way occupied in the immediate pre-25th Dynasty: Alara dedicated one of his sisters there; there was a temple of brick; Piye is called beloved of Amun of Gematen on one of the abaci of B 502 (Dunham 1970: 55 fig.40 column E side D). Whether the site was
in constant occupation from the New Kingdom until the 25th Dynasty is a matter which can only be resolved by further excavation.

From Old Dongola itself, came a number of pieces with inscriptions, but they were certainly all removed from other sites (PM VII 193; the Nastasen stela presumably from Barkal); A finely shaped block with a panel containing the cartouches of Taharqo with texts describing him as beloved of Amun Lord of the thrones of the Two Lands and of Amun of Gem-Aten (Jakobielski and Krzyzaniak 1967-1968: 161-162, pl 32 a-b). The block was re-used in a side chapel of the Church of the Granite Columns and was the earliest Pharaonic block from the site. Jakobielski and Krzyzaniak were of the opinion that this was not an altar, and suggested that it was brought from a place not far off. The block certainly was an altar or barque-stand, and its inscriptions indicate Kawa as its place of origin. Macadam found no Taharqo altar at Kawa, and it seems likely that this block came originally from temple T.

El-Khandaq east II (Edwards 1989: 106 no.61; ROM-MM.3 Grzymski 1987: 30) possibly NK to Meroitic. Some antiquities were noted by earlier visitors to Khandak, but are now lost (Crawford 1951: 36-38, referring to Linant de Bellefonds and Waddington).

Argi (Edwards 1989: 100 no.9; ArkeII 1950: 35-6) opposite Ed Debba, there is a cemetery where fragments of objects of probably 25th Dynasty date were left by grave robbers.

The major groups of Napatan material come from the cemeteries of el-Kurru and Sanam. Other cemeteries, as yet unexcavated, do exist in the vicinity of the 4th Cataract. Painted tombs of 'Napatan' date (Leclant and Clerc 1989).

Meroe
The earliest burials in the cemeteries are dated to the early 25th dynasty. The Amun temple might be 25th Dynasty in origin, showing stylistic affinities with B500. The original M 250 is also suggested
to be 25th dynasty in origin. The earliest levels so-far excavated in the town are dated by their pottery to the 8th and 7th C BC.

The southern known limit of Kushite influence is in the Sennar region. A Neferkare-scarab from Sennar (Khartoum SNM 3643: Arkell 1950, 40) is of a type also found at Sanam (cf Griffith 1923: pl 42, [20]) and was recovered from a settlement site containing potsherds of Gebel Moya culture. At Gebel Moya itself, there were quantities of faience beads and amulets including scarabs and plaques with the names of Shabaqo and perhaps of Psamtik I (Addison 1949: 117-119, pl L), as well as a scarab of Shoshenq I.

Also associated with Gebel Moya pottery is a Menkheperre scarab from Kosti (Khartoum SNM 3562: Arkell 1950, 40). A 25th Dynasty period scarab (Khartoum SNM 4969/2: Arkell 1950, 39-40) with the inscription "mery Amenre" was found at Umm Harot in the Wadi Muqaddam, one of the desert routes connecting the Korti-Napata bend of the Nile with the Sennar-Gebel Moya region.
Appendix 3

The Aktisanes episode of Diodoros.

The events recorded in Diodoros (I, 60, 70ff.) are set during the reign of "Amasis". Amasis is said to have been a harsh ruler, and that, in consequence, when "Aktisanes, the king of the Aithiopians" led an army against Egypt, many of the people revolted, Amasis was overcome, and Egypt fell under the rule of the Aithiopians. This passage, discussed by Priese (1977) and Török (1986: 205-06, no.25), is therefore believed to refer to the reign of Amasis, Ahmose II, of the 26th Dynasty (570-526 BC).

Whilst the historical content of the Aktisanes story is generally disregarded - being recognised as a version of the Sabakon story reported by Herodotos - the contemporaneity of Aktisanes and Amasis has to be considered. Meroitic scholars are agreed that Diodoros is referring to the 26th-dynasty ruler, but there is, as already noted, no archaeological evidence for placing 'Aktisanes' during the 26th Dynasty; the Kushite kings of this period being amply documented. However, the Aktisanes episode in Diodoros's narrative is not associated with the 26th Dynasty.

Diodoros gives a consecutive history of Egypt which is based very largely upon that of Herodotos. In both writers Moeris is succeeded by a of number kings before the reign of Sesostris/Sesoosis, the universal conqueror. His son Pheron went blind and was cured by bathing in the urine of his chaste wife. Here Diodoros interpolates "a long line of successors on the throne [who] accomplished no deed worth recording" followed by Amasis and the Aktisanes episode. After the death of Aktisanes "the Egyptians regained the control of their government and placed on the throne a native king, Mendes, who some call Marrus" who built the Labyrinth. This ruler is clearly another form of Moeris to whom has already been attributed the building of a Lake (ie Lake Moeris, the Faiyum) and an associated complex (ie the
Labyrinth). Diodoros has a further five generations without kings before Cetes-Proteus who ruled at the time of the Trojan war. Here he picks up the narrative of Herodotos again, which is then followed quite closely, except for the insertion of seven generations of kings "who were confirmed sluggards" between Rhampsinitus-Remphis and Cheops-Chemmis the builder of the first/largest pyramid. The pyramid builders are followed in Herodotos's narrative, by Anysis in whose reign Sabakon invaded Egypt. The Sabakon episode is similar in both Diodoros and Herodotos. Herodotos follows Sabakon's return to Aithiopia with the restoration of Anysis and the invasion of Sennacherib, the rule of the dodekarchy, and eventual supremacy of Psammetichos I (Psamtik I). Then follows the rest of the 26th Dynasty to the reign of Amasis (Ahmose II). Diodoros differs slightly from Herodotos in his account of the dodekarchy, but with the accession of Psamtik I the narratives follow fairly closely together again.

In Diodoros's account of the 26th Dynasty Amasis-Ahmose II is given a very different treatment from the Amasis of the Aktisanes episode. This 26th-dynasty king "ruled over the Egyptians in accordance with the laws and was held in great favour". Whoever the originator of the Amasis-Aktisanes episode intended his Amasis to be, Diodoros clearly thought he was different from the Amasis of the 26th Dynasty. It is possible that the Anysis of Herodotos has been corrupted into the Amasis of Hekataios/Diodoros. It should be noted that Plutarch (Moralia 151; Septem sapientium convivium 6) also refers to a contest between Amasis and an unnamed king of Aithiopia. In this instance the contest is one of wisdom, in which Amasis promises - if he fails - to withdraw from towns around Elephantine. No attempts have been made to claim the historicity of this episode.

This does little to resolve whether "Aktisanes" is a Greek form of a Meroitic king's name, and one who ruled around the time of Ptolemy I. It is, however, only the name which is considered to be of any value to Meroitic studies. Yet the preservation of a Kushite royal
name in a Greek source, if nothing more than coincidence, should not be given undue value, especially if the source is otherwise universally regarded as totally valueless. A parallel situation occurred with the inclusion in the Meroitic king lists of "Ergamenes", again derived from a narrative of Diodoros. Török has strongly argued that the narrative has taken a contemporary Meroitic royal name and attached it to an episode recounting the triumph of Hellenism. A number of Meroitic scholars, however, still prefers to find a basis in "historical fact".

There is a possibility that there was a ruler whose name was close to that of the Greek form "Aktisanes", who ruled about the time of Ptolemy I. The reading of the name on the Barkal jamb is so uncertain that the possibility of two rulers with very loosely similar names reigning some considerable time apart should not be excluded.
Appendix 4

The Wadi Gasus Inscription.

The inscription in the Wadi Gasus, apparently double-dated to kings associated with Shepenwepet I and Amenirdis I, has been the subject of a considerable literature and debate. It is now generally attributed to the early expansion of Piye's power and is accepted as an indicator that Piye was acknowledged in Upper Egypt by his twelfth regnal year.

In attempting to identify the king who is associated with Shepenwepet I, and owner of the year 19, a series of presumptions have debarred certain obvious candidates.

Kitchen [1] initially advocated a synchronism of Piye's year 12 and Takeloth III's year 19, although there is no evidence for a year higher than 7 for the latter. More recently Kitchen has argued in favour of Iput II being the associate of Piye [2]. A king Iput was certainly ruler of Leontopolis at the time of Piye's invasion, but it is difficult to comprehend why Upper Egypt should be double-dating with his reign, in preference to any of the other, more prominent, Delta or Middle Egyptian dynasts. Most recently a double-date of Piye and Rudamun has been advocated by Aston and Taylor [3]. It is therefore necessary to review all of the possible candidates, and consider whether in fact the Wadi Gasus inscription can be attributed at all.

The possible candidates for the king associated with Shepenwepet I are:
1. Osorkon III
2. Takeloth III
3. Rudamun
4. Iput II of Leontopolis
5. Nimlot of Hermopolis.
Were it not for the apparent chronological problems raised, Osorkon III would be the obvious choice. As father of Shepenwepet I he is the king who is always associated with her. He is also the only candidate who is both closely associated with Shepenwepet I and attested monumentally as having a reign of over 19 years. Kitchen [4] rejected the possible identification based upon his own reconstruction of events (objecting to the idea that Piye's campaign "would fall into the 27th year of Osorkon III"), and most other writers, usually influenced by Kitchen's premises and arguments, have not considered it further.

As brother of Shepenwepet I, Takeloth III is associated with her, and their father, in the Osiris Heqa-Djet chapel at Karnak. Since the kings are undoubtedly co-regents in this chapel, it must date later than year 24 of Osorkon III, in which year Takeloth III became co-ruler [5]. Whilst Takeloth III seems to have survived his father, the highest regnal years so-far known are 6 [6] and 7 [7], and there seems to be no good evidence for extending it [8] although other rulers of this period have equally scanty attestation of regnal years, despite long reigns (eg Iuput who has an attested year 21, but little else).

Rudamun, who is proposed by Aston and Taylor seems a less likely choice even than Takeloth III, and the attribution of a long reign to him is derived solely from the ascription of the Wadi Gasus graffito to him.

Kitchen [9] abandoned his nomination of Takeloth III in favour of Iuput of Leontopolis, on the re-attribution of a monument giving this king a year 21 [10]. Kitchen distinguishes him from the king Iuput known from Nile Level Text 26, but he certainly paid some attention to Thebes since the faience plaques in Edinburgh and Brooklyn can be firmly attributed to him [11]. The wider family connections of Iuput are not known, and it seems unlikely that he belongs to the same family as Osorkon III [12]. There is little reason to believe he

-326-
would have been the ruler by whom Shepenwepet would have dated her monuments: that must have been a close relative.

The publication by L. Bongrani Fanfoni (1984) of a vase carrying the name of Nimlot, alongside those of Shepenwepet I and Amenirdis I, raises the possibility that it was he who was associated with them in the Wadi Gasus inscription. Apart from Osorkon III and Takeloth III, Nimlot is the only other ruler named alongside Shepenwepet I. The identification of Nimlot as the second ruler in the Wadi Gasus inscription does have a number of factors in its favour: this king is associated with the same God's Wives on the Museo Barracco vase; Hermopolis was a major Upper Egyptian centre and was under the sway of Osorkon III [13]; Nimlot is known to have been its ruler in Piye's years 19/20, and to have been a former ally. Nimlot himself was almost certainly a member of the royal family of Dynasty 22/23 and therefore a relative (possibly close) of Shepenwepet I. No regnal years of Nimlot are yet known, although he is attested as ruler of Hermopolis in the events leading up to, and during Piye's campaign. The Assyrian list records the ruler of Hermopolis in 667 as 'Lamintu', certainly "Nimlot". Most Egyptologists have preferred to see him as a 'Nimlot II', perhaps a grandson of the first. The possibility that this is the same king as Piye's ally should not be discounted. Whilst it would suggest a very long reign for Nimlot, in the region of perhaps fifty-plus years, equally long reigns, or careers, are known.

All of the arguments for the identity of the Libyan ruler have assumed that the year 12 alongside the name of Amenirdis I belongs to Piye. Admittedly to challenge this assumption is to cast the apple of discord into all interpretations of late Libyan Egypt, there is however, no single piece of evidence which supports the premise. The Kushite rulers named, or appearing on monuments (apparently as contemporary) with Amenirdis I, are Kashta (always as a filiation), Shabaqo (specified in a number of inscriptions as her brother) and Shebitqo. The genealogy of the family as reconstructed by Dunham and Macadam made Piye an elder brother, but this must be seriously
questioned. Kitchen [14] rejects the possibility of the year 12 belonging to Shabaqo, since, he believes, that year cannot be equivalent to anyone else's 19th year.

The objections which Kitchen raises to the attribution of the Wadi Gasus graffito to year 12 to Shabaqo, derive entirely from his own reconstruction of the history and chronology of the late Third Intermediate Period. The premise that there were no other rulers contemporary with Shabaqo is especially questionable: Piye made no attempt to depose the dynasts, the biblical and Assyrian accounts of the Eltekeh campaign of 701 certainly imply their continued existence, and the Assyrians later listed the rulers of Egypt in Taharqo's reign (in 667-666).

Another assumption forced by the conventional attribution of the Wadi Gasus inscription is that Amenirdis was placed in her position by a brother. This is a situation otherwise unparalleled. The Nitoqert Adoption stela is explicit that Psamtik I sent his daughter Nitoqert to Thebes. It is also explicit that Amenirdis II was given by her father to his sister "to be her eldest daughter"; also that the testament of Shepenwepet II was made for her "by her father and her mother", Piye and Amenirdis I. Shepenwepet I was certainly installed by her father, Osorkon III, and so with all known God's Wives of this period. Equally, all evidence for the entry of the hswt at hnw n Imn shows that a father placed his daughter in the temple. Whilst unusual circumstances might have indicated a sister being placed in the office, it would be more likely, in accordance with this evidence, that a conquering king would have forced the adoption of his daughter. It should be noted that the Louvre stela C 100, which carries a particularly militaristic titulary of Piye, records the installing of his daughter as Prophetess of Mut. The question should be asked, was it Kashta who was responsible for Amenirdis I being adopted at Karnak? Firm evidence for Kashta's expansion of power into Upper Egypt has always been elusive.
The possibilities, which should not be discounted, even if they go against normal understanding of the period are:

Year 12 of Kashta with year 19 of a king, perhaps Osorkon III.
Year 12 of Shabaqo with year 19 of a king, perhaps Nimlot.
Year 12 of Piye could be defended on the grounds that if Kashta had installed Amenirdis, then she was in office during Piye's reign.

The Wadi Gasus inscription can really only be ascribed to a ruler when a sound chronology of the period has been established.
Appendix 5

The Kushite succession: matrilineage or patrilineage?


The system of the Kushite succession has been extensively discussed, but opinion is still divided as whether it was matrilineal or patrilineal. Evidence from Meroitic times has been interpreted as indicating that a form of matriliney prevailed. The traditions preserved in Graeco-Roman sources are also invoked in support of this. For the earlier phases the evidence is far less clear. The matter has been somewhat complicated by the idea of 'brother succession', which has been fairly widely accepted for the 25th Dynasty [1].

Any attempt to understand the Kushite royal succession must begin by establishing a genealogy for the family and tying to that the available evidence for the order of succession, with any additional evidence regarding the mode of succession (ie appointment, election, usurpation).

There has certainly been some confusion in literature about 'matrilineage' and matrilineal descent, and the undoubted importance of the Kushite royal women - in both Early ('25th Dynasty') and Middle (C2 BC - Cl AD) Meroitic times - has added to this confusion [2].

The Royal Genealogy.

The genealogy of the 25th Dynasty and its immediate successors was reconstructed by Macadam (1949) and Dunham and Macadam (1949), based on the inscriptional material from Kawa and the Kushite royal cemeteries. This reconstruction was undoubtedly influenced by
Macadam's premises about the nature of the Kushite state and by his own succession theories. The reconstruction proposed by Dunham and Macadam has since been discussed, but largely accepted by Leclant and Yoyotte (1951), Kitchen (1973) and Török (1986). The only major dissents have been Leahy's (1984) proposition that Tanwetamani was son of Shabaqo, not of Shebitqo, and Priese's (1973) doubts about Piye. Wenig recently reviewed a large number of older ideas, notably those which relate to the accession of Taharqa.

Re-examination of all of the material and of the reconstructions, forces a critical review. The reconstruction is based upon a very large number of premises about the history of the early 25th Dynasty; about the royal cemeteries and attribution of graves to certain reigns; and about succession theories. Most fundamentally Dunham and Macadam presupposed only one major family and only one centre of rulership in Kush in the generative stage of the monarchy. Many of the individuals known from the royal cemeteries simply cannot be placed in the genealogy with any great confidence.

In this discussion I have adopted (perhaps better: I have been forced to adopt) an extremely negative position in regard to both the Dunham-Macadam reconstruction and to any possibility of bettering it. Extreme negativism is, however, a useful starting point: if we can discard the preconceptions and, to be fashionable, deconstruct the texts, we might find new possibilities for understanding the early monarchy. To this end, I have reconsidered the material published by Dunham and Macadam in their fundamental article in JEA (1949). The new version of this prosopography is attached (as Appendix 6). It attempts to gather the most recent additions to the corpus and discuss individuals, their relatives and titles in greater detail than was possible for Dunham and Macadam.

The work of M.F.L. Macadam and D. Dunham.

M.F.L. Macadam appended to his publication of the inscriptions of Kawa an examination of the relationships of the royal family of Kush
This was supplemented in his joint article with Dows Dunham. These works have become the standard theoretical discussions of the succession and genealogy. Because of the importance of this work and its wide acceptance, it is worth examining the evidence and assumptions closely and critically.

Macadam proceeded logically with his argument, beginning with a discussion of the God's Wife of Amun, Amenirdis I. Erman had demonstrated the adoptive nature of the filiations in texts of the God's Wives, which earlier writers such as Lieblein and Petrie had taken to be marital and blood relationships.

Macadam's first assumption was that mwt.s designated only an adoptive relationship, not a blood relationship. So, speaking of the Abydos door-jamb of Peksater/Pekareslo, he noted that this lady, like Amenirdis I, referred to "mwt.s Pebatma". He concluded that 'Peksater was probably the adoptive daughter of Pebatma', thus establishing a principle that queens who were not God's Wives of Amun could adopt daughters, and that they could adopt more than one. Macadam's arguments that mwt.s designates only an adoptive relationship would seem to be contradicted by the text on the granite basin of Shepenwepet II, where her mwt is a Great Royal Wife, and hence not a God's Wife of Amun.

Macadam also noted that Pebatma's title snt nswt "makes her the sister as well as the wife of Kashta". In making this assumption Macadam reveals that he was thinking in terms of only one Kushite king existing at this time.

Shabaqo is attested as brother of Amenirdis I "and was therefore a son of Kashta". This is clearly the correct interpretation of the evidence.

Macadam reads the Nitoqert Adoption stela as a record of Nitoqert's adoption by Shepenwepet II. From this he argued that Shepenwepet II had been given to the sister of her father; since her
father is known by numerous inscriptions to have been Piye, then Piye must have been brother of Amenirdis I. On his understanding of the text the argument was logical. However, Caminos demonstrated quite conclusively that the text must be understood as saying that Nitoqert was adopted by Amenirdis II [9]. The text therefore tells us that Amenirdis II was given by her father Taharqo to his sister, Shepenwepet II daughter of Piye. Macadam also notes that "the adoptive mother of a princess tends to be her aunt", citing Pebatma-Peksater "probably", Amenirdis I-Shepenwepet II-Amenirdis II (a conclusion drawn from his immediately preceding argument); but not, of course, the political adoptions Shepenwepet I-Amenirdis I, Nitoqert.

In these arguments Macadam established some principles which were to come into play later in his reconstructions. It should be emphasised at this point that there is no single inscription which identifies Amenirdis I as sister of Piye. Indeed there is no certainly contemporary monument which names these two together.

The Nitoqert Adoption Stela, as Macadam [10] observed, tells us that Taharqo had given his daughter, Amenirdis II, to his own sister, Shepenwepet II, as her heiress. Since Shepenwepet II is known from many inscriptions (not only the statue referred to in Macadam 1949: 121 n.3) to have been a daughter of Piye, then it follows that Taharqo also was a child of Piye. Taharqo's mother, Abar, was thus a wife of Piye. Abar is also given the title snt snswt.

Macadam then turned his attention to the Kawa stelae and references to Alara. Kawa IV 16-20 refers to the "mothers (mwwt) of my mother" being committed to Amun by their brother, Alara. Kawa VI 22-24 uses the singular. Noting that mwwt is later qualified by the plural suffix .sn, Macadam stated his belief that the plural was not written in error. The speech of Alara in Kawa VI, in which the king refers to his sister as "a woman born together with me in womb", Macadam takes as indication that Alara and his sister were twins. This can be neither proven nor disproven: it could mean more simply
that they shared the same father and mother (rather than the same father and different mothers, or same mother and different fathers).

Macadam discusses the female descent recorded in the inscription of Aspelta. He argues that the *dw3t ntr* princess was Amenirdis II, but, since "her office required her to be a virgin she could not have been the natural mother of Nasalsa". Macadam concludes: "This is proof that some at least of the relationships enumerated in this list were adoptive. Perhaps they all were." He then argues, quite logically, that the ancestresses of Amenirdis II listed do not represent the known line Shepenwepet II-Amenirdis I-Shepenwepet I. Therefore, Macadam concludes, Amenirdis II must have had two adoptive mothers. He expands this idea, proposing that adoption was practised amongst the Kushite royal women as an institution separate from the God's Wife of Amun at Thebes. Having already argued that Madiqen had adopted her sister Henuttakhebit, Macadam is able to propose a theory in which royal women could adopt their sisters, or their natural daughters, and in which the adoptive relationship was more important than the actual one.

Macadam states that "all adoptions practised by the Ethiopian royal family seem to have been within that family except some of those made by the votaresses for the sake of religious alliances with Egypt". The application of this theory leads, I believe, to Macadam's major fundamental error. He returns to Abar. Abar was a *snt nswt* of Piye and of Shabaqo, since he assumes them to have been brothers. We know that her *mwwt* were sisters of Alara; accepted. One of Alara's wives was Kasaqa. Macadam then emphasises that "sister-marriages were especially common", before concluding:

1. that Abar was Kashta's daughter (as sister of Shabaqo and Piye whom he already identified as sons of Kashta);
2. that Abar was adopted by her aunt Kasaqa;
3. that Alara was Kashta's brother (brother-sister marriage following on assumption (2)).
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These conclusions, that Alara and Kashta were brothers; that they both married their own sisters; that Piye and Shabaqo were brothers, sons of Kashta, have remained firmly rooted in Nubian studies, and have hardly ever been challenged.

In his discussion Macadam [11] introduced the second major theory, that the kingship passed from brother to brother and then to the children of the eldest son (table A). Macadam [12] states that:

It is clear that the royal succession did not go from eldest son to eldest son, for in that case both Shabako and Taharqa would have been usurpers. Under this system Tanwetamani would have had no right to succeed either, if he were only a son of Kashta's second son.

Macadam then proposes that the succession went from brother to brother, and then to the children of the eldest brother in the same manner, their ranks being determined by the rank of their respective mothers. Still unhappy about Tanwetamani's right to the throne, Macadam emended the Assyrian record which states that Taharqo's successor, Tanwetamani, was "son of Shabaku". Nearly all writers have followed Macadam in 'correcting' this to "son of Shebitqo".

Macadam, on the evidence of Kawa IV:9 and V:13-14, saw the possibility that a reigning monarch could influence the succession; although a rank of Crown Prince is not clearly attested. This observation did not affect his general theory of brother succession: he seems to have believed that a prince such as Taharqo would have been selected from amongst the eligible princes.

From this critique of Macadam's analysis - which I hope has been fair - it will be seen that, whilst making many valid observations, Macadam had a number of preconceptions about both the Kushite royal family and the nature of the Kushite state. The most significant in influencing his reconstruction are:

1. an assumption that there was only one state, or chiefdom in Kush during this early stage of development. From this Macadam applied
the terms s3t nswt, snat nswt etc. only to those known kings - Kashta, Piye, Shabaqo etc. He seems not to have considered the possibility that there were other rulers to whom these individuals could have been related.

2. directly related to (1) is the idea that there was only one family involved.

Responses to the Macadam theories.

Macadam's genealogy and succession theory has been generally accepted.

Priese (1981) emphasised the matrilineal nature of the kingship, following the indications of the Meroitic period and, principally the statement in the work of Nicholas of Damascus that the Aithiopian kings were succeeded by the sons of their sisters. Since it is established that a number of kings were also sons of previous rulers it must be assumed that kings married their sisters, or the sister who was the 'heiress'. Priese discusses the possible schemes, in which the throne passed to the eldest son of the eldest sister; to all sons of the eldest sister; to all sons of all sisters and to all sons of the eldest sister who was married to the eldest brother. The surviving inscriptional evidence confirms that kings married women designated snat, 'sisters', but the information is insufficiently detailed to support any particular model. Priese adopts the most complex model as the likely solution. Török (1986) has argued against the matrilineal model.

'Heiress' theories have for a long time formed part of the 'Received Knowledge' of Egyptology, specifically in discussion of the 18th Dynasty. Robins (1983) has conclusively demonstrated that these were a fiction and that there is no evidence to support them. This idea, along with the emphasis placed upon matriliney as an 'African' phenomenon, have doubtless played a key role in the formulation of the Kushite succession theories.
Robins also emphasises that the record of female ancestry does not, in itself, predicate a matrilineal system. Nor does it presuppose an important role for women in the society. All that it can indicate is that female lines of descent were as important as male ones. This is very clear in Egypt in the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period. Claims on high office could be made through the female line as well as the male line. Many later cultures have similarly placed importance on female lines of descent, even if women were excluded from holding office. Many examples could be cited, two will suffice. In the Byzantine empire it was quite permissable for a man to assume the name of his mother's family if it was more distinguished than his father's. In Britain many families have passed titles and estates through the female line, those marrying into the family adopting the older name. In Kush, records of female ancestry and representations of royal women cannot, in themselves, be used as evidence of matriliny.

Rather than a straightforward patrilineage in which the sons of the eldest son held the right to the throne, the system may have functioned so that all sons of kings were potential rulers: the strongest being the one who seized power. Examination of succession in other states, indicates the wide range of possibilities additional to those already proposed by scholars for Nubia. Whether matrilineal or patrilineal, lineal or collateral, there have been many other factors affecting the succession and selection of the heir: in some cases the rank of the mother was significant, in others only those sons born after the ruler's accession were eligible. Alternative rules of succession are considered further below.

In both a patrilineal and matrilineal systems the role of the king's Chief Wife is important. It is possible that her sons were the heirs. In Egypt the Chief Wife was not always a king's sister, but it remains uncertain what criteria elevated her to pre-eminent status. In the Neo-Assyrian empire the Chief Wife was the first wife to bear the king (or, presumably, prince) a male child. With such
criteria as this last, it becomes impossible to rationalize the material: we know simply too little.

The possibility should not be excluded that the family combined a patrician (the descendants of Kashta) and a matriclan (the relatives of Alara). Such combinations are not unknown elsewhere.


The succession of the God's Wives of Amun by adoption was an important influence upon Macadam's theories of adoption in the Kushite royal family. Macadam assumed that during the 25th Dynasty princesses were adopted by an aunt already holding the office. Macadam's theories have, however, been employed in a circular argument.

Kitchen [13] proposed that Amenirdis I had been installed as heiress to Shepenwepet I by her brother Piye. He argued from the analogy of the brother-succession theory of Macadam, combined with the lack of clear evidence for Kashta's intervention in Upper Egypt. Kitchen [14] also suggested that it was more likely that Piye's daughter, Shepenwepet II, was installed by Shabaqo or Shebitqo, rather than by her her father.

Given the importance of the position of God's Wife of Amun in the 25th Dynasty, the abundant monuments relating to them, and their importance in the reconstructions of both genealogy and political history, it is worth reviewing the material briefly.

Springing from the role of the Great Royal Wife the separate institution of the God's Wife of Amun developed during the later 20th Dynasty and Third Intermediate Period and is of paramount importance during the 25th Dynasty. During the 26th Dynasty the holder of the office was virtual ruler of the Thebaid and also assumed the role of High Priest of Amun.
Despite a vast body of material relating to the, particularly 25th and 26th Dynasty, officiants, the development of the institution is not altogether clear. The most informative monuments and texts all date from the latest of the God's Wives, Nitoqert and Ankhnasneferibre. Fragmentary material relating to earlier holders suggests that the various rites of passage recorded did begin earlier, but at exactly what point remains unclear. Indeed there may have been a gradual accretion of royal attributes and rites. Certain phrases within the Nitoqert stela imply that similar acts had been performed for her mother, Amenirdis II. However, it is dangerous to project back from the latest to the earliest. Nevertheless, the scenes and iconography of the Heqa-Djet chapel at Karnak do suggest that some important aspects of the office may go back to Shepenwepet I, if not earlier. Indeed, Shepenwepet I achieves a far greater prominence than her predecessors.

There is some reason to believe that the princess selected to be future God's Wife was the eldest daughter of a king, but this cannot, at present, be proven. The princess was adopted by the current holder of the office as her 'eldest daughter'. From this time on, all inscriptions would record her parentage as 'daughter of King X, her mother is the God's Wife Y'. If her natural mother was mentioned it would usually be with the formula 'born of Z' (mst.n ...). These filiations led many earlier scholars to suggest marriages between the Libyan, Kushite and Saite royal families.

The act of adoption is illustrated in the well-known passage from the Nitoqert Adoption stela [15].
I have heard that a king's daughter is there, (a daughter of) the Horus Lofty-of-Diadems, the good god [Taharqa], justified, whom he gave to his sister to be her eldest daughter, and who is there is Adorer of the God. I will not do what in fact should not be done and expel an heir from his seat.... I will give her to her to be her eldest daughter just as she was made over to the sister of her father.
Now after she came to the God's Wife Shepenwepet, the latter saw
her and was pleased with her; she loved her more than anything and
made over to her the testament which her father and mother had
executed for her; and her eldest daughter Amenirdis, daughter of
King Ta[harqo], justified, did likewise.
The act of adoption was thus sanctioned by a legal document,
witnessed by important dignitaries. From this point the heiress
became the Adorer of the God (dw3t ntr). This, at any rate, was the
assumption of Sander-Hansen and others. The objections raised by
Caminos [16] notwithstanding, the majority of texts which name both
princesses, the God's Wife and her future successor, seem to
distinguish them in this way.

In all known (ie inscriptionally recorded) instances, the princess
was installed as heiress by her father:

    Ankhnasneferibre was sent by her father Psamtik II [17].
    Nitqert was sent by her father Psamtik I [18].
    Amenirdis II was installed by her father Taharqo [19].
    Shepenwepet II was installed by her father Piye [20].
    Shepenwepet I was installed by her father Osorkon III [21].
    Isis was installed by her father Ramesses VI [22].

The evidence for the other Third Intermediate Period incumbents is
less certain, but they too are most often associated with their
fathers [23].

    In addition, the following should be noted: Piye installed his
daughter Mutirdis as Prophet of Hathor and Mut [24]; and, all known
Chantresses of the inner abode of Amun were given by their fathers
[25].

    There is no good reason to assume that a princess was given by her
brother unless there is specific documentary evidence to that effect.
For this, the Anlamani inscription (Kawa VIII) could be adduced.
Anlamani is specifically stated to have installed his four sisters as
sistrum-players in the temples of Napata, Sanam, Gem-Aten and Pnubs.
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Similarly, Taharqo [26] says that Alara dedicated his sisters (one of them Taharqo's grandmother) to Amun at Kawa. There is a clear difference between these dedications and the installation of the God's Wife at Thebes: one (Madiqen), possibly two (Maletarata) of Anlamani's sisters were also royal wives; Alara's sister was also married. A parallel might also be found in the role of Pebatma, wife of Kashta and mother of Amenirdis I, as Chantress of Amun, presumably at Thebes.

Kitchen's suggestion of Piye installing his 'sister' Amenirdis I, is thus without any direct parallel. Regarding Kitchen's idea that Shepenwepet II was installed not by her father, but by a later king, one might ask — why would Shabaqo or Shebitqo install Piye's daughter in preference to daughters of their own? In this case, Kitchen's theory can be disproven by reference to the already cited section of the Nitoqert Adoption Stela which states that Shepenwepet II's testament was made for her by her father and her mother, who can only be Piye and Amenirdis I.

The question again arises: who did install Amenirdis I? The most obvious candidate must remain Kashta. This becomes more likely if we question that Piye and Amenirdis I were, in fact, brother and sister. There are no documents which clearly associate them together and all of the descriptions of Amenirdis as snt nsw refer to Shabaqo.

The Genealogy of Queen Nasalsa.

The genealogy of Queen Nasalsa is one of the few which extends beyond simple filiation. Nasalsa was the sister of a king (generally assumed to have been Senkamanisken) also his wife (Aspelta's father was named as a king) and mother of Anlamani, Aspelta and Madiqen (inscriptionally documented). She was buried in the royal cemetery at Nuri (Nuri 24: decorated, and with inscribed objects). She is depicted and referred to in Kawa Inscription VIII [27]; the accession stela of Aspelta [28], the stela of Prince Khaliut [29]; and the 'Dedication Stela' of Madiqen [30].
The genealogy of Queen Nasalsa is recorded on the accession stela of Aspelta. Aspelta named his father, his mother and her female ancestry to a further six generations. The names contained in all of the stela's cartouches were erased in antiquity. The attribution of the stela to Aspelta is certain, as his Horus, Two Ladies, and Golden Horus names are undamaged in line 1 [31] and are identical with those of Aspelta on the Madiqen stela. The surviving information (tabulated in section II) gives six generations of female descent, most with the title snät nsw, but the earliest also 'Queen of Kush'. Nasalsa herself is the first queen for which contemporaneous inscriptive material gives this title, which is therefore of no help in identifying the originator of the line. Queen Maetarata also has this title and although she might be identified with one of the sisters of Anlamani, her exact placement is uncertain (see Appendix 6).

The inscription, despite its obvious importance, has received rather cursory treatment in Nubian studies. Priese [32] made little more comment on it than:

"Die Genealogie geht zwei Generationen über ALARA hinaus!"

Macadam [33] devoted more attention to it, but used it as the basis of a very complicated network of 'adoptive' relationships. Budge [34] alone drew the obvious conclusion from the inscription and used it to calculate the floruit of the earliest queen. Assuming Aspelta to have reigned in the last quarter of the 7th century, and estimating four (giving 175 years) or five (giving 150 years) generations to the century, he concluded that "the queen of Nubia who was the great ancestress of Aspelta's family lived about the beginning of the eighth century B.C.".

Nasalsa's mother is given the title 'Adorer of the God of Amen-re, king of the gods, of Thebes', which is usually assumed to indicate Amenirdis II [35]. The evidence suggests that, despite Psamtik I's protestations that he did not intend to prevent her accession as God's Wife of Amun, in actuality Amenirdis II did not succeed Shepenwepet II and may have returned to Napata. Habachi [36]
suggested that she married the vizier Monthuhotep, in which he has been followed by a number of writers. However, there is no evidence that the 'king's daughter Amenirdis' who married Monthuhotep was a daughter of Taharqo. Indeed, as argued below, it seems highly unlikely that a dw3 ntr princess, and destined hmt ntr (God's Wife of Amun) would be married off to a mere official, even a Vizier. Her only equal would be a king and if she was married, it is most likely that she was married to a king.

Macadam [37] proposed that the mwt-relationship throughout the Aspelta genealogy was adoptive since the dw3 ntr Amenirdis II was a virgin and therefore could not have been the natural mother of Nasalsa. As he had stressed the mother-relationships in the inscription to be adoptive, and yet the mother of the dw3 ntr was clearly not meant to be understood as Shepenwepet II (well attested as her adoptive mother at Thebes) Macadam [38] was forced to conclude that Amenirdis II must have had two adoptive mothers. Within Macadam's scheme Nasalsa was probably a niece of Amenirdis II if adopted: therefore Atlanersa was brother of Amenirdis and Senkamanisken was his son (Nasalsa is smt nswt). Macadam's solution was thus:

```
(Taharqo)

(Atlanersa) Amenirdis

(Senkamanisken) Nasalsa

(Anlamani) three daughters Madiqen (Aspelta)
```

Here the possibility is considered that the genealogy should be read straightforwardly as the record of Aspelta's actual female descent.
The inscription narrates the presentation of the royal brethren to Amun and the selection of Aspelta, followed by the speech of Amun-Re:

"... for his father is Geb, the Son of Re (/////) | m3ct hrw, his mother is the Royal Sister, the Royal Mother, the Mistress of Kush, Daughter of Re (/////) | given life for ever; her mother was the Royal Sister the Adorer of the God of Amun-Re, King of Gods, in Thebes (/////) | her mother was the Royal Sister (/////) | m3ct hrw; her mother was the Royal Sister (/////) | m3ct hrw; her mother was the Royal Sister (/////) | m3ct hrw; her mother was the Royal Sister (/////) | m3ct hrw; her mother was the Royal Sister, the Mistress of Kush (/////) | m3ct hrw.

The genealogy may be tabulated:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{snt nswt hnwt K3s } & (\\/\\/\\/\\/\\//) \\
\text{snt nswt } & (\\/\\/\\/\\/\\//) \\
\text{snt nswt } & (\\/\\/\\/\\/\\//) \\
\text{snt nswt } & (\\/\\/\\/\\/\\//) \\
\text{snt nswt } & (\\/\\/\\/\\/\\//) \\
\text{snt nswt dw3 ntr n Imn R\textsuperscript{c} nswt ntrw n W3st } & (\\/\\/\\/\\//) \\
\text{s3 R\textsuperscript{c}(\\/\\/\\/\\//) } & - \text{snt nswt nswt hnwt K3s } ([\text{Nasalsa}]) \\
\text{nsw bity } & (\\/\\/\\/\\//) \quad [\text{sn}] \quad (\text{Aspelta})
\end{align*}
\]

Aspelta enters the sanctuary to be crowned and receives from the god:
"the sdn-crown of thy brother [sn.k] king [nsw bity] (/////)|"

This presumably means that Aspelta was brother of his predecessor, Anlamani. The cartouche is large enough for two squares of hieroglyphs.

In this text it is noteworthy that Aspelta names his father. This is contrary to usual Egyptian practice in accession or coronation texts. Kings may refer to 'my father' but this does not necessarily indicate their actual father. There are, of course, notable exceptions: Hatshepsut emphasises her father's role in appointing her.

No discussions of the Aspelta genealogy have examined the size of the lacunae and possible restorations [39]. Most striking is the small space for the name of Aspelta's father in line 19. This can only permit two squares, which cannot be sufficient for the name of Senkamanisken. Tanwetamani might possibly fit; Atlanersa requires two squares, for flat signs and a half square for thin uprights. Senkamanisken requires three squares in all its writings [40]. Taharqo fits, but is unlikely on all other grounds. It is possible that the king's throne name was used, although in Kushite inscriptions the throne name is only used in conjunction with the birth name; when only one name is used it is the birth name.

Senkamanisken's throne-name was Shpr-n-R® which requires three squares; but some shabtis carry an abbreviated form Shpr-R® which requires only two squares.

The name of (2) the Divine Adoratrix, had two squares, enough for Amenirdis, although the possibility cannot be excluded that she reverted to her Kushite birth-name.

(3) occupied three squares.
(4) occupied three squares
(5) occupied two and ½ squares
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In seeking an explanation of the small space for the name of Aspelta's father, we have to consider the possibility that the succession is wrongly reconstructed and that Senkamanisken preceded Atlanersa; or that a king is missing from the record. Reisner himself considered these possibilities. I defer discussion of this a later section.

In attempting to restore the erasures of the Aspelta stela, it may be noted that the Kawa stela of Anlamani [41] records that that king dedicated four sisters as sistrum-players: one to Amun of Napata, one to Amun-Re of Gem-aten (Kawa), one Amun of Pnubs, and one to Amun-Re Bull of Nubia. Madiqen was apparently the princess dedicated to Amun-Re Bull of Nubia, who was worshipped at Sanam [42].

If we try to restore the genealogy assuming that it represents a true genealogy rather than adoptive relationships:

1. The father of the divine adoratrix was Taharqo; known — assuming that the divine adoratrix was Amenirdis II, for which assumption there is no alternative.

2. Therefore her matrilineage is that of one of Taharqo's wives, probably that of his Great Royal Wife.

3. The husband of Amenirdis must be a king, since (a) it is unlikely that a dw3 mtr princess would be married to anyone of lesser rank; and (b) her daughter is a snt nswt, therefore Amenirdis must be mother or 'halfmother' of a king [43].

This king must be Tanwetamani or Atlanersa (assuming the succession to be correctly established). Since Amenirdis would have ceded her office in the reign of Tanwetamani, it is conceivable that he married her.
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The conclusions to be drawn from this genealogy in its preserved state – and its destruction is one of the greatest losses to study of this period – are limited. Significantly, there is good reason to suppose from this that there were Kushite rulers who were still remembered who had pre-dated the time of Alara and Kashta. Whether they had adopted Egyptian pharaonic style is debateable: the title snt nswt accorded to the royal women, may be retrospective. The genealogy, if recording an actual rather than an adoptive line of descent, must be that of a wife, probably a Chief Wife, of Taharqo.

Women and matriliny in Kush,

Factors in the historical record, as well as a number of ideas derived from Egyptological preconceptions and European views of Africa have ingrained the idea of matriliny in Meroitic studies, yet discussion of matriliny in Nubian studies has been rather superficial. The time available for writing this paper, has not permitted the sort of analysis and comparison I think necessary. Matriliny is complex, and manifests itself in many different systems both in Africa and elsewhere. Within Meroitic studies we are still faced with basic problems of interpretation: eg Was the Kandake the King's Mother, King's Sister and mother of the Crown Prince, or the King's Wife? What relationship do ruling women have to a matrilineal system? Ruling women in Egypt (and elsewhere) do not necessarily predicate a matrilineal system, just as matrilineal states do not necessarily have women rulers.

The royal women figure prominently in reliefs, accompanying sons and husbands in the lunette-scenes of stelae and in temple reliefs and in a funerary context. Many of these examples can be seen as continuing Egyptian traditions, but they are more significant when they are different to those traditions.

Much has been made of the processional scenes of royal women in the Kushite temples. Unfortunately most of these are fragmentary and lack the inscriptions which would be so valuable for illuminating not
only genealogies, but also the cultic role of these women. The situation is very different from New Kingdom Egypt, when it was only the royal daughters who were given such prominence.

The scenes from the Kawa temple originally comprised two processions in the Hypostyle Hall. One of these began with a figure of the king the height of two registers [44], followed on adjoining walls by figures arranged on two registers, the lower musicians, the upper including royal women [45]. Of these royal women, the feet and edges of the robes of six were preserved, although there may have been more. From a similar, but less well-preserved procession, no. I, [46], fragments of the figures of two of the royal women were recovered [47]. These fragments show that there were different "ranks" of women, shown on different scale and with differing headdresses. The smaller figure, presumably indicating a younger princess, wears a plume emerging from a papyrus umbel. The larger figure wears a fillet with a lotus flower at the front (in the position of the uraeus); on the fillet are three small standing figures, one with solar disk, one with Hathor crown and one with double crown (?) (it is unclear in the plate whether these figures have human or lioness heads). The large plumes emerge from these amuletic holders, the iconography of which clearly refer to Hathor, Sakhmet or Tefnut and perhaps Mut.

Similar types of headdress are known from the drawing of the Pylon of B 700 [48]. There, the upper register apparently depicted a queen wearing three plumes followed by two with two plumes, in these instances emerging from papyrus umbels. A similar headdress was worn by the princess Amenirdis, wife of the Vizier Monthuhotep.

These reliefs show an important role for the royal women, and are certainly different to Egyptian tradition. They also seem to indicate some form of ranking system within the hierarchy. However, with the available evidence it is difficult to penetrate any further.
The genealogy of Nasalsa, understandably a focus for theories of matrilineal succession, has already been discussed. Macadam's theories of adoption amongst the royal women [see above pp.332-336] are, I believe, grounded in too many suppositions and too little evidence, to be accepted.

In order to clarify the possibility of matriline in Kush we must ask, what do we know of the King's Mother?

The **mwt nsw**.

No **mwt nsw** are attested for Alara, Kashta, Piye, Shabaqo or Shebitqo.

Although Pebatma is the only wife of Kashta so-far known, and mother of the God's Wife Amenirdis I, she is never called **mwt nsw**.

Abar

**mwt nsw, smt nsw, hnt t3wy**

Well-attested on monuments of Taharqo and specifically stated to be his mother, Abar is not entitled **hmt nsw**, although she was presumably wife of Piye.

Qalhata

**mwt nsw, smt nsw, hnt n T3-Sty**

Depicted on the 'Dream Stela' of Tanwetamani, but without the title **mwt nsw** (see discussion in Appendix 6 sub Qalhata). The decoration of the burial chamber of Ku.5, the shabtis, (? and a jar fragment from Ku.4) all call her **mwt nsw**.

...salka

**mwt nsw**

Known only from the Pylon of B 700, hence assumed to be mother of Atlanersa.
Nasalsa  
\textit{mwt nsw, snt nsw, hnwt n K3y}  
Inscriptionally attested as mother of Anlamani and of Aspelta.

Amanitakaye  
\textit{mwt nsw, snt nsw}  
Assumed by Dunham-Macadam to have been daughter of Aspelta, sister  
wife of Aramatelqo and mother of Malonaqen, she is not, however,  
called \textit{s3t nsw} or \textit{hm3t nsw} on surviving monuments, nor do her  
monuments associate her with a specific ruler.

Saka'aye  
\textit{mwt nsw}  
The title is known only from the shabtis from Nu.31 [49]. Dunham and  
Macadam [50] stated "Mother of (presumably)" Malowiebamani.

name unknown  
\textit{snt nsw, hnwt n K3t, mwt nsw}  
The mother of Irike-Amanote [51] in a parallel to the Taharqo texts,  
comes to see her son crowned. The beginning of line 82 is broken, so  
it is uncertain whether any other titles preceded \textit{snt nsw}, although  
it seems unlikely. She was presumably related to King Talakhamani,  
whose death is recorded in line 4, and to Malowiebamani of line 12.

Atasamalol  
\textit{mwt nsw, snt nsw, hnwt n K3y}  
Depicted on the stela of her son, Harsiyotef. A fragmentary  
cartouche [52] on an altar from Nu. 61, suggested this may have been  
her burial place.

Pelkha  
\textit{mwt nsw, snt nsw, hnwt n K3y}  
Known only from the lunette of the stela of Nastasen.

Maletarata  
\textit{mwt nsw, snt nsw, hnwt K3y}
The evidence here is uncertain, a full re-examination of all of the material is necessary.

Dunham and Macadam thought 'Maletaral I' was mother of Senkamanisken; 'Maletaral II' they dated considerably later, c temp Amani-natakellebte; Monnet suggested Malatarata to be one of the sisters of Anlamani. If indeed there was only one of the name, a later date is more likely. Dunham attributed Nu 25 to this individual, and noted that although there was a large number of shabtis belonging to at least 8 others, they were all earlier and most immediately so, of "generations 7-12", and also topographically close. The foundation-deposits of the tomb were of the otherwise unknown Piye-Ariten. About 86 shabtis were in situ around the walls of the burial chamber. Of these, about one quarter were of Madiqen. Dunham suggested that the neighbouring tombs had been robbed to supplement those made especially for this burial.

From this admittedly small number of firmly attested mwt nsw, a few notable points can be observed.

1. The preserved titles are mwt nsw, snt nsw and often hnwt n k3s
   (earlier queens can be hnwt t3wy or hnwt n t3-sty).

2. None of these royal women is called hmt nsw or any of its variants, even if there is good reason to suppose that they were in fact King's wives.

Can this information be used as evidence of matrilineal succession?

It might be thought that the choice of these titles emphasises the "sister-son" relationship, irrespective of whether a king was son of a preceding ruler. It is contrary to Egyptian practice, where the mwt nsw was, by virtue of that title, also hmt nsw wrt, even if she had not held that position during the reign of her husband (the most obvious example being Mutemwiya mother of Amenhotep III, unattested during the reign of Thutmose IV: [53]).
The Assyrian evidence can also be viewed in the light of this. Tanwetamani is called, in three instances, the son of the sister of Taharqo. What was the Assyrian source? Are we to assume some form of accession decree which was sent to neighbouring rulers which actually stated this relationship?

The case of Nasalsa is particularly striking, since the Aspelta stela clearly refers to his father as a king, but Nasalsa is not given the title hmt nsw. Did queens cease to be hmt nsw on the death of their husband? [54]

The mythological background, certainly in the Taharqo stelae and their derivatives, emphasises the role of the mwt nsw as Isis seeing her son crowned as Horus [55]. Whilst it is possible that this might have led to an emphasis on the queen's relationship with the reigning king, in Egypt it did not prevent the mwt nsw being referred to as hmt nsw wrt. Perhaps there was less significance attached to the position of hmt nsw wrt in Kush than there had been in Egypt.

The title snt nsw also attested for these kings' mothers is a common Kushite title. Indeed, there is a much greater emphasis placed upon the role of snt nsw in Kush than there had been in Egypt. Troy [56] observes that it is not common until the 18th Dynasty, and then it is often an additional designation of royal wives. There is no evidence for the use of the title as it appears to have been used in Kush. The Anlamani stela [57] states that the king's mother Nasalsa was "amongst the royal sisters", paralleling those texts which describe the new or prospective king as among the royal brethren [58].

The Royal Ancestors: The Medinet Habu Reliefs.

A scene on the external wall of the chapel of Amenirdis I might have been a valuable source of information. The wall is now mostly inaccessible, the chapel of Nitoqert having been built directly against it.
Originally the scene depicted two standing female figures facing right in front of an offering table. Their names are now, unfortunately, lost, but might be supposed to be Shepenwepet II and possibly Amenirdis II. A row of seated figures is facing, on the same base-line, but only half the height of the register, allowing space for a further row above. The first figure is Amenirdis I, her cartouches surviving. This figure is partly obscured by the wall of the Nitokert chapel.

At the far end of the same register - the Nitoqert chapel is shorter than the Amenirdis chapel - is preserved, with three seated figures. The first of these is a king with typical Kushite cap-crown, uraei and streamers. Behind him are two women, each wearing heavy wig, vulture headdress and modius. No names were ever carved. Hölscher [59] thought that these figures depicted Piye followed by Amenirdis I and Shepenwepet I. He also noted that there was a standing female figure in front of this group. His observations were made before the restoration of the chapel - this standing figure is no-longer visible.

The band of text beneath the cornice records that the chapel was built by Shepenwepet II and includes the cartouches of Piye, which are undamaged.

The reliefs presumably were intended to depict the royal ancestors: what completed parts of this scene survive behind the wall of the Nitoqert chapel are, of course, unknown. It is impossible to speculate further on this scene. As with the erasures in the Nasalsa genealogy, ancient motives have deprived us of an important part of the information we require.

Alternative modes of succession.

Without detailed textual sources which might reveal a mythic prototype for the succession, or an ancient genealogy which would enable us to understand the working of the succession, we are left.
with the evidence for the order of kings along with some genealogical material. Understandably, scholars have tried to rationalise the material, and have generally assumed that the order of rulers suggests a legitimate succession, and hence have tried to find a theory which fits the evidence.

In Egypt, the descent of the kingship is was closely linked with mythic cycles, and the role of the royal women within these also led to modern scholarship suggesting a theory of succession by which the throne passed through the female line. This was examined and refuted by Robins (1983).

Examining the evidence for royal succession in other states, it is clear that many factors beyond the simple "rules of succession" have played an important role. Irrespective of whether the system of succession is patrilineal or matrilineal, and whether, within that, collateral or lineal, other elements such as selection by the ruler and his advisors, military dispute, religion and ethnicity have all played a part.

The Kushite succession has been discussed within the context of African parallels. Yet, even a cursory examination of succession among the numerous African kingdoms shows that they have employed every possible form of succession - patrilineal, matrilineal, lineal and collateral - and that most have favoured patrilineage over matrilineage.

In order to provoke discussion of a wider range of possibilities, the different forms are briefly considered here. The examples cited are meant purely as examples, and are hence random. Although the emphasis has been placed upon African states, other ancient and early-modern monarchies have been included.

1. Patrilineal succession.
Patrilineal succession may be affected by a number of criteria: e.g.
the rank of a prince's mother may invest him with particular precedence.

Primogeniture, in which the eldest lineal male heir succeeds, can, in the case of an elderly ruler, or a long reign, result in a grandson, or even more remote descendant succeeding (eg France: Louis XIV > Louis XV > Louis XVI). With the end of a direct line, the claims of collateral lines may be affected by other powerful groups, as, for example on the death of Elizabeth I of England, and Anne.

In New Kingdom Egypt the eldest surviving son ascended, and the children of elder, but deceased, sons were passed over (Egypt: Ramesses II > Merneptah, 13th son). Attempts by a ruler to control the succession may involve co-regency (Egypt, notably the 12th Dynasty) or the appointing of a Crown Prince (Egypt, notably reign of Ramesses II; Neo-Assyrian empire), but this did not prevent palace revolution at the point of the king's death.

Patrilineage may take a number of variant forms:

a. father to son: Kimwani [60]; Bushi [61]; Buha [62]. Alpers [63], discussing the succession of the Mwene Mutapa dynasty of the Zimbabwean plateau, noted that succession was patrilineal with a tendency towards being collateral, rather than lineal [64]. There were many exceptions to the direct line and in some instances a new ruler might be a favoured junior son designated by his father, or chosen on the basis of a purification test, or that heirs might be debarred by disability or disease (eg leprosy, blindness). Alpers concluded that custom mattered little unless it was backed by force [65].

Some monarchies have attempted to control patrilineal succession by appointing co-regents (Egypt: 12th Dynasty) or Crown Princes. Factors such as seniority, mother's rank etc., may have dictated which prince was appointed as successor. In Assyria during the Sargonid period, other princes and officials were made to swear loyalty and acknowledge the succession; but even this did not prevent rebellion.
b. father to son, usually eldest: Bugabula [66]; Busambio [67]; Bushubi [68]; Rwanda [69]; Bulamogi [70].

c. father to son, usually younger: Burundi [71].

d. to any close and suitable son, or possibly, and occasionally brother: Buganda [72].

e. appointment of successor by ruler with consultation among family and leading chiefs; the successor had to be a son of the ruler born after his accession: Kiziba [73]; Kiamtwara [74]; Maruku [75]; Bugabo [76]; Ithingo [77]; Karagwe [78]; Kianja [79]. In Bali-Nyonga, in the Bamenda Grassfields, selection was made from among the ruler's adult sons with the help of a secret oral testament confided by the ruler to notables, among them holders of priestly offices [80]. The Nso in the Bamenda Grassfields claimed descent from migrating princes of Rifum (ie the lakeside coronation site of the Tikar chiefdom of Kimi) and employed a patrilineal succession. The dynastic lineage was called 'children of the palace', but only some were eligible for succession — those born after accession of their father to the kingship, whose mothers were of free-commoner status. Selection was made by a succession council consisting of state councillors (of cadet royal lines) and the princess-priest [81]. The Venda dynasties of the Zoutpansberg [82] preferred direct to collateral succession, the dying chief usually naming his heir. To succeed, a candidate had to be son of a woman who was both a true Venda and a royally lobola-ed wife. Nevertheless, powerful brothers often succeeded.

f. rival sons dispute succession, often fighting, with one eventually emerging supreme. Bunyoro [83]; Nkore [84]. This system was formalised in the Ankole kingdom of Uganda [85]: the ruler (Mugabe) was not allowed to die of illness or old age, so was poisoned; his successor had to belong to the royal line, fulfilled by patrilineal descent. He also had to be the strongest and this led to contest amongst the brothers, so that one alone remained
alive to claim the kingship. After the mourning ceremonies a substitute king was chosen in a mock battle. The accession war might persist for months, with potential claimants being murdered or fleeing the country. The successful new king would enter the royal kraal with his mother and his sister, and kill the substitute king, after which he was proclaimed. Ritual purification of the country followed.

Many examples exist (some already noted) where father to son succession might be broken by brother succession, eventually reverting to elder line (Luuka [86]). In some instances, succession, originally father to son, was completely replaced by brother succession: Bukooli [87] (through all brothers from eldest to youngest, then to eldest of next generation; Bukono [88]; Busiki [89].

2. Brother succession

This might be patrilineal or matrilineal, and could be qualified by rank of mother, or other factors.

Brother succession passing through all brothers from eldest to youngest, eventually reverting to the son of the eldest brother is attested for the Buzimba [90] and Rozwi-Changamire [91]. Amongst the Bugweri, the succession went to the eldest son of the last ruler [92].

For the Swoswe dynasty of Marandellas [93], the succession was collateral, the eldest son succeeding without regard to his mother's rank. Kom, a dynasty of Ndobo origin in the Bamenda Grassfields, invested the kingship in a matrilineage of the Ekwü clan: it was matrilineal and fraternal, by seniority in age. Failing brothers, the eldest sister's son succeeds [94].

Succession amongst the Bemba, also matrilineal and adelphic, was discussed by Roberts [95]. The sons of a royal woman whose brothers
were potential chiefs were eligible for succession, but they may well have had to contend with the sons of each of their sisters. This resulted in horizontal and vertical conflict in generations. The colonial administration suggested limiting the horizontal element by considering the claims of only the two eldest daughters of any given royal woman. As Roberts pointed out "Even if there were agreement on what constituted genealogical seniority, it would still have to contend with factors such as personal ability and (in the old days) force of arms. Richards [96] discussed the beliefs which dictated the matrilineal system amongst the Bemba. She pointed out that the father's status did not affect that of the child: so a princess could produce an heir by a slave father without lowering the child's prestige. The close relationship between brother and sister is based on the fact they were born from one womb; this is equally strong in the case of the royal family when the children are from two different fathers.

3. Rotation through houses.

In the Chinamora dynasty of Shawasha [97], succession was collateral, eventually becoming a rotating system through three houses. The Mangwende dynasty of Nhowe [98] also employed a system of collateral succession which apparently alternated between two houses of the dynasty.

4. Dual-monarchies.

Forms of dual kingship have existed in which the throne is held, usually by representatives of two distinct families, and sometimes with a division of function.

The most notable instance is Sparta, where the kingship was invested in the two royal houses, the Agiads and the Eurypontids. The early succession was supposed to have been directly lineal and patrilineal. Later, succession remained patrilineal but, when circumstances dictated could be by a brother, grandson, cousin and
collateral representing the senior male heir. In these instances the state appointed the king. [99].

5. Election.

Electoral monarchy is probably the least-frequent form of succession. The most notable examples are Poland, where the kingship was vested in a number of families, and the Holy Roman Empire. The Papacy and the Republic of Venice could also be described as forms of electoral monarchy. In imperial Rome, by far the best-documented of ancient successions, election by the senate (in theory) and military (in practice) combined with dynastic claims, nominations and adoptions; death by violence was frequent, if not the norm.

The Kushite Succession from Tanwetamani to the end of the 'Napatan' Period.

The evidence for the succession during the 25th Dynasty is discussed above (Chapter 11). The succession in the period following the 25th Dynasty is without firm evidence. The ordering of kings has been reconstructed on the evidence of texts at Barkal (B 700), the stelae of Aspelta, stelae from Kawa and from the evidence from royal cemeteries. The reign lengths are unknown.

Reisner [100] wondered whether there was a "missing" king between Tanwetamani and Atlanersa, an idea he later abandoned: at that stage he had not identified Atlanersa's burial at Nuri.

Atlanersa - Senkamanisken
The inscriptions of Senkamanisken were added to the altar of Atlanersa from B 703 [101]. Reisner also noted that the decoration of B 703 was in the name of Atlanersa, with the names of Senkamanisken on columns in 702, and on the pylon [102]. The evidence thus indicates that Senkamanisken succeeded Atlanersa, it is assumed directly.
The parentage of both Atlanersa and Senkamanisken remains unknown, although it is generally assumed that Atlanersa was a son of Taharqo. The description of Amenirdis II as smt msw in the Aspelta stela genealogy, lends weight to this possibility.

Anlamani - Aspelta
The stelae of Anlamani and Aspelta show them to have been brothers. It is also clear from the stelae that Anlamani preceded Aspelta. The name of Aspelta's father is, unfortunately, erased on his year 1 stela. As noted above[103], the space is too small for the name of Senkamanisken, unless the throne name had been used, which would be untypical.

Aramatelqo and his successors.
Following the reign of Aspelta, the historical and genealogical information virtually ceases. Even Dunham and Macadam were reticent in reconstructing the genealogy.

The inscriptions of the 'Late Napatan' rulers provide a few details, but little which really illuminates the method of succession. The stela of Irike-Amanote names his immediate predecessor, Talakhamani, and an earlier king, Malowiebamani. The King's Mother is depicted on the stela of Harsiotef and that of Nastasen, but in neither instance are their tombs identified at Nuri.

Conclusion: the succession during the 'Napatan' period.

As can be seen from the foregoing discussion, and from the reconstruction of the royal genealogy, I disagree with the theory proposed by Macadam, and generally followed since, that succession passed from brother to brother and then to the children of the eldest brother during this period. The available evidence is insufficient to support the theory. Evidence might yet be forthcoming which does confirm that Piye was a son of Kashta, but the relationship of Shebitqo and Tanwetamani to Shabaqo, still makes the brother-succession theory untenable.
Equally, the sister-son relationship of Tanwetamani to Taharqa, emphasised by the Assyrian texts, might indicate a form of matriliny, but the evidence is far too scanty to make any general comments. I have argued against many of the matrilineal theories proposed by Macadam, because I believe them to be founded on insufficient evidence. Women were undoubtedly important in the Kushite royal family, and, it seems, in a different way to the role of Egyptian royal women. However, even if a form of matriliny did prevail, I feel that — with the type of evidence available — we cannot hope to define or penetrate it.

This paper has, I concede, been largely negative in attitude: it has attempted to go back to first principles, to re-examine the evidence impartially, and without theorising whilst reconstructing. Such negativism is bound to be unpopular: but it is necessary. The genealogy as reconstructed by Dunham and Macadam, and the succession theory they promoted, has dominated Nubian studies for forty years. It is appropriate to question it now, before it becomes too entrenched to remove.
The following tables are to show those relationships of kings which are fairly certain.

1 Alara

Kasaqa = ALARA sister = X

Tabiry = Piye = Abar (King)

Taharqo

Abar as snw msrw could be sister of Piye. She is never called s3t msrw, which calls into question the suggestion of Dunham and Macadam that she was a daughter of Kashta.

2 Kashta

King

KASHTA = Pebatma King

Ir-pa-ankh-ken-ken-ef Amenirdis I Shabaqo Pekareslo = Piye

Pebatma is the only known wife of Kashta, so it has been assumed that she was the mother of all of his children.
5 Shebitqo

Kashta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shabaqo</th>
<th>Piye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SHEBITQO = Arty

6 Taharqo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alara</th>
<th>sister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abar</th>
<th>Piye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Shepenwepet II TAHARQO = Tekahatamani Qalhata Shabaqo

Ushanukhuru Nesishutefnut Amenirdis II Tanwetamani
(Nesanhuret) 2PA GWA

7 Tanwetamani

| Piye |

| Shabaqo | Qalhata | Taharqo |

TANWETAMANI = Arty
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Appendix 6

Index of Kushite royalty.


<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abar</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Akheqa</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Akhrasan</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Akhratan</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alara</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Amaniastabarqo</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Amanibakhi</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Amanimalol</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Amani-natsaki-lefte</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Amanitakaye</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Amenirdis A</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Amenirdis B</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Amenirdis C</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Analma&quot;aye</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Anlamani</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Aramatelqo</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Artaha</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Arty</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Asata</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Aspelta</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Atakhebasken</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Atassamalo</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Atlanersa</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Atmataka</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Baskakeren</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Batahaliye</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Har</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Haremakhet</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Harkhebi</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Harsiytotef</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Henutirdis</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Henuttakhebit</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Iretirou</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Irke-Amanote</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ir-pa-ankh-ken-ken-ef</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Istemkheb</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Kariben</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Karkamani</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kasqa</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kashta</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Khalese</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Khliut</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Abar

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.1: Troy 1986 176 (25.5)

rt-p^t; wrt hswt; hnwt t3wy; nbt h3swt nbw; mwt nsw; snt nsw; hnwt rsy mbh; bcart mwrt

Gebel Barkal temple B 300: Lepsius V 7c.
Temple of Sanam: Griffith 1922: 97, pl.28.

Abar is well-attested as the mother of Taharqo [88]: in Kawa V 1.16 (Macadam 1949: 28) and the parallel text of Tanis Stela B, 1.11 ff. (ibid.); Gebel Barkal temple B 300 (Lepsius V 7c) and in the temple of Sanam (Griffith 1922: 97, pl.28). She was daughter of a sister of Alara. As mother of Taharqo she was presumably a wife of Piye [71].

Abar's title snt nsw suggested to Dunham and Macadam (1949) that she was a sister of both Shabaqo and Piye, and hence a daughter of Kashta [40]. Abar was the daughter of a sister of Alara [3], who was "born together with him in one womb" (Kawa VI, 11.22-23: Macadam 1949: 36; cf.Kawa IV, 11.16-18: Macadam 1949: 16, 121). Macadam (1949: 21 n.42) thought that this meant that Alara and two sisters were triplets: it certainly indicates that they shared the same father and mother. Taharqo seems to stake at least some of his claim to the kingship on his relationship to Alara through Abar. Macadam (1949: 127) proposed that she was the 'adopted' daughter of Kashta [26] (so Leclant LA VI, 166), arguing on the basis of his female-adoption theories. Macadam assumed, probably unnecessarily, that Taharqo's reference to the "mothers of my mother" in Kawa IV 1.16 implied that Abar's mother had two mothers, one at least being an adopted mother. One of these, he proposed to be Kashta. The phrase could equally imply a female line of descent.

On reading the name as 'Abiru' see Leclant LA I, 13: Leclant and Yoyotte 1952: 8 and 22.

Reisner suggested that Abar was buried in Nuri 35 (Dunham 1955: 17-19) although no inscribed material was found to support this.

2. Akhe( qa?)

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.2

snt nsw; hmmt nwj

Nuri 38 (Dunham 1955: 129-130) included 170 shabtis "exactly like figures of Queen Madiken" inscribed for Akheqa, with three intrusive shabtis.
Dunham Macadam suggested she was a daughter of Aspelta [20], perhaps by Henuttakhebit [32], and sister-wife of Aramatelqo [16].

3. Akhrasan

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.3.

IHM Nsw

Shabtis from Nu. 32: Dunham 1955: 202-205; 18-4-536 fig.208.

Dunham Macadam suggested about temp. Malowiebamani [49].

4. Akhratan

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.4

Nuri 14 with cartouche in chapel: Dunham 1955: 241-243, fig.188, pl.LXI B. Statue from Barkal: Boston MFA 23.735: Dunham 1955: 242 fig.188; 1970: 23 no 13, fig.16, pl. XXIII.

Dunham and Macadam supposed that he was a son of Harsiyotef [30], at gen.25. Török 1986: mid. C4 BC.

5. Alara

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.5

The wr-Chieftain s3 rC (Kawa IV, 17; Kawa VI, 22); nswt (Kawa IX,54; Nastasen)


His wife was Kasaqa [39], their daughter Tabiry [86] married Piye [71]. His sister was the mother of Abar [1] a wife of Piye and mother of Taharqo [88].

The texts relating to Alara are all posthumous, dating from the reigns of Taharqo (Kawa IV and VI), Irike-Amanote (Kawa IX) and Nastasen.

No tomb at Kurru has been certainly identified as his, although Ku. 9 has been attributed to him. No inscribed objects have been found to confirm this, and there is no evidence that Alara was buried at Kurru.

-367-
The two inscriptions of Taharqo refer to Alara as brother of the mother of Abar, and in both instances the word wr follows sn (in IV an emendation see n.39 p.20). This could be read as sn.s wr "her elder brother", rather than "her brother, the wr-Chief", but Macadam (1949: 40 nn.76-77, his emphasis; 122) argued that this was in "neither case to be translated 'her elder brother' since this same brother states in V 23 that Abar's 'mother' was his twin sister". Macadam (1949: 122) stresses that the phrase hat ms(t) hnc.i ht w^t "born together with me in one womb", must indicate that Alara and his sister were twins, therefore, the sign must be read as wr-Chieftain. An alternative interpretation would see Alara and his sister as children of the same mother, by different fathers.

Whilst observing that "Stated according to our texts, Alara was the brother of Abar's mother" Macadam (1949: 10, n.40) argued that he was also an elder brother of Kashta. Despite the lack of inscriptiveal - or any other - corroborative evidence, this has been generally accepted.

6. AMANIASTABARQO

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.6.

Granite stela from building 100: Dunham 1955: 267, fig.211.
Gold plaque similar to that from Nuri: Keimer 1951: 225-227; Dunham 1952: 111-112.

No relationships have been suggested for this ruler, placed at gen.16. Torok 1986: early C5 BC.

7. AMANIBAKHI (?)

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.7

Granite stela from Building Nuri 100: Boston MFA 21.3236: Dunham 1955: 271, 269 fig.213, pl.LXX,C.
Granite offering table from Building Nuri 100, possibly of the same although the name not enclosed in a cartouche: Dunham 1955: 272 no.6, 269 fig.213, pl.LXXV, B.

Dunham Macadam could not suggest a date or relationships, Torok places him at gen.27 in the 2nd half of the C4 BC.

8. Amanimalol

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.8
Titles lost, but name written in cartouche.

Statue from Barkal 500: Khartoum SNM 1843: Dunham 1970: 21, no.9, pl.XVII-XVIII. The head is missing. It is assumed (probably rightly) to form a pair with a statue of Senkamanisken.

Reisner suggested she was buried in Nuri 22, but Dunham Macadam 'unidentified'.

Presumed to be (chief) wife of Senkamanisken [80].

9. AMANI-NATAKI-LEBTE

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.9.


10. Amunitakaye

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.10

snt nsw; mwt nsw


King's mother, probably of Malonaqen [46].

Dunham Macadam suggested that she was a daughter of Aspelta [20] sister-wife of Aramatelqo [16], and mother of Malonaqen [46]. The cylinder-sheath is the only object which carries a title other than mwt nsw, designating her also as snt nsw. The plaque of Malonaqen in
the foundation deposit makes it very likely that she was that king's mother. She is not referred to as \textit{hm\textsuperscript{t} nsw}.

11. Amenirdis A

Omitted by Dunham Macadam 1949. For titles Troy 1986 177 (GW.4).

For monuments see Leclant in LA I: 196-199.

The God's Wife of Amun Amenirdis I. Daughter of Kashta [40] and Pebatma [66]. Adopted daughter of Shepenwepet I, daughter of Osorkon III. Sister of Shabaqo [81]. The name Amenirdis was possibly adopted by her when she was installed as heiress to Shepenwepet I, no other Kushite women of this early period having Egyptian names.

Many monuments call her 'daughter of Kashta'. The Abydos jambs give her mother's name. The statue (Cairo CG 565) and related inscriptions published by Mariette (1875: pl.45d), all from the chapel of Osiris-neb-anhk at Karnak, give the titles "King's Sister [of] (Neferkare) God's Wife (Amen[irdis]|".

Earlier writers thought that Kashta had installed Amenirdis as heiress to Shepenwepet I (v. Zeissl 1944: 68; still assumed by Adams 1977: 260), but this is now generally discounted and Piye is now seen as the more likely protagonist (Bierbrier 1975: 103), following the arguments of Kitchen (1973: 151 and n. 289) that just as the Kushite throne passed from brother to brother so it was Piye who installed his sister. However, there are good reasons for reviving the older view, that it was indeed Kashta who installed Amenirdis.

It must be emphasised that her monuments associate Amenirdis I only with Shabaqo and Shebitqo, not with Piye. The chapel of Osiris-neb-anhk (Leclant 1965: 94-96 [27.B1]) in the Monthu enclosure names her alongside Shabaqo. In this chapel was discovered the celebrated alabaster statue of Amenirdis (Cairo 565: Leclant 1965: 96-98 [27.B2]; Borchardt 1925: 114-115 pl.96). In the Wadi Hammamat a number of graffiti of Pasenenkhons and other workmen are dated to the time of Amenirdis I and to year 12 of Shabaqo (Couyat and Montet 1912: 96 pl.xxxv; cf. nos. [70], [78-79]; Graefe 1981: 58-59, 70, 86-89). The chapel of Osiris-heqa-djet (Leclant 1965: 47-54 [12]) was founded by Osorkon III, Takeloth III and Shepenwepet I with a courtyard added by Amenirdis I and Shebitqo. An offering table dedicated in the reign of Taharqo may be posthumous (Bierbrier 1975: 103, 142 n.14): a stela of year 21 of Taharqo names Shepenwepet II as God's Wife, so the death of Amenirdis occurred before then. Her burial was made at Medinet Habu, the decoration of the chapel being completed by Shepenwepet II (Hölscher 1954: 20-23, pls. 1-2, 12-13, 16-18). From the burial many shabtis are known (Hölscher 1954: pl.21 A).

The most controversial document is the inscription in the Wadi Gasus dated to "year 12 the Adorer of the God Amenirdis" apparently
associated with year 19 and the God's Wife Shepenwepet. Kitchen (1973: 177-178) has strenuously argued must be of Amenirdis I and Piye, and not of Shabaqo. The possibility that the Wadi Gasus inscription should be attributed to year 12 of Shabaqo, with year 19 of Osorkon III or Nimlot of Hermopolis is discussed in Appendix 6. Since there are no monuments or documents which attest Amenirdis I with Piye it might be wiser to leave the Wadi Gasus inscription unascribed.

12. Amenirdis B


For monuments see Leclant in LA I: 199-201.

The Adorer of the God Amenirdis II. Named as a daughter of Taharqo [88] in the Nitoqert Adoption Stela. Probably not the same as the wife of the Vizier Monthuhotep [13: Amenirdis C].

The latest Egyptian monument attesting Amenirdis II is a lintel from a chapel built for Nitoqert, which includes figures of Amenirdis II and gives her the title 'God's Wife' (Cairo JE 29251: Christophe 1956: 70-79; Leclant 1965: 106-108; 1975: 199-201). However, the lintel also records Nitoqert's steward, Pedihorresnet, who is attested in office during the reign of Nekau II, and it is very unlikely that Amenirdis would have survived until then. The cartouche of Taharqo has been erased, indicating that the lintel was carved before the Nubian campaign of Psamtik II in 591 BC.

13. Amenirdis C

\[
bnt \ pr \ rt-p^t \ wrt \ im3t \ wrt \ pst \ nbt \ im3t \ btn \ wrt \ im3\byt \ hr \ Hwt-Hr \\
\]


Perhaps a daughter of Shabaqo [81].

The stela in Cairo Museum, published by Habachi (1977) has scenes on both sides of the Vizier Monthuhotep and his wife, the king's daughter, Amenirdis. Habachi listed the other known monuments of this official, which include a scarab in the Pushkin Museum and fragments of a double statue (Louvre A 49 and Berlin 8803 see also Vernus 1978: 63-65 no.73), which seem to indicate that he was a Northern Vizier associated with Athribis and Heliopolis. Amenirdis is clearly a Kushite princess, indicated by the style of her headdress which consists of close cut hair or a cap, with two tall plumes. The stela is undated as are the other monuments of Monthuhotep.

Unfortunately, nothing further is known about his family. Habachi (1977) argued that this Amenirdis was identical with the Divine
Adoratrix Amenirdis II [8]. Leclant (LA VI, 182 n.234) points out that for her to be the same as the Divine Adoratrix the marriage must have been later than 656 BC. The identification has been accepted by later writers (Vittmann 1978: 145) but is far from certain. The Aspelta accession stela almost certainly carries a reference to Amenirdis II with the titles of her Theban office, and as mother (actual or adoptive) of Queen Nasalsa [43]. There is no documentary evidence to prove that Amenirdis C was a daughter of Taharqo [63]; she could equally have been daughter of Shabaqo or of Shebitqo [58]. It is far from likely that any princess who had been Divine Adoratrix would have been married to an official, whatever his rank: if she was married at all it must have been to a king.

It is possible that this Amenirdis was a daughter of Shabaqo. Many of Shabaqo's family had Egyptian names, and this was certainly a period in which the Kushites consolidated their position in Egypt.

14. ANALMA'AYE

Dunham Macadam 1949 no.13


Dunham (1955: 150) suggested he was a successor to Malonaqen, "not necessarily his son". Dunham Macadam 1949, do not postulate relationships.

15. ANLAMANI

Dunham Macadam 1949 no.14


Kawa Stela: Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek: Macadam 1949: 44-50. Inscription VIII.

Lintel from Sanam: PM VII 202; Griffith 1922: 86, pl.xi [1, 2]. Also referred to in the stela of Madiqen (Louvre, line 10) and probably also in the Aspelta accession stela (see above p. 23), although the cartouche is erased.
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Son of queen Nasalsa [60], who is depicted on the Kawa stela VIII. Kawa VIII records the visits made by the king to various sanctuaries, the installation of prophets and campaigns, probably part of his coronation progress. Line 24 records that Anlamani dedicated four of his sisters to be sistrum-players at Napata, Gematen, Pnubs and Sanam.

16. ARAMATELQO

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.12.


Dunham Macadam suggested that he was a son of Aspelta [20] and Henuttakhebit [32].

17. Artaha

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.15

ḥat nsw

Nuri 58: Dunham 1955: 119-120. The only inscribed objects were the shabtis, of which, it was estimated, there were originally at least 180. There are no recorded intrusive objects. Shabtis: Dunham 1955: 261, fig.205.

Dunham Macadam suggested a wife of Aspelta [20].

18. Arty

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.16.

s3t nsw; ḥat nsw

Referred to in text of Cairo JE 49157 (Lefebvre 1925: 29).

Daughter of Piye [71], wife of Shebitqo [82].

An inscription on the statue of Shabaqo's son Haremakhet [28] (Cairo JE 49157) reads: ḥat nsw (Shebitqo) | s3t nsw (Piye) | Arty. Some have read the inscription as 'the royal daughter Pi(ankh)y-Arty'
others (Leclant LA V 519 n.46) 'the royal daughter of Piye, Arty', the name Piye is is written inside a cartouche, that of Arty not. This formula is quite usual.

Lefebvre (1925: 33) thought that this queen Arty was identical with Piye-Arty [73], and that she had married Shebitqo and Tanwetamani successively. This was followed by Dunham Macadam. Reisner suggested that she was buried in Kurru 6.

19. Asata

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.17.

ḥwt nsw; ḫwt nsw rmt n Kmt(t)


Dunham Macadam suggested a wife of Aspelta [20].

20. ASPELTA

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.18.


Statue from Barkal: Boston MFA 23.730: Dunham 1970: 23, no.12, fig.15, pls.XXI, XXII.

Stela of year 1, from Barkal: Cairo JE 48866: Grimal 1981; Török 1986: 178 no.14, after ANET 447f..

Stela of year 2, the so-called 'stèle de l'excommunication' or 'Bannstele': Cairo JE 48865: Grimal 1981; Schäfer 1906b: 287-296; Torok 1986: 181ff. no.15 after Schäfer 1906b.


Shrine added to Temple of Sanam: PM VII, 199 (21); Griffith 1922: 107-110, pls. xlv, xliv.
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Son of Queen Nasalsa [60], brother of Anlamani [15] and of Madiqen [44],

Dunham Macadam thought he was son of Senkamanisken, although there are problems associated with the reading of the names of the accession stela (see above pp. 345-346).

21. Atakhebasken
Dunham Macadam 1949, no.19.

fmt nsw; fmt nsw wrt


King's Chief Wife, possibly of Taharqo: so Dunham Macadam and Leclant (LA VI, 166 and 182 n.228).

22. Atasamalo

snt nsw, mwt nsw

Nuri 61 (Dunham 1955: 232-235) with sandstone altar, broken cartouche (fig.180); uninscribed shabtis.
Harsiyotef Stela, lunette.

Mother of Harsiyotef.

23. ATLANERSA
Dunham Macadam 1949, no.21

Nuri 20 (Dunham 1955: 32-35) no inscriptional evidence other than shabtis, although a number of these appeared to be in situ (Dunham 1955: pl.VIII, C).
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Obelisk fragment from Old Dongola: Cairo CG 17.027: Kuentz 1932: 55-57, pl.XV.
A colossal statue from Barkal, B 700 (Khartoum SNM 5209: Dunham 1970: 33, no.17) was attributed to Atlanersa by Reisner (1931: 82 no. 37), but by Dunham (1947: 63-65) to 'Ergamenes'.

The relief in B 700, apparently depicting royal women of the family of Atlanersa, is known only from the drawing by Felix [Griffith 1922] and other early sources.

Assumed to be son of Taharqo [88], from the Nasalsa genealogy where the Adorer of the God (presumed Amenirdis B [12]) is mnt nsw. His mother is the mnt nsw ...salka, known only from the relief in B 700 copied by Felix.

24. Atmataka

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.22.

hmt nsw

Shabtis, some in situ, at least 158: Dunham 1955: 136, fig.206.
Heart scarab intruded in Nuri 47: Dunham 1955: 174, fig.130.

Dunham Macadam assumed a wife of Aramatelqo [16].

25. BASKAKEREN

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.23.


Assumed to be a younger son of Malowiebamani [49] and successor of Irike-Amanote [34], presumably on theory of brother-succession.

26. Batahaliye

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.24.

hmt nsw

Nuri 44 (Dunham 1955: 228-231) with grey granite stela (17-4-76: p.230 fig. 177).
Harsiyotef stela: Cairo JE 48864; Grimal 1981b.

Wife of Harsiyotef [30].
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27. Har

Dunham Macadam omitted.

Son of Piye [71], father of Udjarenes [93] wife of the 4th Prophet of Amun Monthuemhat [55].

Named on an offering table of Udjarenes, the last attested wife of the Fourth Prophet of Amun, Monthuemhat (Barguet, Goneim, Leclant 1951: 493-494, pl.II) from the court of Monthuemhat's tomb at Thebes. The inscription calls her daughter of the s3 nsw (of) Piye, Har. As with many of these texts this may be read as either, son of King Piye, Har, or as Pi(ankh)y-Har. The enclosure of 'Piye' within a cartouche suggests the former may be preferable (as adopted elsewhere here).

28. Haremakhet

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.27.

r-pC(; h3ty-C; sd3wty-bity; srw-w3ty; mr.tw; s3 nsw (s-b3-k3)\(mr.f(t3-h-k))\;srw w^3ty nsw bity (t3-n-w-t-lm.n); hրp...; irty nsw \(c_nhwy; h\(m\ nтр tpy n lmn = Ipt Swt; h\(m\ nтр Hnsw p3 hrd


The eldest son of Shabaqo [81] by Mesbat [54]. His wife's name is unknown, but he was father of Harkhebi [29], High Priest of Amun.

The Karnak statue (CG 42204) is dated to the reign of Tanwetamani [91]. A statue fragment from the Mut temple at Karnak associates him with Queen Tabekenamun [85] and with Queen Arty [18], perhaps indicating a date in the reign of Shebitqo. Haremakhet's sarcophagus names Mesbat.

Haremakhet served as High Priest of Amun at Karnak (Kitchen 1973: 197) probably from the reign of Shebitqo, if not that of Shabaqo himself. He was no longer in office, and perhaps dead by year 9 of Tanwetamani.

29. Harkhebi

Dunham Macadam omitted.

hm nтр tpy n lmn
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Son of Haremakhet [28], High Priest of Amun, and grandson of Shabaqo [81].

Harkhebi succeeded his father as High Priest of Amun (Kitchen 1973: 197) and continued in office under Psamtik I, being referred to in the Saite Oracle Papyrus (Brooklyn 47.218.3) of year 14.

30. HARSIYOTEF

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.28.


Son of Queen Atasamalol [8] and husband of Batahaliye [26].

Dunham (1955: 222) noted the examination of cranial fragments, supposed to be of Harsiyotef, which placed his age at death "somewhere in his middle twenties". Since the stela is dated to the king's 35th regnal year, this is hardly likely. The examination also suggested that Harsiyotef "Racially.. may well have been a survivor of the primitive white type that characterizes the earliest urban levels all over the Near East... although he was probably somewhat more refined in the manner of Angel's... ancient Greek 'basic white' type!"

31. Henutirdis

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.29

\[\text{nsw}\]

Nuri 34 (Dunham 1955: 225-228) with offering table (Boston MFA 21.3233: 18-1-52 p.228, fig.175).

Assumed to be temp. Harsiyotef [30].

32. Henuttakhebit

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.30.

\[\text{nsw; nsw; nsw; nsw wrt n Mdkn}\]
The last of the three royal woman depicted on the stela of Madiqen is the snt nsw s3t nsw Henuttakhebit. She bears the additional title 'the Great Royal Daughter [s3t nsw wrt]' of Madiqen. Macadam (1949: 126) cited the Nitoqert Adoption Stela for the usage of s3t wrt as 'adopted daughter' and proposed that Henuttakhebit was actually a sister of Anlamani [15], Aspelta [20] and Madiqen [44] "there having been no other kings to whom she could at that time have been sister". Thus, he concluded, Henuttakhebit must have been adopted by her elder sister, Madiqen. Henuttakhebit was buried in Nuri 28 (Dunham 1955: 126-128), confirmed by the foundation deposits carrying her name. She was assumed (Dunham Macadam 1949: no. 30) to have been the wife of Aspelta and the mother of Aramatelqo [16] on the basis of a fragment of electrum with the title 'King's Mother' (but no name) from her burial (Dunham 1955: 128 fig.95 17-3-448). As her shabtis carry only the title 'King's Wife' this fragment might actually belong to an object of Queen Nasalsa [60]. There is nothing more to support the theory that Henuttakhebit was a King's Mother. The shabtis, all discovered in the later tomb, Nuri 25 (Dunham 1955: 159 17-2-1882) carry only the title 'King's Wife'.

33. Iretirou

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.79 ("Yeturow").

ḥmt nsw rat n Kmt; ḥmt nsw; s3t nsw; snt nsw

Nuri 53 (Dunham 1955: 35-38) with decorated burial chamber (Dunham 1955 36, fig.21, pl.IX, C) and shabtis in situ. Heart scarab intruded in Nu. 74: 18-2-243: Dunham 1955: 37 fig.22. B 700 relief: Griffith 1929.

Assumed, largely on the evidence of Pylon 700 to have been a sister-wife of Atlanersa [23] and daughter of Taharqo [88] (so Dunham Macadam 1949; Macadam 1949: 129). Buried in Nuri 53 (Dunham 1955: 35-38) which has a painted chamber (fig.21). The inscription in the chamber and on the heart scarab (from Nuri 74: Dunham 1955: 37 fig.22) gives her title as ḥmt nsw rat n Kmt and the name is written without cartouche. The queen's headdress - a close fitting cap crown or wig, with vulture wings, modius, disk, horns and plumes - is that usually associated with a king's Chief Wife.
The relief on the pylon of B 700 gives a larger number of titles \( \text{hmt nsw s3t nsw snt nsw} \). The name is perfectly conventional Egyptian, and quite common in the Late Period. The rarity of purely Egyptian names amongst the Kushite royal family suggests the possibility that she was the \( s3t \) and \( snt \) of an Egyptian king.

34. IRIKE-AMANOTE


Dunham (1955: 214, fig.164) compares the titularies from Kawa and Nuri, the prenomen is the same, with variations in other names.

The king succeeded Talakhamani [90], who himself succeeded Malowiebamani [49]. Irike-Amanote's unnamed mother is referred to, and as \( \text{snt nsw} \) was presumably related to one of these kings.

Dunham Macadam assumed him to have been father of Harsiyotef [30] and Baskakeren [25]; presumably on the theory of brother-succession.

35. Ir-pa-ankh-kenkenef Pekatror

Dunham and Macadam omitted.

\( \text{mr m3c wr h3wty} \)


Son of Kashta [40] and Pebatma [66].

The texts of the stela give: P3g3tttr \( \text{rn.f nfr Ir-p3-cnh-knkg} \). On Wenig (1990) discusses these documents and their significance. Wenig suggests that the 'beautiful name' is an Egyptian rendition of the meaning of the Meroitic name (which is unknown to us). The name Pekatror he associates with the Meroitic title \( \text{pkr} \) (discussed by Török 1986: 61).

This man was a royal prince with military command. The stela inscription says that he arrived in Egypt when he was aged twenty (as Wenig notes, this was also the age Taharqo went to Egypt).
36. Istemkheb


Istemkheb *H*, 381 37 small inscribed green glaze and 300 similar uninscribed (various Museums incl: Boston MFA 00.696; Cairo JE 34432; Leiden AF 141; London UC 531; Oxford Ashmolean E.3615; Philadelphia UM E.14650)

Coffin fragments Cairo JE 34431, Temp. No. 9.2.15.11: Leahy 1984.

Four broken alabaster canopic jars.

Daughter of Shabaqo [81], Chief Wife of ?

The coffin fragments give the titles "King's Chief Wife, King's sister, King's daughter [of] (Shabaqo) | 3st-3h-bit [sic]". Thus Istemkheb was a daughter of Shabaqo and Chief Wife of another king. Leahy suggested she may have been wife of Tanwetamani. Aston [unpub.thesis] considered that she could have been sister of Shebitqo and his Chief Wife. She may even have been married to one of the late Libyan dynasts.

As some other members of Shabaqo's family, Istemkheb carries a purely Egyptian name.

37. Kariben

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.31

Kariben

Meroe South 500 (Dunham 1963: 380) with black granite stela: Boston MFA 23,869; 22-1-85: p.379 fig. 206 E.

Dunham Macadam proposed a brother of Si^aspiqo [84] or Nasakhma [59], the tomb dated on archaeological grounds.

38. KARKAMANI

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.32.

Nuri 7 (Dunham 1955: 161-164) with inscribed foundation plaques (17-4-461: fig.123).


Relationships unknown, usually placed gen.15 [Török 1986: end of C6 BC].
39. Kasaqa

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.33.

no titles recorded.

Stela of Tabiry: Dunham 1950: 87 19-3-1366, p.90 fig.29f, pl.XXX.A.
Kawa block, Temple T: Kawa Inscription XLVI: Macadam 1949: 90,
pls.35, 42.

Mother of Tabiry [86] and wife of Alara [5].

Macadam (1949: 119-130 particularly 128) proposed, and his ideas have
largely been accepted since, that Alara, Kasaqa, Kashta and Pebatma
were all brothers and sisters.

40. KASHTA

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.34.

Faience offering table fragment Ku.1: 19-3-537: Dunham 1950.
Ku.8 (proposed by Reisner, no inscriptional evidence).

Father of Amenirdis I [11], of Shabaqo [81], of Ir-pa-ankh-kenkenef
[35], of Pekareslo [67]. Husband of Pebatma [66].

Most references to Kashta are posthumous, in filiations of
Amenirdis I.

Macadam proposed that he was brother of Alara and Kasaqa, as well
of his own wife Pebatma (see above pp.332-336).

41. Khalése

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.35.

r(t)-pC(t); wrt nsw; nb(t) im3t [?]; s3t nsw

Pylon of B 700: Griffith 1929.

Dunham Macadam thought "probably" a wife of Atlanersa [23].

42. Khaliut

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.36.

s3 nsw n ḫ.t.f ḫ3ty-C n KnD
The large diorite stela discovered by Reisner in front of Pylon I of B 500 had been dedicated on behalf of a Prince Khaliut in the reign of Aspelta. Khaliut is clearly stated to have been a bodily son of Piye [71] and throughout given the title Mayor (ḥ3ty-ḥḥ) of Kanad. A number of theories about the stela have been presented: certainly Khaliut died long before the stela was set up, and it has been thought that this represents an attempt by Aspelta to placate the descendants of Khaliut who may have had a superior claim to the kingship.

43. Khensa


ḥmt nsw; snt nsw; s3t nsw; ḫmt nsw wrt; ḫnw t3wy; rt-pḥt; wrt hts;
wrt ḫswt; nḥt ḫm3t; ḫnw ḫnw nbwt.

Kurru 4 (Dunham 1950: 30-37) with granite offering table; alabaster offering table; alabaster vases; steatite ball (Boston 21.313:)
almost identical to the bead published by Steindorff (1907: 96) and attributed to an otherwise unknown king.
Silver basin: Boston MFA 21.3091.
Kohl tube: Leclant 1962: 207-08 pl.70.

Wife of Piye [71].

The Louvre statuette has the titles of Usermaatre Piye, and Khensa can therefore be assumed to be his wife. Uniquely for Kushite queens, Khensa is called wrt hts (see Troy 1986: 81, 83-85, 116, 189 (B 3/6), a common queenly title in the Old and Middle Kingdoms, but is attested only once — and then in an archaizing context (Troy 1986: 84) — between then and the 25th Dynasty. The title was used in the 25th Dynasty by Amenirdis I, but is attested later only in the late-26th Dynasty. Such archaism, and its use by Amenirdis suggests a close contemporaneity with Khensa.

If the fraternity of Shabaqo and Piye is questioned, snt nsw cannot refer to Piye. Khensa must, therefore, be the daughter of Kashta and sister of Shabaqo; or, the daughter of Shabaqo and sister of Shebitqo. If this is the case a joint rule of Piye with one of those kings is necessitated.

44. Madiqen

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.38.
Stela of year 3 Aspelta, the 'Dedication stela': Louvre C 257: Schafer 1895. Nuri 27 (Dunham 1955: 109-111), with inscribed cylinder sheath (18-3-1012: Dunham 1955: pl.CVIII) and shabtis.

Daughter of Queen Nasalsa [60], sister of Anlamani [15] and of Aspelta [20]. Henuttakhebit [32] was her s3t wrt.

The Louvre Stela, dated to year 3 of Aspelta, depicts Madiqen and describes her (1.9) as the 'Royal Sister, Royal Wife of the Living One, Madiqen, her mother is the Royal Sister and Royal Mother, the Mistress of Kush, Nasalsa. The Pharaoh [pr-53] Anlamani made her a chantress before his father Amun-Re the Bull of Nubia'.

This confirms the evidence of the Kawa inscription VIII, of Anlamani, which records the dedication of four un-named sisters at the chief Kushite sanctuaries of Amun.

The shabtis, as the stela, call her stn nsw hmt nsw n p3 cnh (Dunham 1955: 260 fig.204), but the exact meaning of this is unclear. Macadam (1949: 123) suggested that it simply meant 'the king'.

Török [1992k] has proposed that Madiqen was the wife of Anlamani and mother of Henuttakhebit.

45. Malaqaye
Dunham Macadam 1949, no.39.

Nuri 59 (Dunham 1955: 25-27) with apparently original grave goods including inscribed heart scarab (Dunham 1955: 27 fig.14 18-2-277, pl.CXXIII.A). The other objects, including a small silver funerary mask (Dunham 1955: 27 18-2-347, pl.CXX.B; Kendall 1982: 36-37, no.35 fig.39) were uninscribed.

There is no direct evidence for the identification of Malaqaye as a wife of Tanwetamani [91], although this has been generally accepted (Dunham Macadam 1949; Leclant LA VI 212, 215 n.41).

46. MALONAQEN
Dunham Macadam 1949, no.40.

Dunham Macadam suggested son of Aramatelqo [16] and Amanitakaye [10].

47. Maletarata

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.41 and 42.

mwt nsw; snt nsw; hnwt n K35

Situla: Louvre E 3841: Monnet 1952
Heart scarab: Boston 20.644: Dunham 1955: 50 17-3-650, p.49 fig.31, Nuri 41
Shabti figures, Nuri 25.

Dunham and Macadam attributed the monuments to two queens, Malateral I, a wife of Atlanersa [23] and mother of Senkamanisken [80] (Dunham Macadam 1949: no.41) and Maletaral II, a King's sister, and wife of Piye-Ariten [72], ca.temp. Amani-nataki-lebte (Dunham Macadam 1949: no.42). Monnet (1952) suggested that the princess was one of the four sisters of Anlamani who were dedicated as priestesses; Maletarata at Kawa. The situla calls Maletarata snt nsw, but the seal gives her the title hnwt n K35 and the name is written in a cartouche. If these are indeed the same person, it suggests an increased status, that she became a king's wife and perhaps a king's mother (see under Qalhata for discussion of title). The heart scarab from Nuri 41, which Dunham attributed to 'Malateral I' is inscribed for her as mwt nsw (he thought of Senkamanisken). Dunham dated 'Maletaral II' much later, and on the evidence of 76 shabti figures found in Nuri 25, attributed that pyramid to her, despite there being intrusive shabtis of seven other individuals (Dunham 1955: 159-161). The foundation deposits named a king Piye-aiten, and Dunham dated the burial to "generation 14". The shabtis carry the titles snt nsw hnwt K35.

48. Malotasen

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.43.

hm3 nsw c3t

Shabtis, some in situ: Dunham 1955: figs.198, 206.
The title hmt nsw c3t is very rare, being attested only for Tabiry and Nefertiti (see Troy 1986: 193 C2/7 and variant C2/8 (only Nefertiti)).

Dunham Macadam suggested a wife of Aramatelqo [16].

49. MALOWIEBAMANI

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.44

Chapel with scenes and cartouche: pl.LIII. A,B,C; fig.148.
F.D. cartouche plaques: 18-4-134: fig.151.
Stela from Nuri 100 on which Reisner thought he could read a cartouche.
Kawa IX of Irike-Amanote.

Mentioned as (immediate?) predecessor of Talakhamani [90], and perhaps as father of Irike-Amanote [34].

50. Masalaye

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.45.

no titles recorded

Shabti, cartouche, but no titles: Dunham 1955: 73, fig.198.

Dunham Macadam suggested a wife of Senkamanisken, probably buried by Anlamani [15].

51. Meqomalo

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.46.

hmt nsw

Shabtis: 18-4-540: Dunham 1955: 113, figs.198, 205.

Dunham Macadam suggested a wife of Aspelta [20].
52. **Meretawmun**

Dunham Macadam 1949 omitted.

Stela from Abydos [D. Aston thesis (unpub.), reference courtesy of Dr M.A. Leahy: I have been unable to otherwise locate this stela or any publication.]

53. **Mernua**

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.47.

bnw sw?


c temp Amanani [15]-Aspelta [20].

54. **Mesbat**

Dunham Macadam 1949, omitted.

bnw ntr

Wife of Shabaqo [81] (Leclant LA V 504, 513 n.107) named on sarcophagus of Haremakhet [28].

55. **Monthuemhat**

bnw-ntr 4-nw n Imn, h3ty-c n Niwt,

A complete list of titles in Leclant 1961.

Husband of Udjarenes [93].

One of the most important and best-documented officials of the late 25th Dynasty (Leclant 1961). Listed in the Rassam cylinder text of 667 as the sarru of Thebes, he was still alive in year 9 of Psamtik I at the time of the transfer of power to the Saites. The text of the Nitoqert Adoption stela records the large donations which he and his wife, Udjarenes, gave to Nitoqert. He was depicted and named with his sons in the Saite Oracle Papyrus, but dead by year 17 of Psamtik I.

56. **Monthuhotep**

r-pct, h3ty-c, wr n niwt i3bt t, it ntr, bn ntr, bn Hrw, bn ntr B3tt nb(t) B3st, h3ty, s3b, r3 Whn, imy-r niwt, h3ty'
Husband of Amenirdis C [13].

Habachi, followed by Vittman (1978: 145, 5.2.1) and Kitchen (1986), proposed that Amenirdis was to be identified with the God's Wife of Amun, and daughter of Taharqo. Attested by the Cairo stela, with his wife (Habachi 1977) a scarab (Pushkin Museum), possibly also the broken pair statue (Louvre A 49 and Berlin 8803: Vernus 1978: no.73 63-65) which does not call him Vizier. His titles indicate that he was a northern Vizier; Kitchen (1986: 567, and 598 Table 15B) places him early in the reign of Taharqo, c 685-675. Nothing more is known of his family.

57. Mutirdis

Dunham Macadam 1949, omitted.

s3t nsw; wrt burt; hm ntr Mwt; hm ntr Hwt-Hr,

Stela: Louvre C 100: Petrie 1905, 293, fig.121; Kitchen 1973: 137; cf Leclant LA IV, 1049 n.25.

Daughter of Piye [71].

On the stela her name is written without cartouche.

Perhaps also owner of a carnelian amulet of Horus the child (St.Petersburg Hermitage: see Lieblein 1891: 38 no.309, "26 Dyn.") the back of which has the cartouche (Mwt-iry-di.s).

The titulary of Piye on the Louvre stela is certainly that of a conqueror, and it is possible that Muturdis was installed in office when Piye campaigned in Egypt. There is no reason to think that she is identical with Shepenwepet II (who might possibly have been given as daughter to Amenirdis I at the same time).

58. Naparaya


rt pĄt; wrt im3t; wrt hswt; hmt nsw; smt nsw; hjwt t3wy.

Kurru 3 (Dunham 1950: 27-29) on evidence of inscribed alabaster offering table (Khartoum SNM 1911: Dunham 1950: 27-29; table pl.XXXI.B).

Dunham Macadam supposed a daughter of Piye [50] and sister-wife of Taharqo [63] (so also Leclant LA VI, 166 and 182 n.226).
59. NASHKHA

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.49.

Nuri 19 (Dunham 1955: 184-187) with F.D. plaque (17-4-996: fig.142).

Dunham (1955: 184 n.1) suggests possible reading Nasakhma-qo.

Otherwise unattested, placed at gen. 18 (Torok 1986: middle of the C5 BC).

60. Nasalsa

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.50.

mŠt nsw; mšt nsw; hawt n K3š.

Nuri 24 (Dunham 1955: 103-108) with inscribed burial chamber, foundation deposits and other objects.

Stela of Anlamani: Kawa VIII.
Stela of Aspelta year 1 'Election' stela.
Stela of Aspelta year 3 'Dedication stela'.
Stela of Khaliut.
Stela ? fragments from Kawa.

Mother of Anlamani [15], of Aspelta [20] and of Madiqen [44], perhaps also of Henuttakhebit [32].

The stela of Anlamani (Kawa VIII, scene) twice depicts the 'King's Mother' Nasalsa. Following the Taharqo stela and Egyptian ideology, Nasalsa sees her son crowned as the goddess Isis saw her son Horus (11.22-24). The name of the mšt nsw of the Aspelta 'Election' stela is erased, but can be restored from the 'Dedication' stela, where Aspelta is shown accompanied by the 'King's Mother' Nasalsa. This stela states that Nasalsa was also mother of Madiqen herself. The Khaliut stela (1.13; Reisner 1934: 43) confirms that Nasalsa was mother of Aspelta. Nasalsa was thus mother of two kings, Anlamani and Aspelta, and of Madiqen, and possibly also of Henuttakhebit. The Aspelta 'Election' stela indicates that Aspelta succeeded a brother, and was son of a king: hence Nasalsa's husband was a king, who must be Atlanersa or Senkamanisken [see discussion above Appendix 5].

61. NASTASEN

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.51

Nuri 15 (Dunham 1955: 246-250), chapel blocks with part of titulary (fig.191).

Silver mirror handle with cartouche: 17-2-1992: fig.192, pl. XCII B-

-389-
Shabtis.

Son of Queen Pelkha [68], husband of Sakhmakh [78].

The Nastasen stela is the last major historical inscription of the 'Napatan' period. The reading in it of the name Kambasuden as Khabbash has established year 1 of Nastasen as a Fixpunkt, 336/335 BC: the reading is certainly erroneous and hence the equation of dates should be treated circumspectly [see Morkot 1991: 330-331].

62. Nefrukekashta

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.52.

no title recorded

Kurru 52 (Dunham 1950: 81-85) where a large number ("not less than 286") of shabtis were discovered.

Her name was written without a cartouche.
Dunham Macadam assumed her to be a wife of Piye [71].

63. Nesanhuret.

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.25.

Son of Taharqo [88].

Stela of Esarhaddon from Sinjirli (Sam'al): Berlin Vorderasiatisches Museum;
Two Stelae of Esarhaddon from Tell Ahmar (Til Barsip): Aleppo Museum;
Thureau-Dangin 1929: 191-196, pl XXXVI.

The Egyptian name Nesanhuret is assumed to be the correct form of the Assyrian 'Ushanukhuru' (Leclant LA VI, 166, n.230; Macadam 1949: 124; Dunham Macadam 1949: no 25) recorded on the Sinjirli stela (Luckenbill 1927: 224-227; Leclant LA VI, 182 nn.230-231). There 'Ushanukhuru' is singled out from Taharqo's "other sons and daughters" who were captured by Esarhaddon at Memphis. As such he may have been Taharqo's eldest son. It is often assumed that the figure depicted on the Sinjirli stela is Ushanukhuru (so Weissbach, Unger, Thureau-Dangin, etc) although the uraeus would make Taharqo a more likely subject (so von Luschan in RA 21:188 etc). The two duplicates of the Sinjirli stela from Tell Ahmar/ Til Barsip (Aleppo Museum) carry an almost identical scene.

64. Nesbastetetrud

-390-
Daughter of Akunosh, Chief of the Ma.

The Osiris statue was dedicated by ḫn n bmr n īm n Dieshebsed, daughter of the Mayor of Thebes and Vizier, Ankh-Hor. She names her mother [mwt.s] as the ḫm nsw Nesbastetruđ daughter of the vr n Mswš Akunosh. Yoyotte (1961: 126 no.17, 159-160) suggested that Dieshebsed was the adopted daughter of Nesbastetruđ (cf. the discussion of mwt-relationships in Macadam 1949 Appendix), who was perhaps the wife of a Kushite king. Yoyotte (1961: 161) proposed that Akunosh had married a Kushite, and that the name of one of his other daughters, Takushit [§9], reflected this alliance. Whilst there is no direct evidence for marital alliances between the Kushites and Libyans, the possibility has generally been rather ignored in the literature. Akunosh, Chief of the Ma, was the ruler of Tjeb-neter (Sebennytos), Per-hebyt (Iseopolis) and Sema-behdet (Diospolis Inferior) (see Yoyotte 1961: 159-161; Gomaa 1974: 69-71). In the narrative of the Piye year 21 stela, Akunosh did not join the coalition of Tefnakhte against the Kushites, and paid fealty to Piye at Memphis, along with Iuput and Pediese.

65. Nesishutefnut

Dunham Macadam 1949, omitted.

ẖm ntr 2-nw īm n Ipt swt.

Scribe statue: Cairo CG 42203: Legrain III 11-12, p1.6; Leclant 1957: 171.

Son of Taharqo [88].

The texts of the scribe statue call him the son of the King's chief wife, whose name was erased, presumably in the reign of Psamtik II (Yoyotte 1951: 223 no.64), although the name of Taharqo was left intact.

[ms.n ḫm nsw wrt tpt n īm.f nb [..] im3t wrt ḫwtn t3wy nbt t3wy ( ///// )]

He may have been a full brother of Amenirdis II, if the God's Wife was the king's eldest daughter.

66. Pebatma


ẖm nsw; snt nsw; s3t nsw; mwtn ntr n dw3t ntr; iht n īm n Rc nsw ntrw

Cairo CG 42198, JE 43651 (lower part of seated statue of Amenirdis I): Legrain 1910: 110-113; Legrain 1914: 6; Leclant 1965: 185; Wenig
Abydos stela: Oxford, Ashmolean Mus. E.3922: Randall-MacIver and Mace
1902: 79, 84, 94, 100, pl.XXXI: Schafer 1906a: 50; Munro 1973: 84,
262, Taf.28 Abb.100; Wenig 1990: 335-336.
Stela fragment, Moscow Pushkin Museum, I.I.b.37 (4163): Hodjash and
Berlev 1982: 164-166.

Mother of the Adorer of the God (later God's Wife of Amun) Amenirdis
I (= Amenirdis A [7]), and therefore a wife of Kashta [40]. Also
mother of Ir-pa-ankh-kenkenef [35] and Pekareslo [67]. Possibly
mother of Shabaqo [81].

The name on the Abydos stela (and hence the same on the Pushkin
fragment) is now recognized as that of Pebatma. Dunham and Macadam
assumed a second person was indicated. They believed the second
'Piebtetemery' to be the mother of Amenirdis II and wife of Taharqo
 [= B, 8]; v. Zeissl (1944: 73-74) thought that she was a wife of
Piye.

Her 'beautiful name' Meres-Niput, Hodjash and Berlev (1982: 170)
take to mean "She is loved in Abydos" rather than "She is loved in
Napata" as Schafer (1906a: 50) had thought (in which he was followed
by v.Zeissl 1944: 73 and others). Hodjash and Berlev cite Gauthier
(Dict. I, 69 and surnom no 17) for this as a spelling of Abydos.
They have been followed by Wenig (1990).

If Pebatma was attached to the temple of Amun at Karnak, it would
presumably have been after the death of Kashta. Tôrôk (1992 b)
identifies her with one of the sisters of Alara who were dedicated as
Chantresses at Kawa.

Wenig identifies the Pushkin fragment as the end of the text of
the stela of which the scene survives, discovered at Abydos (now
Oriental Institute of Chicago) of the army chief (mr ms^)
and wr
h3wty P3g3ttrr whose beautiful name is Ir-p3-^nh-^kmnf.

Significantly Pebatma is also a s3t nsw which has far reaching
implications.

She is suggested to have been buried at Abydos, although this
might have been a cenotaph.

67. Pekasreslo (Peksater)

s3t nsw; hmt nsw; hmt nsw wrt; snda ib Hr n-m ddwt.s nbwt

Stela Berlin 4437: Erman 1892: 47-49; Schäfer 1906a: 48-50; Wenig
Stela Bologna 1939: Schafer 1906a; Bresciani 19 : no.31, p.84-85
pls.44-45; Munro 1973: 86, 262, Taf.27, Abb.97; Graefe 1981: 1, 72-
Priese (1968: 176/180) suggests the name should be rendered as the Meroitic Pekareslo.

The stela in Bologna, of a qbbw a hmt nsw wrt (pkrs3li) | Irethorou, Munro (1973: 86, 262) dates not after 630; cults of the 25th Dynasty royal family presumably ended with campaign of Psamtik II.

68. Pelkha
Dunham Macadam 1949, no.55
snt nsw, mwt nsw
Stela of Nastasen, lunette.
Mother of Nastasen [61]. Otherwise unattested.

69. Peltasen
Dunham Macadam 1949, no.56.
s3t nsw; snt nsw
B 700 Pylon relief: Griffith 1929.
Assumed to be daughter of Taharqo [88] and sister of Atlanersa [23] (so Dunham Macadam 1949; Leclant LA VI, 183 n.236) on the evidence of Pylon of B 700. This is the only record of this princess.

70. 'Pihartis'
Dunham Macadam 1949, omitted.

hmt nsw

Nuri 54 (Dunham 1955: 132-134) was attributed by Reisner to a queen named 'Pihartis', temp. Aramatelqo. Dunham (1955: 134) examined one shabti at Oxford (Ashmolean 1922.51) on which he read the name of
'Piankh-her' [74], not 'Pihartis'. Dunham (1955: 262, Fig.206) reproduces Reisner's readings. Dunham tentatively accepted Reisner's reading and tomb attribution, but a close examination of any surviving shabtis is required before this can be confirmed.

71. PIYE

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.61.

Macadam (1949: 120) argued that Piye was the son of Kashta [40] which has been followed by most writers (Dunham and Macadam 1949: 146 no.61; Kitchen 1973 etc.) although questioned by Priese (1981: 51).

72. PIYE-ARITEN

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.57.

As a king known only from the foundation deposit of Nuri 25 (Dunham 1955: 160 fig.120), which is dated 'archaeologically' to ca. gen.14.

73. Piye-Arty

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.58. Troy 1986: 176 (25.12)

snt nsw; [hmt nsw]; hnett n Kmt

Stela of Tanwetamani, the 'Dream Stela' (Cairo...: Grimal 1981b) depicted in the lunette scene.

Probably chief wife of Tanwetamani [91].

Queen Piye-Arty is depicted on the 'Dream Stela' (Grimal 1981b: pl.I) following Tanwetamani [64] when he approaches Amun-Re Lord of Thrones of Two Lands hry ib Ipet-Sut. She is given the titles snt nsw [hmt nsw] hnett n Kmt. The reading of 'king's wife' (hmt nsw) is not absolutely certain, but likely. Lefebvre (1925: 33) suggested that she was the same as Queen Arty [14] the wife of Shebitqo (Dunham Macadam 1949: no.58; but cf.Leclant LA VI, 215 n.40).

74. Piye-her

Dunham Macadam 1949 no.59

hmt nsw

Nuri 57: Dunham 1955: 138-139.
Shabtis, a total of about 200: Dunham 1955: figs.198, 207.
Dunham and Macadam suggested 'Piankh-her' might be "a Napatanized Egyptian name: P3-\(^n\)h-ht, 'the king is pleased' or the like", and that she was a wife of Aramatelqo [16].

75. Piye-\(q\)ew-qa

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.60.

Nuri 29 (Dunham 1955: 180-182) with F.D. tablets (fig.138).

Dunham Macadam suggested a wife of Si-\(\dot{c}\)aspio [84].

76. Qalhata


\textit{snt nsw; \(h\)nwt n T3-Sty; mw\(t\) nsw}

Stela of Tanwetamani, the 'Dream Stela' (Cairo: Grimal 1981b.
Kurru 5 (Dunham 1950: 38-41) with painted decoration (Dunham 1950: pls. IX, X).
Jar-stoppers with the names of Tanwetamani, suggest that she was buried in his reign: 19-2-647, 648: Dunham 1950: 39, 41 fig.12f.
Shabtis: Dunham 1950: pl.XLVII.D.

Probably the mother of Tanwetamani [91] (so Leclant LA VI 212, 215 n.39; LA V 519, n.47), although the evidence is not explicit. If so, she was a wife of Shebitqo [82](so Dunham Macadam 1949: no.63, on the assumption that he was the father of Tanwetamani) or, as accepted here, a wife of Shabaqo [81]. Probably a daughter of Piye [71] and sister of Taharqo [88].

The 'Dream Stela' (scene: Grimal 1981b: pl.I) shows Tanwetamani followed by the \textit{snt nsw, \(h\)nwt n T3-Sty}, Qalhata before the ram-headed Amun-Re of Gebel Barkal, and followed by the \textit{\(snt\) nsw \(h\)nwt n Kat} Piankh-Arty before the human-headed Amun-Re of Ipet-Sut. Qalhata is not called King's mother, which should be expected in an accession inscription. However, comparison with other stelae suggests that the titles and position may indicate that she is his mother. The scene on the Harsiotef stela (Grimal 1981: pl.X) is similarly divided, with Harsiotef and the \textit{mw\(t\) nsw, \(snt\) nsw, \(h\)nwt n K\(\dot{a}\)t\(\dot{a}\)} Atasamalo before the ram-headed Amun-Re of Gebel Barkal, and the \textit{snt nsw \(h\)nwt nsw} Batahaliye before the human-headed Amun-Re of Ipet-Sut. The Madiqen stela (\(\text{Sch}\ddot{a}\ddot{f}er\) 1895) and the Aspelta accession stela (Grimal 1981b: pl.V) both call the king's mother Nasalsa \textit{hnwt n K\(\dot{a}\)t}, although the disposition of the scenes is different. The Nastasen stela, although placing the king's mother before the Amun-Re of Ipet-Sut, gives her the titles \textit{snt nsw, mw\(t\) nsw \(h\)nwt n K\(\dot{a}\)t Pelkha}, and his wife the \textit{\(s\dot{t}\) nsw \(h\)nwt n Kat} Sakhmakh. In sum, these stelae put the king's mother, with title 'Mistress of Kush' before the Amun of Gebel Barkal, and the king's wife with the title 'Mistress of Kush' before the Amun of Ipet-Sut.
Egypt before the Theban Amun. Whilst this does not confirm, it does suggest that Qalhata is appearing on the 'Dream Stela' as Tanwetamani's mother, rather than wife (and mother of a later king). Her burial at Kuru (Dunham 1950: 38-41) contained jar-stoppers with the names of Tanwetamani, suggesting that she was buried in his reign; the painted decoration (Dunham 1950: pls. IX, X) gives her titles as mwt nsw, smt nsw, and her shabtis (Dunham 1950: pl.XLVII.D) mwt nsw.

77. Saka^aye

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.64

mwt nsw

Nuri 31 (Dunham 1955: 199-202) on evidence of remains of ca. 63 shabtis [fig.208].

Dunham Macadam suggested: mother of (presumably) Malowiebamani [49] hence (possibly) wife of Nasakhma [59] or Siaspiqo [84].

78. Sakhmakh

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.65.

s3t nsw (?) hmt nsw

Stela found built into wall of B 551: Khartoum SNM 1853: Dunham 1970: 34 no.23 pl.XXXIV. Stela of Nastasen: Berlin 2268.

Wife of Nastasen [61].

On the stela from Barkal Sakhmakh wears a double-plume crown.

Reisner proposed she was buried in Nuri 56 (Dunham 1955: 250-252).

Dunham Macadam proposed: daughter of a king, perhaps Harsiyotef, but more probably the unnamed king of Kurru 1 (gen 24) since she is not a king's sister. A wife of Nastasen.

79. ....salka

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.66.

B 700 Pylon: Griffith 1929.

Supposed to have been the mother of Atlanersa [23] (Dunham Macadam 1949: no.66; Macadam 1949: 129, 131), a partly preserved cartouche on Pylon B 700 records this queen.
80. SENKAMANISKEN

Dunham Macadam 1949 no.67

Nuri 3 (Dunham 1955: 41-47) with inscribed foundation deposits, and at least 410 serpentine and 867 faience shabtis.
Statue from Barkal: Khartoum SNM 1842: Dunham 1970: 21 no. 7, pl. XIII, XIV.
Statue from Barkal: Richmond, Va., 53-30-2: Dunham 1970: 21 no.8. pl.XV, XVI.
Sphinx from B 501: Khartoum SNM; Dunham 1970: 33 no.18, pl.IV, XXXII; Wenig 1978: 175 no.86. Fragments of a second sphinx.
Headless granite lion found SE of Sanam: LD Text V 285; Waddington and Hanbury 1822: 189.
Fragment of statue base from Barkal, with Horus and Nebty names: 16-4-263: Dunham 1970: 91, 90 fig.56.
Sandstone block from Sanam: Griffith 1922: 101, pl.XI [3].
Granite offering table from Sanam (?): Khartoum SNM 5208: Reisner 1931: 82 no.45.
Added inscription on Atlanersa altar from Barkal.
Completion of B 700.

Reisner (1919b: 250) says Senkamanisken a son or brother of Atlanersa [23]; Dunham Macadam suggested a son of Atlanersa by Malataral I [47: Maletarata].

81. SHABAQO

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.68. Leclant LA V

Shabaqo was the brother of the God's Wife Amenirdis I [11] and therefore a son of Kashta [40] (Leclant LA V, 504 n.3). An inscription from Karnak describes Amenirdis as snt nsw Neferkare [Shabaqo] hmt ntr Amenirdis (Mariette Karnak pl.45d; Macadam 1949: 120).
cf (Leclant LA I 196-199).

82. SHEBITQO

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.69; Leclant LA V

Manethon states that Shebitqo was the son of Shabaqo [81] but Macadam (1949: 124) argued that he was brother of Taharqo [88], and therefore son of Piye [71]. Macadam's arguments have usually been accepted (Kitchen 1973: 383; Leclant LA V, 514, but cf.516 n.2), but Priese (1981: 51 and n.11) again raised a doubt. Priese cited the text naming Shebitqo's wife, Arty [18], which calls her a daughter of Piye, but not a king's sister. It would also be possible, as Macadam
was aware, to read the Kawa inscription V (Macadam 1949: 28 11.13-14) as implying that Taharqo and Shebitqo were not brothers:

I came from Nubia in the company of the Royal Brethren [snw nsw], whom His Majesty had summoned (?) that I might be there with him, since he loved me more than all his brethren and all his children [snw.f nbw r msf.f nbw], and I was preferred to them by His Majesty ...

Kawa IV 11.7-9, however, includes Taharqo amongst the royal brethren, and Macadam used this passage to argue the relationship (Macadam 1949: 15 with nn.14-19):

Now His Majesty [ie Taharqo] had been in Nubia as a goodly youth [...] a king's brother, pleasant of love, and he came north to Thebes in the company of goodly youths whom His Majesty King Shebitqo had sent to fetch from Nubia, in order that he might be there with him, since he loved him more than all his brethren ...

Macadam (1949: 17 n.19) commented that if "we understand by r snw.f nbw all Shebitku's other [his emphasis] brethren, a sense which is quite in accordance with Egyptian usage, then it is clear that Taharqa was Shebitku's brother. That sense, however, might not have been intended, but when it is remembered in addition that in 1.7 Taharqa is called a 'king's brother', and that he was travelling to Egypt with the other 'king's brothers', the evidence is seen to be fairly conclusive that they were all brothers of Shebitku."

The Abydos coffin fragments of Istemkheb [36] daughter of Shabaqo are also significant. As smt snw she must be sister of either Shebitqo or Tanwetamani. Leahy, preferred a slightly earlier date, on the grounds that Tanwetamani's reign in Upper Egypt was brief; although it is possible that Istemkheb was married to one of the Libyan dynasts - and hence would have remained in Egypt. Assuming that smt snw indicates 'sister' rather than a very broad relationship, the coffin fragments do add further weight to the theory that Shabaqo was father of at least one other king.

83. Shepenwepet

Dunham Macadam 1949, omitted. Troy 1986 177-178 (GW.5) LA

The God's Wife of Amun, Shepenwepet II. Many inscriptions call her daughter of Piye [71] (eg CG 42200: Legrain 1914: 9, p1.VIII). Her mother was a hmt nswt wrt. This was recorded on a black granite box from Medinet Habu (Hölscher 1954: p1.20 E-F) where the inscriptions on the side (Hölscher 1954: p1.20 F) carried three cartouches: the first of the hmt ntr Shepenwepet, the second erased, but with the title smt nsw, presumably carried the name of Piye. The last cartouche, also erased, was preceded by one full column and a part, of titles: mwt.s hmt nsw wrt [.....] [....] (////////), possibly for Pekareslo. If Shepenwepet II were indeed daughter of Pekareslo she would have been niece of Amenirdis I irrespective of whether Piye was son of Kashta or not. In addition to the ancient erasures, the surface of the box had suffered from natural erosion, and although examined at Medinet Habu in 1992 and
1993, the texts had suffered since Hölsher's photograph was taken and no traces of the name could be distinguished.

Statue Cairo 59780: Hölsher 1954 pl.20 B-C, from Medinet Habu.

The building works of Shepenwepet II at Karnak give an indication of her floruit. The chapel of Osiris-Nebankh [Osiris pa-wesheb-idad] (Leclant 1965: 23-36 [9]) was built with Taharqo, as was the chapel of Osiris-pade-ankh (Leclant 1965: 99-105 [28]) west of the gate of Thutmose I. The chapel of Osiris-Wennofer-within-the-persea [hry ib p3 isd] (Leclant 1965: 41-47 [11]) was built by Shepenwepet II, but names no king. A statue of Shepenwepet's steward, Akhamenrou (Cairo JdE 37346: Lichtheim 1948; Leclant 1954: 155-6, pl.III, Vc; Graefe 1981), carries the cartouche of Tanwetamani. Her leading role in the events recorded by the Nitoqert Adoption Stela confirms that she was alive in year 9 of Psamtik I. An inscription in the Wadi Gasus depicts Psamtik I followed by Nitoqert and Shepenwepet (Schweinfurth 1885: Taf.I), but the text is undated and hence gives no suggestion of how long into Psamtik's reign Shepenwepet lived. Here she is accorded the title 'God's Wife' and Nitoqert (who takes precedence) that of 'Adorer of the God' suggesting that the depiction is contemporary, not posthumous. Shepenwepet is again described as the mother of Nitoqert, and the omission of Amenirdis II may confirm that she had, as suggested above, returned to Napata. The scenes on the Taweret shrine of Pabasa (Cairo CG 70027: Roeder) and statue Cairo CG 39145 depicting Shepenwepet and Nitoqert, again give precedence to Nitoqert, but, as Lichtheim (1948) argued, this is probably a posthumous representation of Shepenwepet.

The earliest record of Shepenwepet II is an Osiris statue at Leningrad (Hermitage 220: Lieblein 1873: 6-11 no.6; Leclant 1965, 165 [D.11]; Wild 1963: 134-136 pl.xv; Graefe 1981). Shepenwepet I, Amenirdis I and Shepenwepet II are all named in the inscriptions, with their official parentage. The statue was dedicated by an official of Shepenwepet I named Nesikhons, perhaps at the time of her burial. The son of Nesikhons is mentioned, and was an official of Amenirdis I. A second Osiris statue belongs to the same officials (Geneva 19719: Wild 1963: 136-140). The naming of the three votaresses on one monument strongly suggests that Shepenwepet II was already installed at Thebes as the eventual successor, in the lifetime of Shepenwepet I. The disposition of the texts can perhaps be understood as indicating that Shepenwepet I was already dead when the statue was dedicated, but in this case it is most likely a funerary monument (Leclant 1965: 163 discusses the large number of Osiris statues from Medinet Habu). The Nitoqert Adoption Stela (11.15-17: Caminos 1964: 75) similarly implies that Shepenwepet was installed by Piye: "[Shepenwepet] ... made over to her [Nitoqert] the testament which her [Shepenwepet's] father [i.e. Piye] and her mother [presumably Amenirdis I] had executed for her...".

Shepenwepet II was herself buried at Medinet Habu, the chapel being extended for Nitoqert and Nitoqert's natural mother, Mehyytenweskhet (Hölsher 1954: 23-28 pl.13-16). Fragments of her
funerary equipment, including shabtis, are known (Hölscher 1954: p1.20, 21 D-E, G-H).

84. SI^ASPIQO

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.70.

Granite stela from chapel: Khartoum SNM 1858: Dunham 1955: p.268, fig.212.
Libation jar: Khartoum SNM 1861 = ? same as "offering stands" Dunham 1955: 177, 179 fig.135.
Heart-scarab: 17-4-142: Dunham 1955: fig. 134.
Offering table from Nuri 100: Dunham 1955: fig. 135.


85. Tabekenamun

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.71. Troy 1986: 176 (25.8)

... Hwt-Hr nbt Tp-ht [tp-k3]; hm (sic) ntr Hwt-Hr nb (sic) lwnt; Nt hmt ntr; hawt t3wy; s3t nsw; hmt nsw; snt nsw; im3wy Hwt-Hr.

Probably wife of Shabaqo [81]; ?? mother of Haremakhet [29].

Known from the statue of Haremakhet [29] son of Shabaqo [81] (Cairo JE 49157: Lefebvre 1925; Leclant 1965: 334 n.1; 117 [32 D,2]) which gives her titles as 'Priestess of Hathor of Aphroditopolis, Priestess of Hathor of Dendera, Priestess of Neith, s3t nsw snt nsw hmt nsw'. Lefebvre understood the text as indicating that Tabekenamun was the mother of Haremakhet (and therefore a wife of Shabaqo), but the sarcophagus names his mother as Mesbat [40]. Dunham and Macadam suggested that Tabakenamun was daughter of Piye [71] and perhaps a wife of Taharqo [88], in which they are followed by Leclant (LA VI, 166) and Troy.

Tabekenamun is a purely Egyptian name, as was typical of a number of Shabaqo's relatives. If this woman is to be identified with Haremakhet's mother it is perhaps possible that here we have the Queen's adopted Egyptian name. She may, of course, be an Egyptian princess, daughter and sister of Delta dynasts, as may be suggested by her religious titles, not noted for many other Kushite queens.

86. Tabiry

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.72. Troy 1986: 176 [25.6].
Stela from Kurru 53: Khartoum SNM 1901: Dunham 1950: 87 19-3-1366, p.90 fig.29f, pl.XXX.A.


She was probably buried in Kurru 53 (Dunham 1950: 86-90) from where the stela was recovered. Her title 'hmtnsw c3t tpt' is attested otherwise only for Nefertiti (18th Dynasty). Her name is written without a cartouche.

Macadam (1949 123) said that the name 'Tabiry' "appears to mean 'the Blemmye woman'."

87. Tagtal

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.73.

Nuri 45 (Dunham 1955: 149-150) with shabtis (18-4-542: Dunham 1955: 150, fig. 208, pl.CXLII).

hmtnsw followed by a corrupt writing perhaps of rmt Kmt.

The name is written in a cartouche.

Wife of Malonaqen (?) [46] (so Dunham Macadam)

88. TAHARQO

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.74. LA VI.

That Taharqo was a son of Piye [71] is fairly certain from his being described as brother of Shepenwepet II [83] on the Nitoqert Adoption Stela. Son of Abar [1] and great-nephew of Alara [5].

89. Taknshit


Daughter of Akunosh, Chief of the Ma.

Yoyotte (1961: 160-161, and n.5) suggested that the name meant "the Kushite", and that this princess was the daughter of the Libyan dynast by a Kushite. Akunosh, Chief of the Ma, was ruler of Tjebnet (Sebennytos), Per-hebyt (Iseopolis) and Sema-behdet (Diospolis Inferior) (Yoyotte 1961: 159-161; Gomaa 1974: 69-71) [see under Nesbastetrud [64] above], and is named in the Piye stela.
90. TALAKHAMANI

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.75.

Kawa IX 11.3-5.

Referred to Kawa IX as predecessor of Irike-Amanote [34], and as a successor (perhaps immediate) of Malowiebamani [49].

91. TANWETAMANI

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.76. LA VI.

Macadam (1949: 124-125), largely on the basis of his own theories of the royal succession, argued in favour of Tanwetamani's being a son of Shebitqo [81]. This was contrary to the evidence of the Rassam cylinder text of Assurbanipal (Luckenbill 1927: 295), which states that 'Tarku' was succeeded by 'Tandamane, son of Shabaku'. Most scholars following Macadam, as Kitchen (1973: 150) noted, 'prefer — perhaps correctly — to take the Assyrian "Shabaku" as intended (or an error) for Shebitku' (cf. Leclant LA VI 213 n.5). Leahy (198.) has argued in favour of following the Rassam cylinder text and regarding Tanwetamani as son of Shabaqo. Three other Assyrian texts (Luckenbill 1927: 366, 405) record the death of Taharqo and describe his successor as 'Tandamane son of his (ie Tarku's) sister' and as 'Tandamane son of the sister of Tarku'. The evidence is explicit in this case, that Tanwetamani's mother, probably Queen Qalhata [76], was the sister of Taharqo [88] and therefore a daughter of Piye [71].

92. Tekahatamani (Dukhatamun)


rt-p^t; bnt mrwt; wrt hswt; hswt nbwt; nbwt im3t; nbt nsw; ḫmt nsw mrwt.f; ḫmt nsw wrt tpt n ḫm.f; ḫmwt rsy mhw; nbtt t3wy.

Barkal temple 300: Lepsius V Bl.5; Gauthier IV, 41, XLII; Leclant LA VI, 182 n.225.

Wife of Taharqo [88].

In the scene in B 300 she follows Taharqo, a parallel to the that in which he is accompanied by his mother.

Reisner proposed Nuri 21 was her tomb, which he had dated archaeologically to the reign of Senkamanisken. There is no evidence to support this idea (Dunham 1955: 63-67).
93. Udjarenes


It is uncertain whether Udjarenes was still alive in year 9 of Psamtik I. Although named on the Nitoqert Adoption Stela as giver of donations to the newly installed Nitoqert, she is described as m3 hrw (Caminos 1964: 75, l.22 with comments p..). Monthuemhat was alive in year 14 of Psamtik I, but dead by year 17 (Bierbrier 1975: 105)

94. Weterik

Dunham Macadam 1949, no.78.

s3 nsw

Meroe South 20 (Dunham 1963: 399) with sandstone offering table (20-4-60: fig.221 H.).

Dunham Macadam 1949 read the name "Weterik (?)", but Dunham 1963 comments that the title is "followed by an illegible name".
NOTES

1 Introduction: history and historiography.


2. Weber 1909 and M. Rostovtzeff, Social and economic history of the Roman empire (1926) and Social and economic history of the Hellenistic world (1941). Rostovtzeff was amongst the first to include a discussion of Meroe (see Török 1984: n 1).


4. Johnson 1936; Préaux 1939.


6. The tendency to separate archaeology from history (in Egyptology) is noted by Redford 1979: 3-6. Recent years have also seen, for a number of reasons, the separation of 'oriental' history from that of the Greek, Hellenistic and Roman worlds (cf Momigliano 1966: 57).

7. Women's history has received considerable attention, even within Egyptology. There is considerable debate about whether 'gay', as opposed to 'homosexual' history exists; see David M. Halperin One hundred years of homosexuality, New York and London 1990; Martin Bauml Duberman, Martha Vicinus and George Chauncey (eds) Hidden from history: reclaiming the gay and lesbian past, Harmondsworth 1991.


9. Kendall's paper contained many ideas that might usefully have been pursued, but the paper seems never to have been referred to, perhaps because much of it tended to be anecdotal and the conclusions simplistic: similarities do not necessarily indicate connections. Two examples will suffice. Kendall attempted to identify the Kunakephaloi and other peoples of classical literature with real African peoples, and cites intermediate (Arab and early colonial) writers who say similar things. There is no serious textual criticism, either of the classical sources or of the later writers. Classical influence on perception of early Arab and European travellers cannot be ignored (the Travels of Sir John Mandeville, provide a good example). Kendall suggests that the "astonishing parallels" between a Jo Luo tale and one (of Egyptian origin) in Herodotos are due to its having been taken to Sudan by the Asmachoi.

10. Macadam 1955:79, pl XIV b, XIII a; pl LIVa (drum) b (trumpet).

11. see eg studies noted by Kerman 1985: 171.


13. see now Edwards nd.

14. Adams 1977: 330, "it seems unlikely that [pastoralists] made much of a contribution to the social or economic life of the Kushite empire". Adams - it seems to me - persistently underemphasises the role of cattle in Nubian culture. He talks about the Nubians 'aspiring' to be cattle herders in the A (p 126) and C (p 152-154) phases.

Shaw et al 1993, on Ethiopia.
18. The exhibition 'Africa in Antiquity' (Wenig 1978) totally excluded New Kingdom objects and only one paper (Leclant 1978) in the accompanying essays volume discussed Old, Middle and New Kingdom Egyptian activities. The purpose there was to emphasise the indigenous over the Egyptian, but similar problems occur in other literature. Adams 1977 is totally inadequate as a discussion of Viceregal Nubia - which is one of the richest of Nubian phases in terms of archaeology and 'historical' records. Trigger 1976 is one of the few which successfully balances the Egyptian and Kushite elements. I would also observe that the Nubian Conferences have, so-far, avoided the viceregal period.
19. Trigger et al is one of few general Egyptological studies which adequately considers the importance of Nubia to Egypt.
20. Robins 1983 was rigorous in its analysis of one particular piece of Received Knowledge, although the 'heiress-theory' is still accepted in some literature.
24. see Kohl 1987.
25. Although it persisted into the 1960ies.
27. Diop, writing in French, used the word 'nègre'. The 1974 UNESCO symposium on the subject (General history of Africa II. Ancient civilizations of Africa: especially 74-75) failed to reach any consensus on the definition, and there is still no agreement on the definition of 'black' in this context.
31. Adams' "corridor" was reduced to a "cul de sac" by John Alexander, 'The Saharan divide in the Nile valley: the evidence from Qasr Ibrim', African Archaeological Review 6, 73-90.
32. Adams cf conclusion below.

2 Dominating Nubia.
2. Smith and Smith 1976: 67; see also Buhlen stela Smith 1976: 8-9
5. There is a strong possibility that the Hyksos rulers were supplying Western Asia with 'luxuries' acquired from Kush.
7. Baines 1986, 41 suggests the events could belong to the reign of Seqenenre Ta'a II, although, as yet, there is no other evidence that aggression against the Kushite kingdom began that early. The possibility should, however, be remembered.
14. Gunn 1929 see also comments of Säve-Söderbergh 1949: 57-58; and of Baines 1986: 44 on this difficult text.
17. Urk IV, 8-9.
21. Sai had itself been an important centre of the Kerma culture.
23. see Säve-Söderbergh 1941: 146-151.
24. Dated year 2, 2 Akhet, day 15.
26. see Urk IV, 8-9; Säve-Söderbergh 1941: 147; Cerny 1966.
27. see Urk IV, 138.16-139.1; Säve-Söderbergh 1941: 149-150. Breasted (1908: 45) noted a 'brick stronghold' at the south end of the island. The site has recently been re-examined see Edwards and Ali Osman 1992: 28 (Gezira Dabaki). Goedicke 1974 discusses the reference in this text to the "inverted water" usually understood to be the Euphrates, but interpreted by him to be the 2nd Cataract.
29. Urk. IV 138f; Säve-Söderbergh 1941: 151.
30. Habachi 1957b; 99-104.
31. TT 71, PM I.12, 140 (2); Urk IV 399, 2, 6.
32. Habachi 1957b: 104.
34. Naville 1908: p1 165.
36. Säve-Söderbergh 1941: 207 ff with Abb 16, handcopy and translation after Breasted 1908.
37. Urk IV 1248-1249.
38. Mond and Myers 1940: 8 ff., p1 88; Urk IV 1243-1247.
41. Formerly read as year 15 after Breasted 1908: 105.
43. Kemp 1978: 290 n 68.
44. The Punt expedition of Hatshepsut appears to have been the first in 18th Dynasty, see Kitchen in LA IV: 1198-1201; Liverani 1990: 240-246.
45. Years 33 and 38, Urk IV 702, 4-7; 720, 6-7.
47. Probably in the reign of Horemheb, Urk IV 2127/2128. Last attested expedition in the reign of Ramesses III, pHarris I, 77,8-78,1; BAR IV 407.
52. see notably the works of Fattovich 1989; 1990; 1991 and Sadr 1987; 1990.
53. M. Serpico personal communication.
55. Arkell 1950; Vercoutter 1956: 68 ff (no.4).
56. Stela Boston MFA 23.733; Reisner and Reisner 1933a; Dunham 1970, 25 (2); text Urk IV, 1227-1243.
57. Amada and Elephantine stelae: Urk IV 1297-1298; Säve-Söderbergh 1941: 155-156.
58. BAR II 799 see Manuelian 1987: 94 and n.233; Säve-Söderbergh 1946: 6 n.1 connects this inscription with the campaign of year 47 of Thutmose III, as did Gardiner 1947: 150*-151* and 176*. On Minmose see Manuelian 1987: 136-137, 164-166.
59. Shorter 1931; cf Edwards 1939a: 8-9, pl 9 a stela of a 1st prophet of Inheret, who followed the king "from Naharin to Karoy".
60. The so-called "marriage" scarab.
63. The text states "those who were carrying chariots, 50 men": Caminos 1968: 67. All the 'tribute', even cattle, is cited in man-loads, making interpretation difficult.
64. See below Chapter 5 and Appendix 1.
65. If correct, the implication must be that the Egyptians were giving chariots, and presumably horses, as part of the gift-exchange system; see further below Chapter 2 and 5.
66. Reisner 1920a: 32: 19 monuments of Usersatet are presently known from Thebes, Silsila, Aswan, the 2nd Cataract forts, Sai and Amara.
68. Urk IV, 1545.14-1546.3; Save-Soderbergh 1941: 156.
70. Säve-Söderbergh 1941; Dehler 1984.
71. Topozada 1988; see also comments of Kozloff, Bryan and Berman 1992: 63 n 22.
72. The scarab will be published by L. Török in his forthcoming report on the Garstang excavations at Meroe. My thanks to Dr. Török for his information on this object.
76. Philadelphia E.16022 A and B; see now Smith 1976: 125, pl. LXXV, 3, 4.
77. Sandman 1938: 146; Gauthier 1910: 122–123.
80. Davies 1905a: pl.XXXVII–XXXVIII.
81. On the temple of Tutankhamun at Karnak see Eaton-Krauss 1988 and pp. 5–6 for the Nubian war scene. Only a few of the Karnak blocks have been published: Legrain 1929: 135 fig 87 shows a Kushite crushed by the wheels of the king's chariot, whilst a soldier stoops to sever his hand; Leclant 1954: pl xiv fig 4 shows a group of captives led by the king to the presence of Amun. The Nubian scene is being studied and published by M. Gabolde, and the complementary Asiatic scene by W.R. Johnson. My sincere thanks to both for their information, and to W.R. Johnson for a copy of his reconstruction of the whole Nubian scene, and photographs of the blocks.
82. Illustrated in Desroches-Noblecourt 1964: pl XVIIa.
84. This was suggested to me by both W.R. Johnson and C.E. Loeben independently.
85. Schulman 1964: 124; 1965: 61–66. Schulman confuses the contemporary of Tutankhamun with the hry pdt of the reign of Ramesses II.
90. Caminos 1968: 83–90 with full bibliography, pl 39–40. The inscription, sawn into into pieces now lies at New Kalabsha. See also comment of Caminos p. 86 sub commentary on lines 2–3 for attribution to this expedition.
91. Spalinger 1979a; 1980.
94. on Amenemopet see Spalinger 1979a: 271–286.
95. see below pp 89–90, 124–126.
99. see however below p. 67 (with n 105) on this family, and note the possibility that this document is not a "real" letter.
105. LD III: 200f; Petrie 1888: pl 11, (70); Habachi 1957a: 33,
3 The political geography of New Kingdom Nubia.

1. Colombot nd My thanks to Mme Colombot for giving me copies of her papers.
5. Davies and Gardiner 1926: pl VI.
7. Reisner and Reisner 1933b: 26 1,2, a hnw n nhh.
8. A ramesside (?) statue of an idmw of Kush, found at Kawa, has a text referring to Amun-Re Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands hry nb Dw w®b: Macadam 1949: 84 (Inscr.XXII) pl 36; 1955: pl.LXXII [0895].
12. See Chap 5 below: it may not necessarily be a relevant factor.
13. The debate on Meroitic North and South was opened by Adams in his controversial paper of 1976, which, with responses, was published as Meroitica 2. The debate continues, notably with the contributions of Török (eg 1987).
18. Many quite sizeable and well-decorated temples can be found associated with mining or quarrying sites eg at Serabit el-Khadim, Timna, Wadi Mia.
19. The inscription of Taharqo from Sanam temple [Griffith 1922: 102-103] seems to refer to the removal of sculptures from Sai. A fragment of a throne of a seated statue carries a recarved cartouche with the name of Piye [Griffith 1922: 87, pl XIII.3, pl XV.1]. The 'Prudhoe' lions were also moved at this time.
21. The re-use of talatat noted by Reisner suggests that Horemheb may have begun the work. The stela of Sety I (Reisner and
Reisner 1933b) must indicate construction was well advanced.

22. No Napatan officials of New Kingdom date are so-far documented and the scenes in the tomb of Huy indicate that Soleb and Faras were the major centres. T. Kendall informs me that there are graffiti at Barkal, but these are unpublished, and no further details are available.

23. Griffith 1922; and below Chapter 8.

24. LD Text V: 286.


27. See below p 86, for an alternative interpretation of Kawa's role.


33. Kemp 1978: 290 n 68.

34. Powis 1984: 63-69, discusses the potential for power conflict between aristocracies and the state (in a European context), and the role of aristocracies as leaders of the community against the power of the state, but only under certain circumstances.


37. Urk IV 709.

38. Davies and Gardiner 1926.


40. Fakhry 1935.

41. Simpson 1963: 2-18, 24-27; Gardiner and Davies 1926:


43. Urk IV 139, 4-6.

44. see below pp 70-71.


4 Ruling Nubia: the Viceregal administration.

The Egyptian elite


4. eg the numerous articles of Habachi.


7. eg Smith 1976.


9. Complete lists have been published by Schmitz (1976) and LA.
The fundamental works of Habachi have discussed various periods.


11. Such as Amenhotep Chief Steward of Memphis (is discussed in Morkot 1990); Ockinga, al-Masri 1988: 13, whilst recognising his elite background comment that Anhurmose's family background was "not a particularly exalted one" and "there is some justification for seeing him as a self-made man".

12. This is an old idea which still has currency; see Gardiner 1961: 223-224; Aldred 1957 argued against.


14. There seems to be no complete study of this subject.

15. Some writers have interpreted the large number of titles as the stages of the cursus; cf Reisner 1920a and the publications of many Theban tombs.


18. Janssen 1992: 314 comments on the view of some Egyptologists that there was, in the New Kingdom, a conflict of interests between a "progressive" army and "conservative" bureaucracy. Many earlier scholars regarded the temples as a powerful institution separate from the state.


23. In various versions see Lichtheim 1976: 167-178; Caminos 1954: 50-56 (8), 83-85 (3), 91-99 (6-7) etc.


26. eg Smith 1981: 340 fig.327 (Horemheb).

27. see Wilson 1951: 187-188.


29. Powis 1984: 10, 64, 66 also notes the distinction made between 'plebeian' and 'noble' forms of execution.


31. Rekhmire, TT 100, PM I.2: 209 (5).

32. eg Kenamun, TT 93 PM I.1 190-194 (9).

33. eg Khaemhat TT 57 (LD III:76) and Kheruef.

34. Davies 1941: pl XXXIV Ramose (prostration). This scene seems to be the earliest depiction of the Window of Appearances. At Amarna the scale of the figures changes.

35. Luxor temple and TT 57 (Khaemhat), Smith 1981: 266 fig 260.

36. There are, of course, exceptions to change in decoration; or continuation of reward scenes, eg Neferhotep.

37. The 'Harim conspiracy' papyrus [BAR IV: 208-221] and the 'Steile der Verbannten' [v. Beckerath 1968] perhaps give some indications, but there are no third-party sources as for (eg) Achaemenid Persia or Imperial Rome.

described in the Amada inscription of Merneptah.

41. The lengthy genealogies from this period (reconstructed by Kitchen 1973; Bierbrier 1975 etc) might reflect Libyan traditions, which would have been oral, see Leahy 1985.
42. Moller 1918.
43. The fragmentary genealogies preserved in the Karnak Priestly Annals and other inscriptions in those temples (eg Jacquet-Gordon 1979). An inscription on the roof of the Akh-Menu [LD III 255; BAR IV: 374-375 752-754] records a claim (the nature of which is not entirely certain) by the w^b-priest Harsiese, to the High Priest and Crown Prince Osorkon in year 11 of Takeloth II "I am the k-priest of Ipt-sw.t, I am the son of the great prophets of Amun through my mother (s3 n hm.w ntr s3n Imn hr nwt). This man was presumably a grandson of the High Priest and King Harsiese, hence descended from the 21st Dynasty.
44. Powis 1984: 15.
46. Habachi 1959.
47. Caminos and James 1963: no 17.
50. Surer (Säve-Söderbergh 1957); Kheruef; also Amenhotep, Steward of Memphis see Morkot 1990.
51. Most recently, Brack 1984.
52. Robins 1983.

The career structure

55. Urk IV: 1935 (725).
57. The well-documented family of Rekhmire, for example, held the vizierate for three generations, but most of the family were 'minor' office-holders.
59. Janssen and Janssen 1990: 67-89 on education, 72, 74 on age at which it commenced.
60. Schulman 1963.
63. Kees 1937: 86.

The development and structure of the viceregal bureaucracy

64. For the Nubian kingdom of the Second Intermediate Period see Säve-Söderbergh 1949; 1956; Vandersleyen 1971: 51-52. For the issue of acculturation or Egyptianization in the Second Intermediate Period see Säve-Söderbergh (ms) cited in Frandsen 1979: 183 n.13.

Save-Soderbergh 1956.


For an example see Lorton 1974: 147-148 (AP no.2).


The first s3 nsw n Ks was Amenhotep, who served Thutmose IV. Various reasons have been suggested for the change in the title see eg Reisner 1920a: 32.

On this title see Pomorska 1988.

Israelit-Groll 1983.

Vallogia 1976.


Who dedicated ST 11 E (Caminos 1974: I 34) on behalf of his father.

ST 11 S (Caminos 1974: I 34-35) and probably the ex voto ST 16 N (Caminos 1974: I 46-47) dated to this reign, but without year. The titles indicate before Hori's elevation to the rank of Viceroy.

The officials of the administration

The Viceroys


See below pp 197-200.

Davies and Gardiner 1926: 10-13, pls IV-VIII.

Davies and Gardiner 1926: 11 n 2.

Davies and Gardiner 1926: pl XIII, pl XXXIX.6, p 17.

Davies and Gardiner 1926: pl XI.

Davies and Gardiner 1926: pl XII-XV.

PM VII: 98 (9); Säve-Söderbergh 1941: 242 n 2. Rekhpaphtef, who is named in the Abu Simbel graffito, also left an inscription at Buhen, ST 3 (Caminos 1974: 19-20).


ST 35 E: Caminos 1974: I 75-76.

ST Col 14 E: Caminos 1974: I 42.

De Morgan: 84 (3); Habachi 1957a: 34-35 (37).


Kadry 1982: 10. Turo was tsw n Bhn, but later Viceroys used epithets such as hm n hm.f/nswt.

Wentawat was hm ntr tpy n Imn-m-R'sas.s and hm ntr tpy n Imn-hmnt-W3st (usually equated with the Ramesseum, although perhaps Amara West see p 89 (with n 113).

From a literal reading of the tomb scene Davies and Gardiner 1926: 26, pl XXIII (from Lepsius).

Davies 1941: pl XXVII: whether the Viceroy (unnamed, but probably at this time Dhotmose) was actually present at Ramose's funeral is irrelevant. He, along with three other officials form a group, followed by the "Companions" and
"Chiefs of the city". These three are the 1st Royal Herald, the Overseer of the Treasury and the 2nd Royal Herald.

**Family and previous careers of Viceroy**

96. Silsila Shrine 11: Caminos and James 1963: 30-34 pl 25; statue from Deir el-Medina: Urk IV 1487-1489 (462).

97. Caminos and James 1963: 30-34.

98. The relationships between the various individuals represented in the Shrine is not clear. The statues depicted Wesersatet and his mother, with the Overseer of the King's Apartments, Senynufe, and his wife Hatshepsut and the Great Nurse and Fosterer of the King, Hentowe. Reliefs depicted the Prophet of Khnum, the High Priest of Harwer and Sobek, and the son of the High Priest of Nekhbet. These three could be local dignitaries, or relatives, or both.

99. Note, eg the s3b Heby, father of both the Vizier Ramose and of Amenhotep Chief Steward of Memphis who was actually Mayor of Memphis see Morkot 1990. On this family also see the comments of Kozloff, Bryan, Berman 1992: 54-55, 65 n.115.

100. On the stela from Buhen, BM 623: Urk IV 1486-1487 (460), Usersatet is called i3my-r pr M's-Tm.

101. Huy 1 is given the title wpwty nsw in his tomb.

102. Stated in the autobiographical inscription.

103. Hori is attested in this capacity before his appointment as Viceroy.

104. For Nehi, 27 monuments are known; a son is named, but there is no mention of his wife.

105. see Reisner 1920a: 41, 45-46; Gauthier 1936; KRI III, 74-76; for their connection with the High Priests of Anhur see Bryan 1986.

106. Habachi 1967: 124, 134, 137 discussed this woman and speculated that she was related to Ramesses II. She might be the same as the sister of the Chief of the Madjoy, Amenemone. The Naples monument of that official (see preceding n) named a sister who was married to the Steward of Amun, the office held by Setau before his appointment as Viceroy.


108. The el Kab chapel was published by Derchain 1971, Taf.28-30.

109. The name at occurs at el Kab, where a High Priest of Nekhbet was buried in the reign of Ramesses III (on his family see Bierbrier 1975: 11-12, 17-18). It also occurs at Thebes, in one instance, a stela of the reign of Amenhotep III, with dual dedications to Nekhbet and Amun.

110. TT 289 PM; some of the funerary equipment see Habachi 1976: 113-114; the sarcophagus, now BM EA78, Bierbrier 1982: 20, pl.42-43.

111. Davies and Gardiner 1926: 7; Macadam 1949: 4; Bell 1985a: 43 n 8.

112. The offering bowl and blocks from a chapel at Faras, Karkowski 1981: 130-136 (74-79), 89-90 (8), were dedicated by Taemwadjsy. A stela from Sebua was dedicated by Mutnofret: Habachi 1960: 47-48, 49 Fig.3.

113. Shabtis from tombs SA 37 and S 57 at Aniba, Steindorff 1937:
78, 85, carry different titles to those of Huy's wife.
114. Davies and Gardiner 1926: p1.XV.
115. However, we know nothing of the family of Amenhotep III's viceroy, despite a large number of surviving monuments.
116. PM VII: 89; KRI IV 166d.
117. eg Webekhsenu son of Hori.
118. eg Amenemopet son of Paser 1.
121. Gauthier 1928; Habachi 1957c: 100.
123. Three female relatives of the Viceroy were chantresses of Wepwawet, recorded on stela BM 792: Bierbrier 1982: 20-21 (2).
124. Messuy, tomb SA 36 jamb faience plaque; note also shabti from cemetery 152 at Wadi es-Sebua: Emery and Kirwan 1935: 103-104; Sety, tomb SA 34, 23 shabtis.

The Chief of Bowmen of Kush

127. Davies and Gardiner 1926: 18 and fig 3; Bell 1985a: 43 n 8.
128. It should be noted that a similar juxtaposition of titles occurs on two statues of a Chief of Bowmen and Overseer of the Northern Lands, also called Khaemwaset, excavated at Tell Basta, and dating from the reign of Amenhotep III (Habachi 1957c). These name the official's (presumed) wives as a Chantress of Bastet, and as a Chantress of Sakhmet, Songstress of Bastet and Chief of the Harim of Bastet. The implication is that the two women bore important titles in Bubastis irrespective of their husband's non-priestly function.
129. The most economical interpretation of the evidence.
130. BAR IV: 208-221.
131. Breastved noted that the text reads literally "in Nubia", a rendering "against the usual custom".
132. Caminos 1974: 43, 3y yv hr wnmy nswt, hry pdt n k3s nsw imy-r pr wr imy r ipt Sth hm mtr hwr wr Imn-R'[?] Bekenset son of Penwepwawet. Caminos observes that the text could have been carved before, or after the frieze of Ramesses III's cartouches. The official is depicted in the act of adoration, and the cartouches (or, less likely, the figure,) of a king would have filled the now destroyed area.

The Overseers of Southern Foreign Lands

134. PM VII: 376-380, Ramessesuserkhepes.
135. PM VII: 380-381.
The idnw

136. Burials of idnw are known from Aniba and Soleb. Door jambs with the name of the idnw n Ks Paser (temp Ramesses III) and of the idnw Sebakbau were found at Amara: Fairman 1948: 9, Pls.V.I, VI.4.
137. PM VII: 91 (d-e); Reisner 1920: (8f).
139. PM VII: 76-77; Steindorff 1937: 242-245.

The indigenous elites

140. Frandsen 1979: 169, commented that at "all levels of the administration the majority of the officials seem to have been Egyptians". Trigger 1976: 207 commentary to plate 50, on the contrary, suggests that many 'Egyptian' officials might actually have been indigenous Nubians.
141. Chapter 3.
142. see below pp 101-102.
144. Reeves 1990: 140-147.
145. Reeves 1990: 146 discussed the dating and the various interpretations of earlier writers. Steindorff considered Maiberpri to have been a contemporary of Thutmose I, Daressy of Hatshepsut, and Quibell of Thutmose III, whilst Maspero suggested he was a son of Thutmose III and "a negro princess" although later he ascribed paternity to Thutmose IV.
148. eg Helck 1958: 152.
149. For example, Paheqamen Benja is thought to be an "Asiatic", see Guksch 1978: 43-44. His parents were names irtin-n3 and ta-rw-k3k, suggested by Guksch to be "hethitischen und hurritischen" or "subaraische" (Mitanni). Benja was a hrn n k3p, imi-r k3wt, imi-r h.m.t n.t nb t3wy, imi-r sq3w-tjw.
151. Now Ashmolean Museum. M.Gabolde (pers comm) suggests that this may actually be the Viceroy Huy 1.
152. TT 64 (Heqaroneheh) PM I.2: 128-129.
154. PM VII: 325 (30).
155. In the Wadi Hamid, see Damiano-Appia 1992: 4-6.
156. Frandsen 1979: 179.
159. Davies and Gardiner 1926:
160. Frandsen 1979:
161. Mery a Kushite see below p 172 n 16. Also the ostracon [New York MMA 14.6.191] depicting a priest (?) Pay and his Nubian wife, Meretseger.
5 Exploiting Nubia? the economy.

6. The Graeco-Roman period is an entirely different issue with a number of studies eg Johnson 1936; Préaux 1939 and more recent works.
7. For example Finlay 1985; Lipinski ed 1979.
8. Helck 1960 but see comments of Janssen 1975b: 5
12. As, for example, Katary 1989.
13. as in discussions of the journeys of Sabni, Harkhuf see O'Connor 1986.
15. Such at least is the impression given by, for example, Breasted 1924: 537, and the idea that Nubia slowly awakened, cf. Adams quoted in the conclusion below.

Geography and ecology.

31. Most recently Helck 1986, with abundant references to earlier discussions.
34. Adams 1976 with discussions; Török 1987 particularly 154-156, 159-162, 168-175;
35. Trigger 1965: 152.
38. Burckhardt 1819: 11.
40. PASCAD; the work of the Mahas Survey has now increased our knowledge of a further region, see Edwards and Ali Osman 1992.
41. Burckhardt 1819: 56.
43. Kemp 1978: 21, 32.
44. Urk IV 137-141.
45. Burckhardt 1819: 46-47; and notably the narrative of the second journey from Kom Ombo to Shendi 173, 175, 176, 191.
46. The Old Kingdom texts imply a more densely wooded area, deforestation may have been caused by natural dessication during the late Old Kingdom, and by human activity. For example, the inscription of Antefoqer (Žaba 1974: 98-109 no 73) refers to the cutting down of trees as punitive action by invading Egyptian forces.
47. Kuper's work is known to me primarily through conference papers, but see Kuper ed 1989.

From fortress to temple-town.

52. Caminos 1968.
53. PM VII 90-91. The map, Caminos 1968: pl.II, shows the proximity of Ibrim and Ellesiya to Aniba. It has been suggested that Thutmose III built a temple at Dakka (Clere 1953), although it is more probable that the blocks were brought from Qubban at a later date: PM VII 41; Farid 1979. Activities at Qubban are attested from year 24, Donadoni 1985.
54. PM VII 167. The only publication is that of Lepsius.
55. Early activities at Sesebi were suggested and 18th Dynasty material excavated at Amara (Fairman 1939: 142), although this was probably transferred to the town later.
56. Reisner and Reisner 1933a.
57. 20-2-166: Dunham 1970: p1 XLVII.H, p.43. Goedicke 1972 suggested that this stela was perhaps pseud-epigraphic.
60. The length of the reign of Thutmose IV is discussed by Bryan 1991: 4-37 who rejects Wente and Van Siclen's proposal of a long reign of 33+ years. She argues that the evidence suggests between ten and twelve years.
61. See above p 61.
62. The established administration seems consciously to be modelled upon that of Egypt.
65. Žabkar 1975: 29-32.
66. Stela of Iw-n-Ikm from Abydos.
70. The nature of the building and duration of the sites suggests that there was not continuous expansion.
71. Liverani 1979; 1990: 135-143 (conquest as cosmic organisation.
75. The inscription on the second Soleb lion, Edwards 1939a; 1939b.
76. Macadam 1955: 28-44, pls II-V, XXXVI-XL.
77. Smith 1976: 211.
79. A few monuments of Viceregal officials were found at Kawa e.g. Macadam 1949: 1-3 (Inscr I), 3-4 (Inscr II), along with some re-used Middle kingdom sculpture.
80. A "Marriage scarab" was found below the pavement of Temple B, Macadam 1949: 83 (Inscr XIX), and part of a base "believed to be from a sphinx or lion", Macadam 1949: 82-83 (Inscr XVIII).
81. Macadam 1955: 12-14; Breasted 1908: 77-78 thought that Gem-Aten was to be identified with Sesebi.
82. Dr Betsy Bryan pointed out to me that the granite rams have been recut, and are possibly of 18th Dynasty date; see now Kozloff, Bryan, Berman 1992: 221, 222 fig 31a.
85. In Morkot 1987, having no practical experience of this road, I perhaps over-emphasised its potential. My thanks to David Edwards for correcting this.
87. Reisner 1917: 223.
89. Some of whom were rather more sceptical, see below Chaps 7-8.
91. Adams 1964: 108 citing Firth 1915: 21 suggests that "By the end of the 18th Dynasty almost all productive activity in the region had probably ceased".
93. Louvre C 57; London BM EA 1189 Smith 1976: 211.
95. 31-12-169: Dunham 1967: pl LXXXIV, B; Ruby 1964 54-56.
97. PM VII: 174; Griffith 1927.
98. see below pp 95-96.
100. The newly founded Amara West was called Pr Mn-M3^c^t-Rc Fairman 1948: 9-10.
103. PM VII: 157-164; Fairman 1938; 1939; 1948
104. PM VII: 127.
105. The New Kingdom temple is largely unpublished.
109. Habachi 1969b; Spalinger (1980) would associate the Nubian battle scene with the Irem campaign of the 2nd decade, also at Amara (passageway of west gate).
111. Statue of Setau, Berlin 2283: Ag Inschr II: 78; and a second fragment, LD Text V, 58.
113. Fairman 1939: 142 and n 2, on the evidence of the priestly titles of Wentawat see p 65 n93 above.
116. pHarris 8, 13; Grandet 1983.
117. Lintel fragment from Kubban LD Text V: 60. Granite seated figure, bottom part, on naos with cartouches of Ramesses III [JEA 61 (1975): pl X.3] discovered at Qasr Ibrim, but doubtless originally from Aniba, as are a black granite pedestal frag from a statue [JEA 63 (1967): 43 pl VI; 40 fig E].
122. eg Breasted 1924; Wilson 1951; Gardiner 1961; Cerny 1965; also discussing economic problems and the weakening of the kingship, but without the notion of 'imperial decline' Trigger et al, 1983: 226-232.
125. Ramesses IV: base from Gerf Hussein PM VII, 36 unpub.
126. Weinstein 1981: 20, lists examples from Beth-Shan; Lachish; Hazor; Ashdod-Tell Mor; Megiddo.
128. The New Kingdom material from Ibrim was discussed by Plumley 1979 who commented (p 128) that a jamb of Amenhotep II is "so large that it is difficult to imagine that it might have been transported from Aniba".
130. There is no inscriptional evidence so-far published which can be dated later than the reign of Ramesses IX.
131. Macadam 1949: 84 (Inscr XXIII) pl 39, of Ramesses-nakht; 84-86 (Inscr XXIV-XXVII) of the hry pdt Nebmarenakht with cartouches of Ramesses VI.
133. Fairman 1939: 141.

The nature of urbanism and colonial settlement in Nubia.

139. Finley 1985: 123-149, discusses the relationship of the city and countryside in the Graeco-Roman world, and although there are fundamental differences from pharaonic Egypt - such as the status of the polis, citizenship, monetary economy etc - the role of the cities as centres of consumption is emphasised.
140. It should be noted that dress is usually known only from tomb paintings, and varies according to whether the Kushites (especially the elite) are shown as "foreigners" (as in 'tribute' scenes, eg Huy) or members of the Egyptian elite (eg the tomb of Djehutyhotep), on which, see comments of Säve-Söderbergh and Troy 1991: 205-206.
142. Notably the neo-Assyrian empire.
143. Wreszinski Atlas II: 182.
146. Sauneron 1950 (Asiatics); Kitchen 1990: 21-23 (Libyans).
147. Yoyotte 1951.
149. eg the large number of Asiatics employed the palace in the 'Harim Papyrus'.
153. see also Appendix 1.
158. EA 49, Moran 1992: 120-121 (two Kushite palace attendants).
164. eg at Luxor, Opet procession in the colonnade hall.
165. EA 70: Moran 1992: 139-140.

Town and country.

169. Griffith 1927.
170. so Kemp 1978: 30.
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173. Gauthier 1936.
175. Nakhtmin might have been a Kushite official working in Egypt.
176. Quibell 1908: pls XXXVII-XXXIX (general views), XL (Sitamun receiving gold collars), XLIII (trays of rings).
178. Frandsen 1979: 184 n.29.
179. Now being prepared by Dr. Patricia Spencer.
180. see Appendix 1.
188. The 'Prudhoe lions' from Soleb temple are of red Aswan granite, see now Kozloff, Bryan, Berman 1992: 220 and n.7.
189. Suggested by the large number of military inscriptions on the road from Aswan to Shellal.
191. The ancient use of these desert roads is now confirmed by the graffiti at Bir Murrat and Bir Ungat: Damiano-Appia 1992.
193. see Appendix 2.

Consumption.

198. also Janssen 1979: 515 on complexity.
202. Two statues of Ruiu in limestone: Steindorff 1937: Taf 37 a-b, c-d.
203. Shabtis of limestone, faience and granite from Aniba, see Steindorff 1937: 76-85, Taf 42-45.
206. Steindorff 1937: Taf 54-56 (scarabs) 57 (finger rings).
207. Steindorff 1937: Taf 59, 93-95, cf Taf 60 (kohl tubes) 62 (mirrors) 63-64 (bronze tweezers, daggers, etc) 90-91 (faience vessels).
208. Steindorff 1937: Taf 86 (45.a-b) (Yahudiya wares).
211. Hankey 1980.
213. Vercoutter 1955-1956: 8 "two sherds of Mycenean pottery, very likely from a stirrup vase"; Vercoutter 1962: 114 n 17. The tomb is apparently datable to reign of Amenhotep II by inscribed pot.
215. V. Hankey (pers comm) from Martha Bell.
216. Tomb 17; Schiff Giorgini 1971: 199, fig 395.
218. Firth 1927: 63, cemetery 110.23, pl 27.c.3.
220. Spindle jars Steindorff 1937: Taf 85 (43 a-b).
221. Generally see Janssen nd.
222. The Viceroy is unnamed, he is accompanied by the steward, Mery.
224. Gifts were presented to the officials on the occasion of Amenhotep III's sed-festivals, and feasts provided by the king for the officials, "from the royal breakfast" on the occasion. The Amarna reward scenes and those in the tomb of Neferhotep also indicate that food and drink was part of the gift.

Trade and profit.

228. Lattimore 1962: 483

Trade and taxation.

238. Liverani 1990; see also Müller-Wollermmann 1983; 1984; Boochs 1984a; 1984b.
240. see briefly Appendix 1.
241. Appendix 1.
242. Appendix 1.
244. cf pKoller as part of the inw.

6 Binding Nubia to Egypt: the royal cult.

12. Price 1984: 11-12, 15-17 refs n 50. Similarly, Janssen 1992b: 313 commented on how "Erman's Die Religion der Agypter ... shows how little affinity this great scholar had for the phenomenon of religious belief".
14. The worship of Amenhotep I and Ahmose Nefertari has received considerable attention (Černý 1927). Stelae invoking Ramesses II are also well-known (Habachi 1969b). The Amarna tombs invoke Akhenaten and Nefertiti (Morkot 1986), and many other rulers are found as intermediaries during their life-times.

The development of the royal cult.

21. EA 23: Moran 1992: 61-62. The pseud-epigraphic 'Bentresh stela' (Louvre C 284: Lichtheim 1980: 90-94) may not be evidence that statues of Egyptian gods were likewise sent to western Asia, but it suggests that the idea was not excluded.
23. There has been little study of religion in Nubia, see Millet 1984.
28. Sāve-Söderbergh 1949: 51; Smith 1976: 76. Horus Lord of Foreign Lands is also depicted on the pyramidion of an obelisk at Tanis, Engelbach 1929: 29 fig 4. He is shown falcon-headed with two plumes, as Sopd.
30. Berlin 1157, Ag Insch II: 257-258; BAR I: 653-660.
32. PM VII: 167.
Horus the Bull.

33. Vercoutter 1956: 72 (no.10), 73 (no.11), 79 (no.26), all from Sai.
34. CEDAE el-Lessiya II: pl 35, scene E4.
35. PM II: 113 (356); published only in LD III: 35d; personal notes 1990; 1991; 1993. The (now broken) text, a speech of Sopd, calls the king twt Horus Lord of Ta-seti.
37. CEDAE El-Lessiya II: pl 35; Vercoutter 1956: 78 no.23; LD III: 59e.
38. CEDAE Amada IV: C10.
41. Drioton 1940.
42. Drioton 1940: 316.
43. For the king as an hypostasis of Monthu see Bell 1985b: 32 with nn 37, 39, 45; and p 34-5, nn 99-105.
44. Kirwan 1939: 29 and pl VI.1.

The Living Image of Nebmaetre.

46. The development of the temple is discussed in Schiff Giorgini 1960 and 1962. The new copies of the reliefs, made by the Schiff Giorgini expedition are not yet published, although all earlier copies are gathered in Schiff Giorgini 1965. I am extremely grateful to M.Prof.J. Leclant for his information regarding the continuing work on the publication of the work at Soleb and Sedeinga, and to Dr. Nathalie Beaux who is completing the publication. The arguments presented here are based entirely upon the published material.
47. Janssen 1959; Leclant 1979/80; for illustrations Schiff Giorgini 1965: 99ff, figs 79-82 from LD III.
49. PM VII: 63-64; Farid 1967: pl XI-XIV.
51. Bell 1985a: n 204 (p 58).
53. Illustrated by M. Muller in SAK 8, pl 6.
54. Two statues from Karnak see Morkot 1990: 335, n 90; also the quartzite statues from Memphis re-used by Ramesses II, see now Kozloff, Bryan, Berman 1992: 150 n 1.
58. LD III: 5b-e; see also Lorton 1974: 16.
59. cf LD III, 84c, 85a, 87b,c, 110k; and Schiff Giorgini 1965: figs.80, 81, 83, 85.
60. LD III, 87b and c = Schiff Giorgini 1965: 102 fig.83, without shoulder straps, but LD III, 110k = Schiff Giorgini 1965: 103 fig 85 (temp Akhenaten) both corselet and straps are shown.
61. Lepsius MSS in the Deutsches Akademie, Berlin: my thanks to Dr. Stefan Grunert for his help at the (then) Akademie der
Wissenschaften der DDR.

64. Goedicke 1978: 140.
68. Schiff Giorgini 1961: 190, fig.6.
69. see Bell 1985b: n.185 (p.57).
70. Leclant 1978: 71.

72. Luxor text in Bell 1985a: 290-91, n 216; a text at Abydos in which Seshat enjoins Sety I "you shall repeat your youth, you shall flourish again like I^h-Dhwty when he is a child"; and an address to Ptolemy IV at Edfu: "I grant that you may rise like the sun, rejuvenate yourself like the moon and repeat life like the flood of the Nile".

73. Louvre E 3408: Drioton 1933a.
74. Saleh 1983: 79, fig 27, pl 64a.
76. Unpublished: known only from its inclusion in a lecture by Dr. T.Kendall at the Seventh International Conference for Nubian Studies, Geneva 1990.
78. Arkell 1950.
79. Edwards 1939a; 1939b.

The cult of Tutankhamun at Faras.

80. Karkowski 1981: 28-9; 71-2; 89-90; 115-129; 130-136; 139-140 for the temple and objects associated with the deified Tutankhamun.
83. My thanks to Dr.W.R. Johnson for pointing this out to me.
84. I take the opportunity to express my gratitude to the late Ricardo Caminos for answering my questions on Shepsy. The earliest known representation of this deity is in the speos of Horemheb at Silsila, although he is named in the reign of Thutmose IV and on an altar of Amenhotep III from Ashmunein.
85. ie Khonsu as a lunar son of the solar Amun-Re, and Horus as the solar son of the lunar Osiris.
88. Macadam 1955: 28-44, pls II-V.
89. Macadam: 1949; Bell 1985a: 32 and 43 n 12.
90. Meha is first named in texts of the Middle Kingdom, see Zibelius 1976: 20 (III Db10, Khety 11th Dynasty), 13 (III F10, Semna Despatches).
93. PM VII: 119, 121.
The deified Ramesses II in Nubia.

94. It has been necessary to drastically reduce the length of the following discussion.
97. PM VII: 127; for the excavations at Aksha and its cult, see
98. PM VII: 157-164; Fairman 1938; 1939; 1948. For change in
orientation see Fairman 1948: 5.
100. The subsidiary rooms which open off the first hall were later
additions and it is likely that the solar and lunar chapels at
the north and south ends of the terrace were also later.
103. PM VII 53-64; Gauthier 1912.
104. PM VII 33-37; CEDAE Gerf Hussein.
105. PM VII 84-90; Blackman 1913; CEDAE Derr.
107. Vercoutter 1962: pl XXXIV.d shows the king before the seated
deity; see also Fuscaldo 1990.
110. The date is, in part, based on assumptions about the building
changes at Abu Simbel, and the change in writing of the king's
name.
111. The reliefs in the Thoth chapel are still unpublished. Plans
may be found in CEDAE Abou Simbel I,1: Pls LXIV, XCIV;
sections: Pls XCV, XCVI; layout of reliefs: Pl CXXII. For the
exterior and brickwork see Pls XVI-XVIII, LXIIIa. A view of
the interior Pl LXIIIb. For the 'rediscovery' of the chapel by
Amelia Edwards and her party in 1874 see Edwards 1878: 308-335,
but cf Burckhardt 1819: 92. The texts are published in KRI.II:
748-751. The following is derived largely from notes by the
writer made on visits to the temple in February and November
1989.
112. A sketch of the barque of Thoth may be found in Stuart 1879: pl
XLI.
113. KRI II: 749.5-6.
114. Also frequently in seal and scarab texts, cf Drioton 1933b.
115. Formerly at Berlin; Johnson 1990: 40 figs 6 and 7.
116. eg Desroches-Noblecourt 1964: pls XXXVI, XXXVIII, XLb. Many of
the pectorals and rings balance solar and lunar elements. cf
the ring of Nebmaatre (BM EA 53906) with a lunar disk and
crescent and figure of a baboon with maet-feather [Glanville in
JEA 15].
117. Drioton 1940: 317 (no.15).
118. This also occurs at Abydos.
119. It is one of the commonest ways of writing the royal name.
123. Scene 8, unpublished; cf el-Alfi 1972: 178, fig 4 (part).
124. KRI II: 749.15.
125. el-Alfi 1972: 178-179, fig.4 and pl.XXXV.3.
126. Also a scarab see el-Alfi 1972: 178, fig.3; see also Bell 1985a: 56 n 184.
127. Gauthier 1912: pl LX.
128. CEDAE Gerf Hussein IV: 30 E 51 Imn n (R) m pr Imn; IV: 45 E 78 pl.XXXII Hathor.
129. Personal notes; cf PM VII: 107 (68) "Amon-Re" (room V; CEDAE salle R).
130. Also at Aksha, see Fuscaldo 1990, stela of Nakht, which shows the barque of Amun-(of)-Usermaatre-setepenre, with human headed aegides with solar disk and ram's horn.
133. C.E. Loeben is preparing a paper on this point.
134. Barsanti and Gauthier 1911: pl I stela I; pl II stela II; pl IV stela IX.
136. cf the carrying chair used for the statues of Amenhotep I and the aniconic Amun (Cerny 1927), and for the king at the Min festival, also used by Akhenaten (Davies 1905a; 1905b).
137. Weigall 1907: plxxiv, 7; PM VII: 90.
139. From personal notes as n 111 above. A slightly inaccurate sketch of the head of the staff may be found in Edwards 1878: 322. For the texts see KRI II: 750:a,iv.
140. Amara stela AW.38.39. 208 + 265, EES Neg.0245, now in Denver. The text refers to a ḫm ntr n Mn-hpr-R (without cartouche). The scene shows two figures before Imn-Râ nb nsyt t3wy. The stela will be published in the forthcoming monograph on the Amara excavations. My thanks to Dr. Patricia Spencer for help with the archive, and to the Committee of the Egypt Exploration Society for permission to refer to the records.
141. KRI IV: 203.5.
144. Steindorff 1937: II Pl.102.

Part 2: The emergence of the Kushite state.

7 The Nubian Dark Age.

5. Trigger 1976: 140.
7. Firth 1927: 25-28; Adams 1964: 114-5; Dixon 1964: 131 taking the extreme, and clearly untenable, view that there was no settled population between Aswan and the 3rd Cataract for over 400 years; Trigger 1965: 112-4.
17. Priese in Adams 1976: 87-88; also comments of Adams 1976: 133.
19. For a recent general survey of the evidence from Nubia from the 6th-4th centuries BC see Morkot 1991.
26. See also Kendall 1982: 22.
27. eg the temple of Amara East, recorded by 19th century AD visitors and now totally destroyed (see Wenig in Endesfelder et al 1977: 459-475).
28. Chapter 3.
29. cf Adams 1984: 245 "It took some time for the lesson of the Pharaoh's to sink in".
30. Reisner 1919b.
34. Drioton and Vandier 1952: 538.
35. Arkell 1961: 112f.; Adams 1977: 242-3; Török 1984: 5, with the proviso that there are no supporting data; Török 1987: 146-146 is even more sceptical; Kendall and Doll in Kendall 1982: 9, 23.
42. The circularity of the argument is discussed below.
43. In the literature on this period only Zibelius-Chen 1989: 341 makes any reference to the Karimala inscription.
8 The archaeology of Nubia after the New Kingdom.

6. Firth 1927.

Reisner's E-Group.

16. Qasr Ibrim, Buhen, Mirgissa and Semna, see Appendix 2.
17. Adams 1977: 265 found it difficult to account for these monuments and did not even suggest the existence of garrisons.

The Archaeology.

20. Abd el-Moneim Abou Bakr 1963: 119-120 pls VIII-IX.
22. Discussed in Williams 1990: n 77.
25. see Brunton 1930: pls XLIII-XLIV; Petrie 1906: pls XVIII-XIX (and A-C) XXXII XXXIII XXXIV (and A-C) XXXVIIA XXXVIII.

Inscribed Egyptian objects.

30. Dunham 1955: 130 [17-3-420].
31. Reisner 1919a see further below p 216.
32. Griffith 1923: 147, pl XLII.12.
34. Both epithets were usual for this king, Kitchen 1973: 334.
35. Addison 1949: 117-119, pl L.
36. This site has recently been the subject of a study by Rudolf Gerharz.
38. Appendix 2, notably from the fortresses.

The cemetery of el-Kurru.

40. Reisner 1923: 34-77 (especially 75-76).
42. Dunham 1950: 121-132.
48. Török 1992a also follows this interpretation. The re-examination of the skeletal material apparently contradicted this, but became the focus of some dispute, see further below.
55. Kendall 1992 quoted Beck's tentative attributions. These became the focus of some dispute and Beck re-examined the material, making some slight adjustments to her original scheme, see Kendall nd with attached table. My thanks to Dr. Kendall for providing me with a copy of this paper.
60. Kendall nd: 2.
68. Reisner 1921b: 21; 1923: 75.
69. Dunham 1950: pls XIA, XIVA, XIVA, XXI-XXIII.
75. So Ali Hakem 1988: 245. The Tanis tombs, to which Ali Hakem presumably alludes, were actually subterranean burials, and their resemblance to mastabas is therefore coincidental.
77. Dunham 1950: 13, 121-123, fig 1a chart I.
82. Dunham 1950: 21, 72.
84. Kendall 1992: fig. 4.
93. 19-3-347; Dunham 1950: 14 fig 1b; cf. Kendall 1992: fig 6b.
94. Kendall 1992: 14 gives the excavation number as 19-3-595, which
   in Dunham 1950: 19, 20 fig. 4b is the pottery vessel (see below
   p 160 and n. 120).
95. 19-3-348: Dunham 1950: p. 14 fig. 1b.
97. Notably the winged scarabs with rosettes rather than sun-disk
   (Kurru 51, 53, 54, 55; Dunham 1950: pl XLIX.A, LI, LII.D,E,
   LIII, LV.A). An identical motif was used on ivories (Nimrud),
   metal bowls (Praeneste) and jewellery (Carthage). While these
   might have a common origin in a Phoenician centre, the
   resemblance to the Kurru amulets is more likely to be
   coincidental, i.e. both are developments of Egyptian originals.
110. 19-3-366: Dunham 1950: 13, 14 fig. 1c.
114. Dunham 1950: 21 19-3-907, fig 22.5b-c; Kendall 1992: fig. 10.
115. 19-3-899: possibly intrusive from Ku.13: Dunham 1950: 52 fig
   18c cf 19-3-882; Kendall 1992: fig. 11.
116. 19-3-834: Dunham 1950: fig 24d; 19-3-887 with 849, 850, 853,
   882, 883, 884, 887, 888.
120. 19-3-924; 19-3-595-601; 19-3-408; Dunham 1950: 20 fig 4b;
    Heidorn 1992: fig. 1.
121. Säve-Söderbergh and Troy 1991: 200-205 pls 35-38; Kendall 1992:
127. Heidorn 1992: 8 and n 23; further comment in Kendall nd: 4-5.
129. Heidorn in Kendall nd: 4-5.
130. D.Aston diss. Birmingham. This was unavailable for consultation.
137. Torok 1987: 146.
142. Ku Tum 2 #6: Dunham 1950: 16 fig 2d, Pls LII.A-B, LVII.B.6

Sanam.

143. PM VII: 198-202; Griffith 1922: 1923.
144. Griffith 1922: 79-114.
146. Griffith 1923.
149. Griffith 1923: 83.
150. Griffith 1922: 85.
151. Griffith 1923: 84.
153. eg a very fine scarab of Amenhotep III; Griffith 1923: pl XLII, 14.
155. Griffith 1923: 113-114, pl XLII-XLIII.
156. Griffith 1923: pl XVII type Vifi, pl XXXI.8 now Oxford, Ash. Gjerstad. This vessel may be Palestinian imitation-Cypriote, the ware is not a Cypriote type.
158. Cylinder seal from grave 396, now Oxford, Ash; Griffith 1923: 150; Hogarth 1922: 295-296, pl XXV upper, tomb group: Hogarth describes this seal as "Southern Hittite" of about 20th Dynasty date. Buchanan 1966 and Collon (pers comm) agree that it is Old Babylonian. Other Old Babylonian pieces were found in the royal tombs at Tanis.
159. Vila 1982: 120.
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Meroe

161. Dunham 1950: fig 28C.
164. Griffith 1923: pl XVIII type XIIn.

9 The Ramesside succession in Nubia

The end of the Viceregal administration in Nubia.

3. Highest regnal year 27, Wente and Van Siclen 1976: 12, but whm wswt year 10. Also graffito of Butehamun, no year, but dated 3 shomu 23, probably three days after the beginning of year 29: Spiegelberg 1921: 57 (no.714).
7. Griffith 1921: 100-101, pl XXII a-b, XXIX 5-6.
11. A number of inscriptions and votive stelae attest the Viceroys and other high officials; the large administrative buildings also suggest that Amara was a Viceregal seat.
13. PM VII: 82; Emery and Kirwan 1935: 56-57 figs 37-44; KRI VI 527f.
16. pBM 10054 [Peet 1930, 60-61] of year 16 of Ramesses IX records the examination of a quarryman, Amenpufer son of Anhurnakht and of Mery a Kushite. pAmherst VI [Peet 1930: 49] names Ti-n-r3-Imm a Nubian slave of the High Priest of Amun. Less certainly a Nubian is the "foreigner" Panehesy, a priest of Sobek of Perankh [Abbott Dockets, Peet 1930: 132 no.15, 133 no.]. Other foreigners are named in the Abbott dockets as well as numbers of Madjoi.
17. The letters of Dhutmose to Butehamun [Wente 1967] display antipathy towards Nubia, but this may be due to the dangerous situation as much as the place. Dhutmose, it should be noted
employs the same term, Yar, during a visit to Middle Egypt, and Wente 1967: 19 n.j suggests the translation "hellhole".

The Viceroy Panehesy

21. see Aldred 1979: 94.
23. so Lefebvre and Wilson see Wente 1966: 74.
27. pMayer A, 6, 4-7.
29. Not whom mswt as Peet 1930 thought see Wente 1966: 85 n.52.
30. Černý 1965: 27.
32. pMayer A, 6, 3-6.
35. Černý 1965: 31 discusses the problems of interpretation of the letter (see next note).
37. Černý 1965: 31, see also n.53 below.
41. Aldred 1979: 95.
42. Aldred 1979: 96, 98.
46. For his career see Kitchen 1973: 16-17.
48. Wente 1966: 85. see eg Tomb Robbery Papyri, where the name is determined with the sign for evil, see also Černý 1965: 31 n.4.
51. Niwinski 1988; Jansen-Winkeln 1992; the material is too complex to discuss here. Jansen-Winkeln offers a valid alternative to Wente's widely accepted chronology of the material.
52. pTurin 1896: Gardiner 1941: 31. The Steward and Butler Yenes is called envoy to the "southern country", in this case Upper Egypt, indicating Ramesses XI was still resident in the delta. Yenes is further attested in years 1 and 2 of whom mswt [pMayer A; pBM 10052; pBM 10383: Peet 1930: 124, 142], where he is one of the magistrates in the tomb robbery trials (see also Černý 1965: 31 n.3). On the various stones and flowers see Zibelius-Chen 1992.
53. Černý 1965: 31 and n.4.
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56. Wente 1967: 24, 25 n.g.
57. eg pBM 10052 p.4 1.22; p.5 11.5, 27; p.7 1.10; p.8 1.18; p.9 1.2; Peet 1930: 147, 148, 150, 151, see comment p.23.
60. Spiegelberg 1921: 57 (no.714).

A successor to Panehesy in Nubia?

62. see Caminos 1974: II 109 and n 3 on this title.
64. Reisner 1920a: 51 (21, c).
65. see Caminos 1974: II 110 n.2.
67. KRI VI: 842, 5-12.

The disestablishment of the Viceregal administration.


The Ramesside successors in Nubia.

73. See above Chapter 8, pp 150-153.

The 'Neo-Ramesside' kings of Kush.

74. Macadam 1955: 21 with n3; Hintze 1973: 135 discussing these kings refers to "neo-Ramesside" tendencies in art. Wenig 1973: 152 describes the names as "ramessidische".
75. Macadam 1949; 72-76.
76. Macadam 1949; 90 inscr.XLV : is this perhaps Kashta?
77. Hintze 1973;
78. A view implicit in Macadam (1949)'s discussion; Adams 1964: 115.

Menmaatre-setepen-Amun Ktsn 'Aktisanes'.

79. see figures to Priese 1977.
81. see Burton 1972: 1-34.
83. Lepsius 1849: 294-95.
84. Wiedemann 1884: 582, n 1.
85. see Priese 1977: 354 and n 33
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86. The Kushite contemporaries of Amasis are generally agreed to be Aspelta, Aramatelqo, Malonaqen, Analma'aye and Amani-natakilebte.

87. See Appendix 3.

95. It could be a writing of nb Ipt or perhaps for nb Ipt Swt.
96. Priese 1977: 357.
98. LD V,5.

Usermaatre-setepenre Ary-mery-Amun.

103. Macadam 1949: 78.
104. Macadam 1949: 76 n.c.
107. Macadam 1955: 45-52, pl 4, VI-VIII, XLI-XLII.
112. Those illustrated in eg papyri continue the 20th Dynasty type.
113. cf Macadam 1955: temp Taharqo pl Xa, b; XII,c; XV, b; XVI c, d; XVII, c, e; XIX a, b; XX a, c etc.: Aspelta, pl XVIII a, b, d; Smith 1981: 399 fig.393 (Pabasa), 413 fig.406 (Monthuemhat ?).
115. The ram pectoral is well-documented for Shebitqo (Heqa-Djet chapel), Taharqo and their successors. It first appears on a bronze of Shabaqo at Athens [Russmann 1974: fig 1 and comments on this ornament 26].

Karimala

117. Grapow 1940.
119. I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Caminos for his generosity in discussing the text and sharing his work: the interpretation of the inscription is mine.
120. Dunham and Janssen 1960: 11.
121. orthographic variants of Karomama etc.
122. One could speculate that Karimala was an Egyptian wife of a Kushite ruler, but that may be not altogether helpful.
123. Königsbuch der Alten Ägypter, ii, pl.71, no.939
127. LD Text V: 198; this reference from Caminos.
128. Khonsu reliefs eg pl.28.
129. so Leclant 1963: 74-81.
131. Leclant 1963: 75 fig 1; Priese 1970; Vercoutter et al 1976: 91 fig 67 see Chap 11 n. 23 below.
132. The variants are discussed below pp 246-248.
133. vBeckerath 1984: 270 (E3), also Shebitqo mery Amun (270 E2) and mery Ptah (270 E3) and Taharqo mery Amun (271 E3).
136. Stylistically, archaism may be found in Saite works which are contemporaneous with the earliest Kushite phase in Egypt; the 'Bocchoris vase' and stela of Tefnakhte.

Kush and Egypt under Libyan rule.

4. Kitchen 1973; Aston 1989; Aston and Taylor 1990; I am sceptical about the attribution of Takeloth II and his successors to the 'Theban' dynasty.
5. The family relationships of the other rulers - Nimlot, Iuput and Peftjauawybast remain unknown.

The Theban Viceroys of the Third Intermediate Period.

10. Coffins and Board Cairo 6256-6259, 6220: (PM I.2 634) he was also Scribe of commissions of the House of Onuris-Shu.
22. Kitchen 1973: 326, assumed he was a son of Osorkon II.
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31. Mariette 1881: pl 73 no 73; Gauthier LdR III: 245.
32. The Menkheperre graffito is presumably PM VI: 255 "son of Amenophis III (?)". I have had no opportunity to locate this graffito on Bigga island.

The Illusory campaign of Shoshenq I.

35. PM II: 34-36.
37. P. James suggests that this might be a scribal error for [pist] Philistines, hence the large number involved, which seems unlikely for horsemen at this date (see Schulman 1983). My thanks to Peter James for lengthy discussions of this period.
42. Török 1984; 1987: 146.

Zerah the Kushite

48. Year 14 of Asa = 897 BC: Mitchell 1982: 462, following the dates established by Thiele.
50. There is no evidence that the reign was this long, the highest certain regnal year is 12, and although Kitchen (1973: 110-111) accepts Jacquet-Gordon's reading of the UC stela, he contrives to keep the reign at 35 years.
54. Vlach in Meroitica 7: 248.
56. see Eph'al 1982: 78 n 234.
58. Schulman 1983.
Egypt and Assyria.

60. I Kings ix.16.
64. PM VII: 381.
67. PM VII: 388.
72. I kings 22:48; II Chron 20:35-36; Culican 1982; Bright 1981: 242; Mitchell 1982: 479-480, a marriage was contracted between Jehoram son of Jehoshaphat and Athaliah daughter of Ahab or Omri (II Chron 18.1; II Kings 8:18), this happened before 863 BC see Mitchell 1982: 475, 488.
76. On whom see Hawkins 1982: 396.
77. On the identification of Qarqar as modern Qarqur 80km nw of Hama: see Weippert 1987: 97 n 1 (a location favoured by Dussaud, Noth, Klengel and Courtois); this has been questioned by Pitard who suggests that it was probably to be located at the northern end of the Gab, to the northwest of Hamath and possibly to be identified with a tell beside the Orontes at Jisr es-Sugur on the e-w route from Aleppo to Latakia see Pitard 1987: 126-127 n 79.
79. Culican 1982
80. ANET: 281: "Hadadezer ... together with the 12 kings of Hatti-land, rose against me. For the fourth time I fought with them...". Bernhardt 1982: 166 n 11; Pitard 1987: 121.
82. Pitard 1987: 130.
88. A concern voiced by Collon 1977: 220 n 16, although she accepts the identification of Musri as Egypt.
90. On which see Tadmor 1961: 143 n 4.
91. Tadmor 1961: 147 n.29.
94. Such as the overlap between Shoshenq III and Takeloth II proposed by Aston 1989, which would place it in the reign of Osorkon II.
96. Dalley 1985 discussed below Chap 12.
97. cf Elat 1978 discussed below Chap 12.
100. Brinkman CAH 23ff; Grayson 71 ff.
102. Tigrath-pileser's claim to have appointed Hoshea might not be accurate, but he certainly confirmed Hoshea's position.
104. As regent for Kashta or Piankhy, a view vigorously defended by Petrie 1918: 282-283.
108. This perhaps did not happen until Sargon's campaign of 720; Tadmor 1958: 37; Bright 1981: 276.
110. That the name is not Sib'e was shown by Borger 1960: 49-53; hence he cannot be identified with So as earlier writers had done (eg Petrie 1918: 284) who was the army commander (turtannu KUR musuri).
119. Khorsabad Annals: Luckenbill 1927: 7-8, following the activities of year 7; the Display Inscription: Luckenbill 1927: where it follows the defeat of Re'e; Tadmor 1958: 78.
120. Nineveh Prism fragment 79-7-8, 14 col i.1-8 cf VA 8424 col ii Weidner 1941; Tadmor 1958: 77.
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The rise of Sais.

126. Redford 1986: 327 cf 277; more specifically Psamtik I: some of the other dynasts fared less well.
131. Kitchen 1973: 146 grants Nechepsos 16 years and Ammeris 31/27 or 21/17 years.
136. lines 142-144 see Leahy 1984a: n 29; Spalinger 1979b: 291 and 1979c: 77-78 argues that he did not, although the evidence seems clear (Gardiner 1961 accepted that he took the oath).
137. Edwards in CAH III.1, 574.
139. Leahy 1984a: 205 and n 30.
140. There is controversy over whether the 'Bocchoris vase' [Smith 1981: 405 fig 398] from Tarquinia is Egyptian or Phoenician. Smith takes it to be Egyptian (in which I concur).
141. From both artistic features and titularies.

Nubia and Libya.

142. Reisner 1919a; discussed by Dixon 1964.
143. 17-3-420: Dunham 1955: 130, fig 97, pl LXXX.J.
144. Reisner 1919a: 43; 1920b: 54.
145. Reisner 1919a: 238.
149. Yoyotte 1951a.
153. My thanks to Dr.S. Swain for discussing the general problem of these sherds from Amara. Their present whereabouts is unknown.
154. Kendall 1982: 23; Reisner 1921b:28; Dunham 1950: 13, 15, 17, 72 figs. 1c, 2c, 3b, 24f, pl 71c; Kendall 1982: fig 18.
156. Schiff Giorgini 1971: 24, fig 128.
11 The rise of the kingdom of Kush.


A dynasty divided?

14. Reisner 1931: Pls V, VI.
15. See Appendix 5.

Alara and the foundations of Kushite power.

16. Nastasen stela: Macadam 1949: 123 n 3; Priese 1978: 77 suggested that it might be Sanam; the location of Ast-resat was discussed by Wainwright 1947; Shinnie 1955.
18. cf. the dedication of their daughters by the Libyan dynasts into the hnr of Amun at Thebes.

Kashta

22. Leclant 1963: 78-81, figs 2-5.
25. Priese 1970: 18 (1.3) and Abb 1; Kruchten 1989: 126.
26. See also Baer 1973: 20 28
30. see Appendices 5 and 6.
31. Other God's Wives whose installations are recorded are associated with their fathers; see Appendix 5.
33. Fragment of a faience offering table found in Ku 1 (intrusive); 19-3-537: Dunham 1950: 24, fig 7c.
34. cf Leclant 1963: 80 n 10.
The chronology of the 25th Dynasty.

39. eg Kitchen and issue of Shebitqo's accession; earlier assumptions that "So" and "Sibe'e" were both to be identified with Shabaqo.

1. Manethon and the classical tradition.

42. Fr.66 (Africanus), 67a (Eusebius), 67b (Armenian version); Waddell 1940: 166-169.
44. Leahy 1984a. Herodotos follows an entirely different tradition.
45. Leahy 1984a: 201 and n 26, notes that this has generally been accepted at face value; Kitchen 1973: 377 is sceptical; Gardiner 1961: 342, non-committal.
46. see below pp 249-251.
47. As in Herodotos; Török 1986; 1989.
50. Leahy 1990: suggested that Manethon's source was Memphis or Sebennytos cf Redford 1986.

2. The monumental evidence.

52. eg LA articles on Kushite kings; v.Zeissl 1944; Baer 1973; Kitchen 1973 etc.
54. Schäfer 1897.
62. Parker 1941.
64. Spalinger 1978b: 44-47.
65. Leclant in LA VI: n.11.
70. v.Beckerath 1966: 47 and n.35.
73. Leclant in LA V: 515 n.35 (citing Gomaà 1974: 98 n 27, who gives no date).
74. Meeks 1979: 673 (25.5.00).
75. My thanks to Dr.C.Roehrig of the Metropolitan Museum of Art for supplying a photograph of the stela and hand copy of the text.
83. Turin 1467: Fabretti et al 1882, 126; Pleyte 1876.
84. Wiedemann 1884.
91. So Yoyotte 1961: 134 n.2; found at Sefeta, see Adam 1958: 307, without year-date.
93. MMA 55.144.6: Yoyotte 1961: 172 n.4; Schulman 1966: 40 no.38.
94. Louvre E 3228: Malinine 1982-83.
96. Couyat and Montet 1912: 96, pl XXXV.
97. see Appendix 4.
100. BM EA 24,429: Leclant 1954: 15-27, pl 5.
104. There seems to be some confusion between the kuy as cult-image, shrine etc. Caminos 1954: 21 distinguishes kuyt "carrying chair from ki(w)"palanquin" and shrine cf Gardiner 1947: 67. Dr Alison Roberts suggested to me a possible connection with funerary ceremonies. A kuy of Psibkhanno I is attested (Helck 1961-70: I 121; Kitchen 1973: 265 n 128) and one of <Ramesses III>-heqa-Tunu (Kitchen 1973: 307 n 361). Perhaps a portable image similar to that of Amenhotep I (Černý 1927).

How long was the reign of Piye.


110. see Appendix 4.

111. Loukianoff 1926.


113. BM. EA 6640: Redford 1985: 10, fig 1, 12 fig 2.


120. Kitchen 1973: 140.


124. Grimal 1981a: pl V.


128. Piye's reign, placed by Kitchen at 747-716 is thus followed by those of his brother, 716-702, and his two sons 702-690, 690-664; the God's Wives Amenirdis I ca 740-700 and Shepenwepet II 710-650 sister and daughter, respectively.

129. Aston and Taylor 1990: 143, the children of Takeloth III "would seem to have outlived him by two generations instead of one".


The Piye problem.

131. Petrie 1918: 267-268; Gauthier LdR IV.


135. Reisner 1919a: 44.


139. Leclant and Yoyotte 1952: 25, n 3.


141. Notably the sandstone stela and the figure on the Victory stela (although the names were left intact).

142. Kendall 1991: 308 might be suggesting that the army of Psamtik II was responsible.

143. PM VII: 212-213.

The campaigns of Piye

144. Kitchen 1973 359 n.671

145. Leahy 1984c.

146. cf the names of officials on the Stela Louvre C 257.

147. The range of the meroitic language is unknown and it is likely
that it was spoken in Upper Nubia.

148. Louvre C 100; Petrie 1918: 293 fig.121.

The early activities of Piye

149. Reisner 1931; Dunham 1970: 29 (13).
152. Reisner 1931: 93 (1.26); Lorton 1974.
153. Urk. III 78-79; Reisner 1921a: 60 no.3; Loukianoff 1926: fig.
154. Urk. III.
155. Loukianoff 1926: 89.
158. Dunham 1970: 58, 16-4-247b, fig 42 on p 59.
159. This is a surface fragment only.

Piye's titulary

161. Reisner 1917: 225, see plan IV pl xlvii.
162. Petrie 1918: 293 and fig 121.
163. see Appendix 6.
165. see Appendix 6.
166. see Appendix 5.
169. see Troy 1986: 81, 83-85, 116, 189 (B 3/6). Another similar title, wrt im3t, used in the 18th and 19th Dynasties was revived by Amenirdis I.

The conflict of Shabaqo and Bakenranef

171. Presumably the "rebellion" of Bakenranef followed on the announcement of Piye's death.
176. Redford 1985: 8; so also Petrie 1918: 285 for stela.
177. Mariette 1857: pl 34; Mariette 1904, 228 says "Une petite stèle grossièrement écrite a l'encre noire".
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182. Malinine et al. 1968: plan A.

Shabako's rule in Egypt.

183. Leahy 1990.
184. Berlandini 1985-86; the green schist statue (torso Louvre N.2541: Russmann 1974: 46 (4); the head Brooklyn 60.74: Russmann 1974: 52-53 (27), fig 5) carries an inscription "beloved of Ptah rsy inbw.f); cf also comment of Redford 1985: 8 n 28.
185. Jones and Jones 1988: 111-113, fig 7, re-inscribed for Psamtik II (it is noteworthy that he re-built the Apis house, but there was no burial during his reign).
192. Colombot nd.
197. Redford 1985: 13 n.c to Table 1.

12 The foundations of the state.

The military basis of Kushite power.

9. Rommelaere 1991: 166-167 (26) and pl II, 228-229 (43).
11. Stöörk LA IV 1009-1013, at 1010 and n 16 for Nubia; gives Akhenaten stela as 361 foals citing Randall MacIver and Woolley 1911: 92. Smith 1976: 129 gives this as sm3w and understands as 'cattle'.

-448-
A horse burial was excavated at Soleb: Schiff Giorgini: 1971 260-265, and was calculated as 1.36m "taille moyenne".

As was suggested by Judith Forbis, see Rommelaere 1991: 28-29.

As was suggested by C.A. Piètrement see Rommelaere 1991: 32.


Davies and Gardiner 1926: pl XXIV.

Davies and Gardiner 1926: pl XXXII.

As Störk LA IV suggested.

Piotrovsky 1967: pl xxviii-xxix. Many of the Nubian rock drawings showing horses and chariots are very difficult to date. Some bear a resemblance to the Saharan chariot drawings.

The Epigraphic Survey 1932: Pls 70, 72, 75 (carrying chariot with lists of captured horses and cattle).

The lack of military scenes from this period accounts for the apparent absence.

Ikeda 1982.


Their chronology is discussed by Markoe 1985: 149-156.

The bowls were catalogued and discussed by Markoe 1985: 242-243 (Cy 1: two-horse chariots and cavalry, also camel); 254-255 (Cy 7: two-horse chariots); 256-259 (Cy 8: grazing horses); 263 (Cy 12: Kourion [MMA 74.51.4553] grazing horses and horses in marsh with young); 264 (Cy 13: MMA 74.51.4555, chariots, grazing horses; 265 (Cy 15: Tamassos [Nicosia J755] horse in central medallion); 278-283 (E2: two-horse chariots with sunshades, prancing horses); 284-287 (E3: Praeneste [Villa Giulia 61566], cavalry horses, accompanying figures Egyptian-beardless with short kilts, interior also strongly Egyptian, grazing horses); 289 (E4: Praeneste [Villa Giulia 61543] prancing horses); 290-291 (E5: Praeneste [Villa Giulia 13245] chariots and cavalry, again Egyptian); 292-293 (E6: Caere [Museo Etrusco Gregoriano, Vatican 20368] cavalry and chariots, very similar to E5); 294-295 (E7: Caere [Museo Etrusco Gregoriano, Vatican 20367] cavalry); 296-297 (E8: Caere [Museo Etrusco Gregoriano, Vatican 20366] one chariot; central medallion cow(?) suckling in papyrus thicket); 298-301 (E9: Caere [Museo Etrusco Gregoriano, Vatican 20365] exterior: chariots cavalry. interior: chariots cavalry, banquet scene; central medallion very similar to E8, but bullrushes rather than papyrus and uncertain whether cow or ibex); 303 (E10: four groups alternate child on lotus and horse against papyrus thicket); 304-306 (E11: [Boston MFA 27.170] chariots and cavalry); 307 (E12: [Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 57.705] chariots cavalry prancing horses); 308-309 (E13: [Leiden B 1943/9.1] chariots and cavalry, central medallion suckling ibex similar to E8). cf the Egyptian relief chalices, Tait 1963.

Markoe 1985: 41-42.

So Markoe 1985: 55.

Berlin Xg Mus 14117.
31. Unpublished, my thanks to Dr. Georgina Herrmann for information on this example.
32. Similar bowls have been recovered from Egypt, but the stylistic details suggest that the majority, if not all, of those catalogued by Markoe, were produced in Phoenician centres.
42. Török 1991: 197.
46. Dunham 1950: 113 pl LXXI.E (19-4-78), 114 (19-4-107).
50. Postgate 1974: 13 (6.7); Lie 1929: 80 line 17; see comments of Salonen 1955: 87.
56. For another view of the reasons for including the Egyptians see Donner 1957: 178-184.
60. Dalley 1985: 43.
62. The Egyptianising ivories are generally thought to be of Phoenician origin.
64. Wilson 1972: 138 collation CTN 111 22
65. Dalley 1985: 44.
68. A scene in the chapel of Beg N 32 [Kendall 1982: 55 fig 69] apparently shows a horse being led to sacrifice. A number of graffiti at Musawwarat es-Sufra depict horses, and horse-

69. Fragments of a yoke (?) from Beg N 5: Dunham 1957: 125 (21-12-31), 124 fig 82 pl. XXXI C, LVIII A; silver harness plaques from Beg N 16 Dunham 1957: 139, 141 21-3-694a-k 138 fig 90 pl XXXIII D, LXII A, B LXIV A; similar harness fittings from Beg N 18 Dunham 1957: 21-3-659-663, 669d, 672, 687 148 fig 96, pl LXIV B; Kendall 1982: 48-49 fig 57.

70. Török 1988: pl 45, 46, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58.

71. Török 1988: P1 I.


73. For descriptions of the breed see Rommelaere 1991: 44-45.


75. Burckhardt 1819: 66.

The economic foundations of Kushite power.

76. Shinnie 1975: 253-256.
79. Liverani 1987: 70.
82. Frankenstein 1979: 266.
84. Bulliet 1975.
85. Kitchen 1993: 606 suggests the possibility that the rise of the Levantine and Arabian incense routes were important for the decline of Punt.
100. Frankenstein 1979: 286 citing Winter and Oded.
104 see Groom 1981: 49-50.
105 see Groom 1981: 48-54.
106 see Groom 1981: 49.
108 Fattovich 1990: 266.
109. A possibility also noted by Kitchen 1993: 606.
111. ANET 275-276.
112. ANET 282-284.
113. Note the 6th Dynasty alabasters from Byblos, and Kerma; with differing interpretations of Kemp (in Trigger et al 1983: 129) and Lacovara 1991. Ramesside alabaster vessels were excavated at Ugarit (Aleppo Museum).
118. Lewis 1974: 120-121.
121. Johnson 1936: 337.
129. Lewis 1974: 84; Wilson in ANET 25-29; Lichtheim 1976: (II) 227  ll.2,40 reads "500 smooth linen mats" (the translation is discussed by Goedicke 1975); Elat 1978: 30.
130. For much of this period, Sidon appears to have been a joint kingdom with Tyre, see Katzenstein 1973: 130-133. Strong Egyptian influence at Sidon continued into the 5th century BC.
132. On these vessels and their contents see Leclant 1968.
133. PM VII: 376, a vessel of 81 hin.
134. Culican 1970; Parcerisa 1985: pl LXXVII (Takeloth II); pl CXXVII.1 (Osorkon II).
135. Parcerisa 1985: pl CIX copied from a cartouche of Shoshenq III; pl CXIV.1 copied from the Osorkon II vessel.
136. At Carthage: Pedubast scarabs were found in eight graves; Pimay son of Shoshenq III, in one; Osorkon III in one; at Salamis, an Osorkon.
137. The 'Bocchoris vase' from Tarquinia appears to be an Egyptian product, those from Lilybaeum are copies of it.
138. A temple of Ba'al Zephon is documented in the Ramesside period, along with temples of Ba'alit and Kadesh (pSaltier IV verso: Caminos 1954: 333-349). The existence of 'foreign quarters' in Memphis in the 26th Dynasty has long been assumed.
142. The literature is copious; vehemently against the identification, Kitchen 1973: 106-107, 180-182, 199-200, 330-
The most recent advocates for the identification, Aston 1989, with literature; Leahy 1990; James et al 1991.

Caminos 1958: 125ff, 166.


Frankenstein 1979: 277.


Barnett 1975: 181, Pl.IX (D.9), 188, Pl.CXI (J.1) with a minimum di of 19 cm. Barnett (1975: 168) also notes that some ivory from Samaria was also identified as African. Some unpublished furniture elements in the possession of the British School of Archaeology in Iraq are certainly from African bush elephant. My thanks to Dr. Georgina Herrmann for her comments on these pieces. It has not, so-far, been possible to distinguish African from Asiatic elephant ivory by scientific analysis and estimates of the size of the original tusk remain the principal criterion. My thanks to Dr. Olga Krzyszowska for her comments on this problem.

The importance of the 'forest' elephant has surely been overemphasised and the bush elephant would have been the dominant species in the Meroitic heartland (see Barnett 1975: 163–164). Large pieces of ivory in New Kingdom contexts, such as the headrest and scribe's water bowl (di 17.5 cm; Barnett 1982: 21) from the tomb of Tutankhamun, could only be from bush elephant.

Suggested by Barnett 1975: 166, who also (1975: 167–168) postulated Phoenico-Israelite trade with India (which he identified with Ophir). The dating of the western Asiatic ivories has in itself been problematic.

On the date of the foundation of Carthage see Katzenstein 1973: 117–128. James et al 1991: 53–55, 327–328, argue that there may have been a confusion in the tradition between the foundation of Carthage (qrtθdst 'New Town') and another qrtθdst, Kition in Cyprus.


The ideology of the Kushite state.

Adams 1964: 114.

Breasted 1924: 537–538.

CEDAE Abou Simbel III: pl XV 0 4, falcon-headed with solar disk Imn nb t3 sti (?) nṯr ḫ3 nb pt, a form perhaps related to the divine king; CEDAE Abou Simbel III: pl VIII N 8, human-headed Imn-Rˁ nsw nṯrw nb T3 Sti.


Griffith 1922: pl.XLIX.

Macadam 1955: pl.LXI.
159. Griffith 1922: pl.V.
161. Dedication inscription: Griffith 1922: 102-103 and pls XXXVIII-XL, 11, 5, 13, 64.
162. Griffith 1922: 102-103 11 1-14, apparently refers to the state in which the temple of "Amon-Re Bull of Bow-land" was found. The text was, alas, very fragmentary, and the references to Shaat (Sai) might have meant that the temple was there, not at Sanam, and that the king transferred the cult.
163. Without considerably more material from the preceding reigns such developments cannot be traced.
164. Griffith 1922: pl XLIII.4; pl XLIV.2 (Aspelta).
165. Schafer 1895.
166. Griffith 1922: pl XLIII.3; cf architrave block with cartouche of Senkamanisken Griffith 1922: 101, pl XI k3 n St.
170. Nastasen stela 11 49-50: the preceding events happened in that 'town'.
171. Setne II IV.15, V.30, VI.35: Griffith 1900: 56, 60, 61.
172. Reisner 1931: pls VI, VII.
177. A large number of re-used reliefs blocks have come to light in recent years at Edfu, also from the hall of Shabaqo in the 'small temple' at Medinet Habu. Many of these blocks carry the typical regalia, but the cartouches are defaced (usually recut for Psamtik II).

13 Conclusion: economic and cultural exchange.

2. eg the stela of the Moabite ruler from Bal'ua (Amman Museum); the ruler depicted on the Megiddo ivories: Pritchard 1973: I fig 90; the Ahiram sarcophagus from Byblos: Pritchard 1973: I fig 126.
3. eg the stela of Barrakab from Sam'al: Pritchard 1973: I fig 127: the rock relief of Urpalla king of Tyana.
4. eg the stela of Yehimilk from Byblos: Pritchard 1973: I fig 130.
5. Morkot 1992 Part 1; for the stelae from Buhen see above Chap 12 n 175. For the inscriptions of Qakare, Iy-ib-khent-re and Wadjkare see Weigall 1907: pl 19.1,2, 21.2, 54.1, 64.4,8, 65.1; Roeder 1911: pl 81b, 108c, 109a, 120a, 121k; Simpson 1963: 45.
Appendix 4: The Wadi Gasus inscription.

10. A stela at Geneva of Smendes, dated to year 21 of Iuput, see Kitchen 1986: 542.
11. Brooklyn Mus 59.17; Edinburgh RSM.
13. Although the stela dated to year 15 of Osorkon III from Hermopolis need not suggest that he was the ruler of the city (cf the Nile level texts).

Appendix 5: the Kushite succession: matrilineage or patrilineage?

2. Priese (1981) and Török (1986) have discussed matrilineage in the Kushite context.
6. All of Lieblein's genealogies assume this.
8. Macadam 1949: 120.
17. Certain from the date and text of the Nitoqert Adoption Stela.
18. Nitoqert Adoption Stela 11.3-4.
20. On the evidence of the Osiris Heqa-Djet chapel.
22. On these earlier God's Wives see Yoyotte 1972.
23. Louvre Stela C 100.
24. see, for example, the stelae of Peftjauswybast.
29. reign of Aspelta: M.B. Reisner 1934.
30. year 3 of Aspelta: Schafer 1895.
34. Budge 1912: xciii.
39. cf Grimal's re-publication of the Aspelta accession stela with its facsimilies of the text: 1981b: pls V-VII.
41. Kawa VIII, 1.24: Macadam 1949: 47,
42. Griffith 1922.
43. The term 'stepmother' usually employed has, I feel, too specific a meaning and is loaded with connotations, at least in the English language.
44. Macadam 1955: pl XVb.
45. Macadam 1955: pl XVe, XIVb.
46. Macadam 1955: pl XIV a, XIIIa,b.
50. Dunham and Macadam 1949 no 64; Dunham 1955: 199.
52. Dunham 1955: 234 fig 180 N Reg B.
53. see Troy 1986: 165 (18.33).
54. see also comment of Macadam 1949: 32, n 49, that s3t and smt nsw continue in use, he does not refer to hmt nsw.
55. Kawa V 16-21 and associated texts; Kawa VIII 22-24 (Anlamani); Kawa IX 82 (Irike-Amanote).
58. Kawa IV 7-8; Kawa V 13-14; Aspelta Election stela; Kawa IX 3-4.
64. Alpers 1970: 206.
96. in Fortes and Evans-Pritchard 1940: 96-97.
100. Reisner 1918b: 110.
101. Reisner 1918b: 104 fig 2, 106, pl XIV
102. Cailliaud Voyage à Méroé I pl.LXI and blocks found by Reisner.
103. pp 345-346.
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