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The Meroe Joint Excavations 1992
on the North Mound at Meroe

Claudia Näser

“The step [...] from debris to a general theory of what the debris represents [...] is not to be gotten simply by pressing the analysis of the debris as far as it will go.” (Hymes 1970: 18)

From January to March 1992 a preparatory campaign of the Meroe Joint Excavations (MJE) was launched in Meroe.¹ A general description of the mission, its aims and the achieved results has been published, as well as detailed reports on the excavations at Northwest Mound 1 (NW1), a slag heap in the northern part of the site, and at temple MJE105 south of the processional way to the Amun temple, M260 (Fig. 1).² The discoveries in a third excavation spot, NTA2, shall be presented in the following.³ The considerable delay of their publication is at least partially due to the fact that work in this area could not be completed and was planned to be resumed at a later date. Since, however, the 1992 campaign remained the only field season of the MJE, the preliminary results from NTA2 shall be presented here for the sake of completeness – and in the hope that future fieldwork in Meroe will solve the questions that were literally only scratched on the surface in this spot.

¹ The topic of this contribution is closely connected with the thanks I want to give to Prof. Wenig, who took me for my first visit and work in Sudan, when I was only a second year student. The three months I spent in the field with the MJE belong to my dearest memories, and Meroe still is one of my favourite places in the world. Thus, I am especially happy to participate in this volume with a paper on Meroe.

I wish to thank Rebecca Bradley for instructive talks and corrections of my English, and Peter Shinnie and Julie Anderson for allowing me to quote from chapters in: Shinnie - Anderson in press.


³ Thus, only the work in the so-called Rescue Area west of the Royal City remains unpublished; but cf. on this Wenig 1994: 18.
1. Bowl, field no. 42 (Fig. 6):
- in shape and type comparable to a corresponding bowl included in Edwards 1999: fig. 74 =

2. Bowl, field no. 43:
- corresponds to components of the 50-line.

34 In passing, it should be noted that other dates have been included other than M. 260.
35 Notably, no M. 260.
36 Shinnie - Bradle.
1. The excavation in NTA2

During a systematic survey of the concession area, a stone wall was discovered about 70 m northeast of temple KC100 on the so-called North Mound (Fig. 1). To judge by its position and orientation it might have belonged to a second row of buildings directed towards the processional way to the Amun temple, which ran about 80 m south of it. In order to check this hypothesis, an excavation area, provisionally labelled New Temple Area 2 (NTA2), was opened. It comprised the southern half of square 760/730, in which the visible part of the wall was situated.

The ground surface was covered with a layer of windblown sand. It was amply mixed with ceramics, but also contained a few chunks of stone and red brick.

1.1 The stone wall

The wall, which ran from southwest to northeast, was preserved to a maximum of two layers (Figs. 2-3). The upper layer, which was present only in the southern part of the wall, consisted of

---

4 New Temple Area 1 was the spot in which the processional temple MJ105 was found.
5 For the grid system in Meroe cf. Wenig 1994: 17. Since no absolute levelling point was available, all elevations refer to an arbitrarily fixed point. N.B.: In the meantime an altitude-point at 360.19 m a.s.l. has been established in the Royal City in connection with geodetic works carried out by the mission of the Humboldt-University/Berlin in Musawwarat es Sufra; cf. Wenig - Wolf 2000: 41.
Its deposition too... the abandonment layers.

Fired brick was present in a Functional phase on the surface, and it corresponds to this period. The repeated re-use of the site, in such a manner that it dates to a time of abandonment. This situation, in combination with other changes, may indicate that the Amun temple.29 Consequently, in the funerary sphere, it is possible that the statues, were reused in the late Meroitic and later periods.

3. The Finds

Since it had originally been intended that the finds was publication, important objects with their contexts are described.

3.1 Ceramics

Significantly, Meroitic sherds from the preliminary 80-Line and Trial excavation deposits (Shinnie - Bradley 2007:67) support the interpretation of Adams' dating of the site to somewhat earlier in the reign of Amenemhet III, and the statement that it was completely abandoned in later Components.

Fig. 3  NTA2, horizon 1, scale 1 : 50 (drawing: B. Weserka, reworked: I. Säuberlich).

27 Shinnie - Bradley 2007:67
28 Shinnie et al. 2006:27
29 Shinnie et al. 2006:197
30 Shinnie et al. 2006:197-200. Note also that 313, fig. 4, part of a highly decorated vessel of a "terminus ante quem" in the ceramics from the 79/80-Line excavation, p. 82, Shinnie - Bradley 2007:67.
Key to Fig. 3

(1), (8), (15) mudbrick walls
(2) hard, compact mud, i.e., remains of a mudbrick structure
(3) very loose sand, alternating with sandy-ashy layers with charcoal
(4), (10), (14), (16) layers of sand, alternating with thin, compact silt bands
(5), (9) mudbrick rubble
(6), (13) very loose sandy-ashy material, many finds
(7) loose, sandy-ashy material
(11) compact mud, from a wall (?)
(12) hard, silty-ashy material, bottom of pit
(17) loose sand
(18) relatively compact, silty-ashy material, foundation trench (?)

large sandstone blocks, which were roughly set and partly dislocated. The lower layer
was constructed of two parallel, loosely set rows of stones. The space between them
was filled with smaller chunks of sandstone. Two upright slabs seem to have been
inserted in a foundation trench. A column segment which was incorporated in the northern
part of the wall indicated that at least the larger building elements had been
reused from older structures. Their provenance could not be determined. Likewise at
the northern end of the wall, several red bricks had been built in.

1.2 The mudbrick structures

North of the stone wall and at a right angle to it, a mudbrick wall (1) was found (Figs.
2-3). It was one and a half courses wide; the bricks measured 36 × 17 cm. Stratigraphically
it proved to be the older feature: part of it had been demolished when the stone
wall was built against it. A packet of solid mud (2) southwest of it probably belonged
to this wall. Single bricks could not be differentiated, but the entire packet was about
two courses wide. It resembles some brick banks found in contexts of domestic architec-
ture in Shinnie's excavations and tentatively interpreted as zir-stands by the excava-
tors.7 They are, however, somewhat broader than packet (2).

The brick wall (1) formed a rectangular corner with another wall (8) of similar
width, running to the southwest. This corner was slightly disturbed by a large pit (A).
A layer of broken mudbrick (9) was detected in the space between the two walls.

In the southeast of the excavation square, another mudbrick wall (15) was re-
vealed. Its visible part was only one brick wide and ran parallel respectively at a right

---

6 The surface of the column fragment is worked in four horizontal bulges. Whether it
belonged to a base, a shaft or a capital is uncertain. Cf. a capital with three bulges and a
uraeus-frieze from M943; Török 1997: 206, pl. 170, no. 23.

7 In a house of the Bottom Component in M.50; Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 15, fig. 7. In Compo-
nent 5 in M.79; ibid.: 37, fig. 12 (not 13, as indicated by the authors). At the outside of
house A in Component 14, building phase II, in M.80; ibid.: 51, 56, fig. 22, pl. 28.
Fig. 4  NTA2, eastern section with pit A, scale 1 : 20 (drawing: B. Wewerka, reworked: I. Siäuberlich).
angle to the other brick walls. They all apparently formed part of the same structure. The stratigraphic relationship between walls (8) and (15) and a small pit (B) remains problematic, but the latter seemed to slightly cut into them.

1.3 The stratigraphic features

The above-mentioned top layer of windblown sand was about 5 cm deep (Figs. 4-5). It was followed by a second layer of similar consistency, which was up to 30 cm thick and contained fragments of red brick, bones and slag, but above all many potsherds. Beside coarse domestic and some “semifine” wares, remarkably many sherds of Meroitic fineware were recorded. Below this layer, areas of different consistency emerged (Fig. 3).

Layer (3), west of the stone wall, contained sandy-ashy material with bits of charcoal, alternating with bands of loose sand. It represents a deposit of domestic material, interrupted by natural accumulations of sand. It ran beneath the stone wall, but above the mud packet (2). Layer (4), partly extending over layer (3), consisted of rather compact sand including fine bands of silt, and can thus be recognized as a natural deposit produced by eolian and fluvial activities. Layer (6) contained sandy-ashy material and many finds. It might represent the fill of a pit sunk into layer (4). Layers (4) and (6) again ran beneath the stone wall.

Fig. 5 NTA2, eastern section (photo: J. Walther).

All three layers (3, 4, 6) produced plentiful pottery of the same sort as this found in the top layers of windblown sand. Moreover, animal bones, slag, plaster, metal fragments, beads and some other small objects were recorded. In layer (3), a fragmentary figurine was found (Fig. 9, cf. below pp. 87f.).

In the eastern part of the square, natural deposits of sand with silty bands predominated (Fig. 3: 10, 14, 16, 17; Fig. 4: 4, 5, 25). In a depth of 10 to 20 cm, they alternated with layers of sandy-ashy material with some charcoal (i.e., domestic debris (Fig. 4: 3, 8). Finds were recorded from both types of deposits. They comprised plentiful ceramics, slag, bones and metal fragments. In the sandy material northeast of the mudbrick walls (Fig. 3: 10, 14, 16), two pits had been sunk.

1.4 The pits

The larger pit (A) had an oval outline with a reconstructable maximum extension of about 2.7 m (Fig. 3). It was about 0.8 m deep. The eastern section displays its strange baggy shape (Figs. 4-5). Since the pit was certainly not dug to this shape, a secondary deformation must be assumed. Either its rather loose fill gave way to the pressure of the surrounding material, which then collapsed onto it; or else its south wall was cut by a later pit, which was not used for domestic refuse but eventually filled with sand and thus could not be distinguished from the surrounding material. The section also shows that the pit had been filled in from the south, which resulted in a concentration of larger objects at the farther, i.e., northern ends of the steeper layers.

The fill consisted of multiple layers of sandy-ashy material mixed with charcoal, and sandy layers, some of which incorporated fine bands of silt (Fig. 4). The latter contained significantly fewer finds. They again are the product of aeolian or fluvial processes, and indicate that the pit stood open for some time. The other layers represent domestic refuse.

In the area of pit (A), five fragments of a glass bottle were found (Fig. 10; cf. below p. 89f.). Although the documentation is not decisive in this respect, some of them apparently came from the layers immediately above the pit, while others originated from the uppermost infill. The excavated western half of the pit yielded plentiful ceramics, slag, bones and several small objects, among them a metal ring, clay weights, faience fragments, organic material of a textile character and beads. Some of the ceramics were almost completely preserved. Among the osteological material, the lower jaw of a camel was tentatively identified.

Next to pit (A), but not intersecting it, another pit (B) was detected (Fig. 5). It had an almost circular outline and a diameter of about 1.4 m. Its filling again consisted of loose, sandy-ashy material rich in finds. It was not excavated, but ceramics, bones and beads were recorded from the uppermost layers.

10 The silty bands rule out that the sandy material had been intentionally tipped to cover the refuse. For this practice, encountered, e.g., in Component 13 of the 79/80-Line, cf. Shinnie-Bradley 1980: 49.

1.5 The trapezoidal depression

In order to clarify the nature of related features, a test trench was opened 2.5 m north of the trapezoidal depression. It was opened 2.5 m north of the trapezoidal depression. At the eastern end of the test trench, a gradual slope below the surface was exposed.

1.6 The occupation sequence

Summarizing the data from the domestic, burial, and mudbrick areas, the northernmost depression (1) was occupied by a deposit containing a large number of pottery sherds, mainly of an earlier phase. The depression (2) contains a high concentration of sherds, mostly from vessels that were not part of the nearby occupation. The test trench, a few meters to the west, was excavated to a depth of several meters, and the uppermost layers were cleaned to reveal a concentration of pottery sherds, mostly from vessels that were not part of the nearby occupation. The test trench, a few meters to the west, was excavated to a depth of several meters, and the uppermost layers were cleaned to reveal a concentration of pottery sherds, mostly from vessels that were not part of the nearby occupation.

11 A camel skull, with an uncrushed uppermost part, was found in Component 13 of the 79/80-Line, cf. Shinnie-Bradley 1980: 62f. Further information about the archaeological site is contained in VA of Compon-ents 7 and 6, p. 49 for a general analysis.

12 Its coordinates are...
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1.5 The trial trench

In order to clarify the further extension of the stone wall and the potential occurrence of related features, a test trench of 30 m length and 1.5 m width, running east-west, was opened 2.5 m north of the main excavation area. As usual in this area, plentiful ceramics were recovered from the surface and the topmost layer of windblown sand. At the eastern end of the trench, the first layer of domestic refuse emerged only 5 cm below the surface. Since no structural remains could be detected, excavation was stopped at this point.

1.6 The occupational sequence

Summarizing the findings from NTA2, the following sequence can be reconstructed. The oldest feature on the site is the mudbrick walls, which represent an episode of domestic occupation. Since excavation was not continued below horizon 1 (Fig. 3), the standing height of these walls could not be determined. It can be assumed, however, that their upper parts had deliberately been removed in antiquity: collapsed mudbrick was few (Fig. 3: 5, 9), and a layer of domestic refuse (3) ran directly over brick packet (2) associated with wall (1), making it unlikely that these structures had been exposed to natural forces for a longer period of time and eroded away.

Soon after the mudbrick buildings had been abandoned, the area started to be used for dumping of domestic debris. The placing of pits (A) and (B) still took the position of the mudbrick walls into account. The refuse was tipped in these pits and in even layers. Since the latter alternated with deposits of sand resulting from aeolian and fluvial processes, the dumping must have occurred in several episodes. The sandy deposits also contained artefacts, which were either mixed in by natural processes or transported by continued human activity. In the eastern part of the excavated area and the test trench, the latest layers of domestic material were situated close to the modern surface, covered only by thin layers of windblown sand representing recent and subsequent natural processes. The amount of stratigraphic loss due to erosion cannot be determined.

Nothing specific can be said about the provenance of the debris, but it probably originated from settlement activities close by. Apart from numerous pieces of slag deriving from industrial activities (cf. below p. 82), the deposits mainly consisted of ash, ceramics, animal bones and further objects of domestic character. A prominent feature

---

1 A camel skull, which the excavators thought to be intrusive, was already reported from the topmost Component 15 of the 79/80-Line, namely from building IA; cf. Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 62f. Further camel bones came from the Top Component of the 50-Line, namely from G50c(1a); cf. Carter - Foley in: Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 302f. and ibid.: 20-23, fig. 8 for the archaeological context. Surprisingly, also lower levels of the 79/80-Line, namely building VA of Component 9 in N.79, and Spits 20 and 28 of Trial Trench 5, representing Components 7 and 6, produced camel bones; cf. Carter - Foley in: Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 302f. For a general analysis of this distribution cf. Bradley 1984: 204, 207.

12 Its coordinates are 750-780/737.5-739.
of pit (A) was some comparatively large fragments of ceramic vessels, mainly bowls (Figs. 5-8), which had obviously been dumped after their first damage, without repair, reuse or employment in other functional contexts.

The stone wall represents the latest structure on the site. It cut into the earlier mud-brick wall (1) (Figs. 2-3), which then must still have existed in some form and to some height, and apparently used it to create a new structure. But since no other feature of contemporary origin could be identified, its context and function is uncertain.

Due to the limited scope of excavation, the reconstruction of the occupational sequence of NTA2 must remain fragmentary. In order to confirm and expand it, the present findings shall be compared with the results of earlier excavations in the area and thus positioned in the archaeological sequence of the North Mound.

2. The North Mound of Meroe

The North Mound is a large kom about 200 m east of the Royal City (Fig. 1). NTA2 lies in its southwestern part, which runs smoothly into the surrounding lowland. It is only 30 m north of Shinnie’s 50-Line Trench, which was laid out to intersect the entire kom on its southern side.  

The results of the excavations in the eastern part of the 50-Line, from B.50 to M.50, were published in 1980.  

The area west of F.50 produced a long and complex sequence of settlement activities. The latest phase, designated Top Component, comprised three levels of mudbrick architecture, comparable in its orientation and building technique to the mudbrick walls in NTA2 (Shinnie - Bradley 1980: figs. 8-11). Accumulation and deposition of domestic rubbish in layers and pits began contemporary with the settlement. The respective deposits alternated with layers of sand, which the excavators attributed to eolian processes. Pits of varying shapes and sizes, containing a mix of domestic refuse and sand, occurred between H.50 and M.50 (Shinnie - Bradley 1980: figs. 4, 8-11). Under reference to unspecified C14-dates, the excavators dated the beginning of the Top Component to the late 3rd or early 2nd century B.C.  

The three main building levels indicate a longer duration of the phase. This is confirmed by a number of C14-dates, the latest – subdivided – sample giving dates of 70 +/- 80 and 240 +/- 70 A.D.

At the surface of the 50-Line, many fragments of red brick were found (Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 25; Bradley 1984: 210f.). Since the buildings of the Top Component with

---

13 NTA2 corresponds to O.53 in Shinnie’s grid system. The 50-Line corresponds to the north-south coordinate 700 in the system of the MJE.
17 MR-125; cf. Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 313 and Bradley 1984: 207, tab. 1, who lists the dates from this sample under two separate episodes. For the corresponding building level cf. Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 24, fig. 11.
the exception of some architectural details were executed in mudbrick, the excavators assumed that they had belonged to a late Meroitic or Postmeroitic episode, evidence of which had almost completely eroded away; or else that they originated from the small temples along the processional way to the Amun temple, in which red brick had been used next to mudbrick and sandstone as a regular building material.\footnote{This observation holds for KC100, M720, KC101, M282, KC104 and MJE105; cf. Anderson in: Shinnie - Anderson in press and Wolf 1996: 33, fig. 2.}

In the later campaigns, the 50-Line Trench was extended westwards, from N.50 to AC.50.\footnote{Cf. Anderson in: Shinnie - Anderson in press for the findings quoted in the following.} The complex sequence of settlement activities continued to Q.50, and thinned out further west. Uncalibrated C14-dates of the middle building period range from 1895 +/- 130 b.p. (75 b.c. - 185 a.d.) to 1730 +/- 140 b.p. (80 - 360 a.d.). The latest building period must thus be somewhat younger. In R.50, a large pit opened from the modern surface. Its fill resembled that of pit (A): layers of domestic refuse alternated with sandy material; the lower part especially contained many ceramics. The stratigraphic position of the pit indicates that in this area of the 50-Line the uppermost antique and subrecent layers have eroded away. West of S.50 the latest building phase is missing. There, the sacral area of the small temples north of the processional way prevented any profane activity from the 1\textsuperscript{st} century A.D. at latest. Partially, older settlement structures were levelled during the construction of the temples.

Shinnie's 79/80-Line Trench, which was situated in the northern part of the mound, 260 m from NTA2 (Fig. 1), produced broadly comparable results.\footnote{Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 27-70, 96, tab. 1, and with a summary Bradley 1984: 197-211. The 79/80-Line corresponds to the north-south coordinates 990/1000 in the system of the MJE.} The latest two phases of an even more complex sequence of domestic settlement were designated Components 14 and 15. In Component 14, areas outside the mudbrick houses had been used for dumping refuse and pits serving the same purpose had been dug close to the walls of the buildings (Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 50). The end of Component 14 was marked by a layer of windblown sand and pits which had been sunk into this layer, indicating that, while building activity had temporarily ceased in the area, the deposition of refuse went on (ibid.: 61). In Component 15, mudbrick was again the only building material (ibid.).

The surface in the 79/80-Line was littered with red brick, moreover scarce traces of a building phase in this material were detected.\footnote{Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 69f. Cf. also Bradley 1984: 210f.} One of the structures incorporated a reused column drum.\footnote{It was situated on top of mudbrick building A of phase I in O.79/80; cf. Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 68, 70.} Likewise, in the nearby Iron Smelting Area (Fig. 1), more precisely in D.81, a building with reused red bricks and a cylindrical sandstone block was found and attributed to the latest building phase in the spot.\footnote{Anderson in: Shinnie - Anderson in press. D.81 corresponds to square 870/1010 in the grid system of the MJE.}

So far the results of the Canadian mission. It is little known that Garstang had already worked on the North Mound, carrying out excavations on the two highest ele-
vations in the centre of the kom in 1911, 1913 and 1914. The northeastern spot and the structures encountered were designated M285, and the southwestern, M284, M286 and M287 (Fig. 1). The two areas are about 210 m and 160 m north of NTA2.

After his first campaign on the North Mound, Garstang (1912: 46) only listed M285 and M286 among “various mounds [...] containing instructive remains of workshops and other buildings”. At the end of his work he contented himself with the following summary: “A number of houses of artizans were readily disclosed, and the mound was probed to a considerable depth (5 to 6 m) with like results. A number of domestic articles, and a splendid series of examples of Meroitic pottery wares were recovered from these buildings” (Garstang et al. 1914-1916: 7).

Further information was recently made available by László Török’s reexamination of Garstang’s papers (Török 1997: 131-139). From them it became clear that M285 contained remains of columns and pillars, and a wall of unspecified building material. M286 was a “large mound covered with iron slag” with parts of a brick building at its eastern side (ibid.: fig. 95); in a trench dug through the top of the mound, further walls came to light. M287 was a red brick structure with remains of a square pillar; the sketch-map seems to show two superimposed systems of walls (ibid.: fig. 95). They may have been part of a building of the latest settlement phase, which in the 50- and 79/80-Lines was preserved only in scanty traces. For M284 no records exist. However, some of the pottery connected with this spot belongs to the late 25th dynasty or the early Napatan period (ibid.: 132, fig. 89). It indicates that stratigraphically deeper levels had been reached there. The bulk of the ceramic material and the small finds documented from M284, M286 and M287 date to the early and middle Meroitic periods (ibid.: 131-139, figs. 89-99, pls. 102-104).

Summing up the evidence of the several excavation areas, it becomes clear that the North Mound is a huge settlement kom built up over a substantial period of time. Accompanying industrial activities apparently shifted from an area south of the 50-Line to the northern part of the mound. While in the earlier levels the deposition of industrial waste concentrated in the 50-Line, it became rarer there in the Top Component, which produced industrial installations in the 79/80-Line and further north. At present the oldest structures on the mound can be dated to the 25th dynasty or the early Napatan period.

Up to the Meroitic period, building on the site was mainly executed in mudbrick. The respective walls and the midden deposits in NTA2 represent a rather late episode in this sequence. In many details they correspond to the last major building phase of the 50- and 79/80-Lines. Interesting for everyday history is the way in which waste disposal was organised. On the one hand, as in NTA2, buildings and refuse dumping seem to represent subsequent episodes, i.e., debris was deposited in areas temporarily not used for dwelling, proving a shifting settlement pattern on a small scale. On the other hand, rubbish was also dumped in the immediate vicinity of existing dwellings.

25 From the map in: Garstang et al. 1914-1916: pl. 1, M285 can be located in the grid system of the MJE at about 820-860/910-950 and M284/286/287 at 730-780/860-900.
26 For a summary on this cf. Bradley 1984: 202-205.
Its deposition took place in pits of varying form and size, as well as in heaps or shallow layers. Fired brick was only introduced as a regular building material in the latest occupational phase on the site. The stone wall with its built-in red bricks apparently corresponds to this phase, which is almost completely eroded away in Shinnie's trenches. The repeated reuse of elements of monumental architecture in this context indicates that it dates to a time when official and sacral buildings had at least partially been abandoned. This situation, which was certainly accompanied or preceded by substantial social changes, is mirrored in the squatter occupation of the small temples in front of the Amun temple. On a larger scale it can be correlated with similar developments in the funerary sphere, where elements of religious installations, like offering tables and bas- statues, were reused. In this context, the phenomenon can definitely be tied to the late Meroitic and the early Postmeroitic era.

3. The Finds from NTA2

Since it had originally been planned to continue work in NTA2, the detailed recording of the finds was postponed to a later campaign. In 1992 only some of the more important objects were documented in photographs, and are presented here.

3.1 Ceramics

Significantly, Meroitic fineware was present in all excavated layers in NTA2. In the 79/80-Line and Trial Trench 3, it first appeared in Component 12 and Spit 11 respectively (Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 49, 96, tab. 1, 160). Upon this evidence, the excavators adopted Adams' dating of about 100 A.D. for its introduction, while others opt for a somewhat earlier date, i.e., the late 1st century B.C. The latter would be supported if the statement that sherds of imports datable to the 1st century A.D. were present in the later Components 14 and 15 of the 79/80-Line proved to be correct (Bradley 1984:

---

27 Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 16 attributed the oldest cultural strata in the 50-Line to the 7th century B.C. on the basis of C14-dates of the 6th century B.C. from later layers of the Bottom Component. For a somewhat earlier estimation, i.e., the 8th century B.C., cf. Bradley 1984: 197-200. Note also, that considerably older C14-dates, i.e., 1030 +/- 140 and 985 +/- 95 b.c., were obtained from a pit below the oldest main layer in L.50; Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 16, 313, fig. 4, part 6. The lowest cultural stratum in P.50 yielded a sherd of a Greek black-figured vessel of the late 6th century B.C.; Näser in: Shinnie - Anderson in press. It provides a terminus ante quem non for the first building activities in this part of the trench. Cf. also the ceramics from M284 and further early pottery from the 50- and 79/80-Lines; above p. 82, Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 16, 161 and Bradley 1984: 200f., figs. 2f. For the lowest levels in the 79/80-Line, no C14-dates are available, but they certainly are of comparably early date as the earliest strata in the 50-Line; cf. Bradley 1984: 197-200.
This gives a *terminus ante quem non* for the midden deposits in NTA2. To define the end of the fine ware is even more problematic. It was still present in tombs of the Western Necropolis, which David Edwards (1999: 59f. = 1999a: 33, 35f.) attributed to his early group III, i.e., the earlier 3rd century A.D.

Only some vessels from pit (A) are available for closer analysis, and detailed ceramic documentation is lacking even for these. In previous works on pottery from Meroe and surrounding sites, only few diagnostic features of coarse and "semifine" wares were established.33 Open shapes are especially problematic in this respect. A comparison of several vessels from pit (A) with the pottery corpus of Shinnie's excavations at Meroe shows that

---

28 At the same time, however, red brick was already in use in sacral and representative contexts; cf. on this also Fitznerbeiter in: Fitznerbeiter et al. 1999: 39, 154-156. In Meroe it was present, e.g.:

- in the enclosure wall of the Sun temple, M250; Garstang 1910: 65; 1911: 25
- in the outer walls and the pylon of M600; Garstang 1910: 68; 1911: 18
- in walls and pylons of the Apedemak temple; M6; Garstang 1910: 67; 1911: 21
- as facing bricks in the peristyle court of M260, i.e., M271; Garstang 1910: 61
- in the small temples in front of the Amun temple, i.e., KC100, M720, KC101, M282, KC104 and MJE105; Anderson in: Shinnie - Anderson in press; Wolf 1996: 33, fig. 2.

Likewise in the Royal City, namely:

- in temple M97 and the remains of an earlier structure beneath it; Garstang 1913: 76f.
- in building M990; Garstang et al. 1914-1916: 13
- as facing bricks in the two buildings at both sides of the northeastern gate; Garstang - George 1914: 10f.
- in two circular structures south of the northwestern gate; Garstang - George 1914: 14
- in three similar structures in court C in spot M98; Garstang - George 1914: 12
- as pavement in house B in spot M98; Garstang - George 1914: 12
- as water-pipes and in the walls of the Royal Baths; Garstang 1913: 78, 81; Garstang - George 1914: 15f., 19.

Cf. also Garstang - George 1914: pl. 1 and Garstang et al. 1914-1916: 9, pl. 2 with annotated maps and a list of further red brick buildings. In contrast, red brick was rare in earlier contexts on the North Mound. It was found:

- in four walls of the middle building phase in the 50-Line; Anderson in: Shinnie - Anderson in press

used for architectural details in buildings of Components 14 and 15 in the 79/80-Line; Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 52, 56, 58, 61, 64, 66-68

- in several features, among them Furnace 1, in the Iron Smelting Area, i.e., D.81; Anderson in: Shinnie - Anderson in press.


tions and Edwards' analysis of the Meroitic ceramics from the Western Necropolis produced the following results.44

1. Bowl, field no. 760/730.28.1: round bottom, simple rim, "semifine" fabric, red slip (Fig. 6):
   – in shape and treatment similar to Shinnie's forms 76 and 81, which are handmade and of fine fabric; complete pieces came from Component 11 of the 79/80-Line and a correspondingly early level of the Top Component of the 50-Line,35
   – comparable to form E7 from W308 (Dunham 1963: 143, 341, fig. E) which was not included in Edwards' analysis; the tomb, however, belongs to his phase Ia (Edwards 1999: fig. 74 = 1999a: fig. 5).

Fig. 6 Bowls from pit (A), field no. 760/730.28.1 (photo: J. Walther).

2. Bowl, field no. 760/730.4: solid foot, ledge rim, coarse fabric, red slip (Fig. 7):
   – corresponds to Shinnie's form 41, which frequently occurred in the upper components of the 50- and 79/80-Lines in different fine fabrics.36

34 In passing, it should be mentioned that the better preserved vessels from pit (A) also included other types, as a large plate or doka, a feeding cup, a lid and a stand of some sort. Notably, no Meroitic fineware was among these pieces.
35 Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 132, 135, 156, figs. 34f.: ware Jc.
36 Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 131, 135-138, 147, 154, fig. 31: wares Cc, Cd and Ce.
in Edwards' typology it is closest to K16, with the relatively wide and flat form hinting at an early date in the series, i.e., in Edwards' group II.\textsuperscript{37}

Fig. 7  Bowl from pit (A), field no. 760/730.4 (photo: J. Walther).

3. Bowl, field no. 760/730.28.2: flat base, ledge rim, coarse fabric, cream slip (Fig. 8):
- flat base and ledge rim occur separately in Shinnie's forms 40 and 41 of fine to "medium" fabrics; while form 41 was frequently present in the upper components of the 50- and 79/80-Lines, form 40 was much rarer and confined to the Top Component of the 50-Line;\textsuperscript{38} direct parallels to 28.2 do not exist,
- this picture is confirmed by the material from the Western Necropolis, where comparable bowls show a marked variety in detail and are subsumed by Edwards under K16 and the typologically later E26, which also includes flat-bottomed specimens; these forms belong to his groups II and III.\textsuperscript{39}

Fig. 8  Bowl from pit (A), field no. 760/730.28.2 (photo: J. Walther).

\textsuperscript{37} Edwards 1999: 56, 59, 66, fig. 77 = 1999a: 29, 33, 43, fig. 6. Cf. also Edwards 1999 et al.: 24, 40, pl. 8 for some relatively early, i.e., probably 1st century A.D. specimens from Musawwarat es Sufra.

\textsuperscript{38} For form 40 cf. Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 133, 149, 154, 157, fig. 31: wares Cc and Kb. For form 41 cf. note 36 on p. 85.

\textsuperscript{39} Edwards 1999: 56, 59, 62, 66, fig. 77 = 1999a: 29, 33, 38, 43, fig. 6.
4. Bowl, field no. 760/730.28.7: solid foot, flaring rim, coarse fabric, red slip:
   - closest to Shinnie’s form 29, which was present only in the Top Component of the
     50-Line; the few complete examples show a marked variety in fabric from coarse to
     fine, 40
   - in Edwards’ typology it compares best, with the absence of a ledge rim, to the
     typologically later forms subsumed under E26. 41

First, the variation in shape is the most remarkable feature of these four bowls from
pit (A). It does not, however, contradict in principle the diachronic tendency estab-
lished by Edwards in his analysis of the material from the Western Necropolis. It only
shows the longevity and the partial synchrony of single variants. Distinctively early and
late shapes of Edwards’ typology are absent, and the assemblage seems to belong to
his groups II or III. The round-bottomed bowl (Fig. 6) suggests an early date within
this range, but even then the shape proves more tenacious than it would be expected
from the evidence of the Western Necropolis and Shinnie’s corpus. The ledge-rimmed
bowls (Figs. 7-8) are comparatively, but not extremely late. 42 In absolute terms, this
would mean a date between the late 1st and the earlier 3rd century A.D. 43

3.2  The steatopygous statuette (field no. 760/730.7)

Layer (3), a deposit of domestic de-
bris, yielded a fragment of a ceramic
female statuette (Fig. 9). It
belongs to a well-known type of
figurine, characterized by volumi-
 nous buttocks, rudimentary legs, a
slim waist, and – not preserved in
the present case – broad, but flat
shoulders. 44 The torsi of these stat-
uettes often show incised or im-
pressed ornaments, which
represent tatoos or scarifications. 45
The hitherto known specimens
lack arms. 46 Their heads are mod-

Fig. 9  Fragment of a steatopygous pottery statuette,
field no. 760/730.7 (photo: J. Walther).

---

40 Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 130, 133, 153f., fig. 30: wares Bb and Gc.
42 For a summary of the development of both bowl types cf. Edwards 1999: 59, 62 = 1999a:
   33, 38.
44 For other types of figurines cf. Wenig 1978: 220f., nos. 142-144.
45 E.g., Shinnie - Bradley 1980: figs. 70-72, nos. 663/661, 987, 3028. For a general discussion of
46 One, however, has a drill hole in one shoulder; Shinnie - Bradley 1980: fig. 70, no. 663/661.
elled separately as small balls; facial details, sometimes including tattoos or scars, are incised or more rarely applied.

The specimens published by Shinnie and Bradley (1980: 180f., figs. 69-72) comprise several body fragments and heads. Most of them originated from the Top Component of the 50-Line and the upper Components 14 and 15 of the 79/80-Line. Only one head and one torso were found in Components 11 and 12 of the 79/80-Line. All of them consisted of unfired clay. As far as a decision is possible, they all seem to represent women; at least no male genitals are indicated, while sometimes female breasts are shown.\(^47\) The heads do not display any gender differentiation.

Shinnie’s later campaigns produced further body fragments and heads, as well as one almost complete statuette with applied breasts.\(^48\) Two of these fragments, which, however, were only tentatively identified, were of pottery. As far as stratigraphic information is available, the specimen originated from the surface layers of the 50-Line, the levels of squatting occupation in M282 – among the latter one of the two pottery pieces – and the occupation level of KC101. Finally, one specimen was connected with the comparatively early phase II of the 50-Line. Another body fragment of clay came from Garstang’s excavation in M284.\(^49\)

As this survey shows, steatopygous statuettes are rather long-lived, although far more frequent in the later levels. Specimens in pottery, such as the one from NTA2, are rare. Whether the difference in material has any dating significance remains to be investigated, as do the functions of these figurines and their relationship to other types of small-scale informal sculpture.

\(3.3\) The glass vessel (field no. 760/730.3)

In the area of pit (A), five fragments of a glass vessel were found (Fig. 10; cf. above p. 89). The complete neck allows its identification as a bulbous unguentarium, doubtlessly an import from Roman Egypt or beyond.\(^50\) The glass is polychrome; its basic

---

\(^47\) Cf. Shinnie - Bradley 1980: fig. 72, nos. 1161, 1662. For a male figure of a different type from tomb W323 of the Western Necropolis cf. Dunham 1963: 258, fig. 168, no. 8.

\(^48\) Cf. Näs er in: Shinnie - Anderson in press. For another specimen with unusual applications cf. Dunham 1963: 258, fig. 168, no. 9.

\(^49\) Török 1997: 133, no. 284-s. The piece is not illustrated, but expressly called steatopygous.

\(^50\) For this form as well as other types of unguentaria cf. Harden 1936: 185-220, 265-279 and Isings 1957: 22f., 40-42, 161f., forms 6, 26, 28a, 133. Cf. also Hofmann 1978: 201-208 and 1979: 72-75 for specimens from the Meroitic period. Edwards 1996: 31f., after discussing previous assumptions on the provenance of glass from Meroitic contexts, indirectly suggests that all glass was imported, since it is generally rare, but especially in settlements, and there is no positive evidence for local manufacture. In the same tenor, Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 177, 183. In contrast, Stern 1981: 46-48 argues convincingly for a local manufacture of inlays and the like from at least the 3rd century B.C. Moulded and blown vessels, she assumes, were, however, imported from Egyptian centers or produced by itinerant glassworkers. Along the same lines, Rehren 1995: 25 and Fitzenreiter - Wenig in: Wenig 1996: 50.
colour now appears black with marvered-in threads of yellow and light grey combed into festoons.51 The height of the neck is 2.5 cm, the diameter of the rim 2.8 cm.

Fig. 10 Fragments of a glass *unguentarium*, field no. 760/730.3 (photo: J. Walther).

The search for comparisons first showed that bulbous *unguentaria* were absent from the Northern Necropolis in Meroe.52 In contrast, nine specimens were found in the Western Necropolis (Tab. 1 on p. 94). The tombs from which they originated are spread across all of Edwards’ chronological groups, i.e., from the 1st century B.C. to the latest phase of the cemetery (1999: fig. 74 = 1999a: fig. 5). Proportions and colours, however, differ from those of the vessel from NTA2 and thus do not provide immediate comparisons.

Shinnie’s early excavations in Meroe produced fragments of *unguentaria* from the uppermost Components 13 to 15 of the 79/80-Line and the Top Component of the 50-Line (Shinnie - Bradley 1980: 182). Since their shape was not further specified, they cannot serve as comparisons. The same is true for the glass finds from Shinnie’s later campaigns (Näser in: Shinnie - Anderson in press).

51 For the colour scheme and the production technique cf. Harden 1936: 7f., 20, 274, pl. 20, no. 811. According to him, black was no regular colour for blown vessels; but since the condition of the recovered fragments was invariably good, a secondary change in colour, e.g., from dark purple or blue, seems unlikely.
52 *Unguentaria* of other shapes were found in N16 and N18; Dunham 1957: 139, 149, 151, figs. 91, 98, pl. 69.G; Hofmann 1978: 201f., 207f., figs. 1, 13; 1979: 72, 75, figs. 1, 13.
Over twenty bulbous *unguementaria* and fragments were recorded from other sites in Lower and Upper Nubia (Tab. 2 on pp. 95ff.). Concerning their dating the following statements can be made:

- The architecture of the Wadi el-Arab settlement was tentatively dated by Williams to his phases IIIA to IVB, i.e., the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D.; but many finds are Post-meroitic.\(^{54}\)

- Cemetery 153 at Wadi el-Arab was dated to the Postmeroitic period by the excavators. Concerning the *unguementarium* they stated: "The type is common in the mound graves of the Byzantine period at Ballana and many fragments were found in nearly all the tombs."\(^{55}\) Since the vessel was the only object recorded from the tomb in question, no further dating criteria can be established.\(^{56}\)

- The cemetery of Shabul was dated by Williams (1991: 175, tab. 29, 179) to his phases IIIA to IVB, i.e., the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D.

- The *unguementaria* from Karanog, especially the specimen with the applied thread, no. 7340, were dated to the 3rd century A.D. by the excavators (Woolley - Randall-MacIver 1910: 73, 82). Török (1987a: 206, figs. 53f.) suggested a mid 3rd century date for no. 7341 and a late 3rd or early 4th century date for no. 7340 on the basis of the painted ceramics from the tombs.\(^{57}\) According to Isings (1957: 58, type 42), a glass bowl which was found with the latter piece, ranges between 1st and 3rd century A.D.\(^{58}\)

- Graves 40 and 114 of Cemetery 214 contained Meroitic fine ware beakers belonging to Williams' phases IIIA to IIIB, i.e., the 2nd century A.D. (Williams 1991: 10f., 20, 37f., tabs. 5f.). According to the pottery and the jewellery, grave 73 is somewhat later: the red-painted beaker and the vessel with the pearl-string ornament occur in Williams' phase IVA, i.e., the earlier 3rd century A.D. (ibid.: 11, 20, 39f., tabs. 5f.).

- In the analysis of the *unguementaria* from Faras, the excavator attributed the relevant specimen to his phase D (Griffith 1924: 153). In the tomb register, however, grave 1028 was associated with phase C (Griffith 1925: 120f.). The related pottery, namely red-slipped fine ware cups and jars, indicates a rather late date, probably in Williams' 1991: 175, tab. 29, 188. For the absolute dating of his groups cf. Williams 1991: 15-20. N.B.: ibid.: 18 states that phase III "is limited by the adjacent phases approximately to the second century A.D.", while ibid.: 20 says that "phase III appears to date to the third century A.D." and that "it is difficult to believe that IIIA began long after A.D. 200". In view of the overall chronology, the latter two statements must be corrected by either substituting phase IV for phase III, or second century and A.D. 100 for third century A.D. 200. In the same sense, Edwards 1996: 58.

54 Emery - Kirwan 1935: 104. Contrary to this assertion, bulbous *unguementaria* were not explicitly identified among the glass from Ballana and Qustul; Emery - Kirwan 1938: 377f. and Farid 1963: 125.
56 Cf. on this also Williams 1991: 17 with note 102. Note that his equation of no. 7340 with Isings' type 101, derived from Török 1987a: 206, and the dates inferred from this are problematic.
phase IVA or even IVB, i.e., the 3rd century A.D. (Williams 1991: 11, 13, 20, 39, tabs. 5f.).

- Cemetery 5-X-40 on the west bank of Gemai was dated by the excavators to the Meroitic period; they expressly noted the absence of any X-group material (Adams - Nordström 1963: 29f.). Findings from the cemetery were not published in detail.

- Cemetery 100 on the opposite bank of Gemai was dated by Williams (1991: 176, tab. 29, 184f.) to his phases IIA to IIIB, with a possible late episode in IVA, i.e., from the late 2nd century B.C. to the early 3rd century A.D. Apart from the glass bottle, the relevant tomb did not produce any diagnostic finds.

- The unguentarium from tumulus A.11 at Firka was attributed to the 4th or 5th century A.D. by the excavator on the basis of Harden’s typology; other objects from the tomb suggest a late date within this range (Kirwan 1939: 32). Further finds from tumulus A.14, among them two glass bowls, were attributed to the same period (ibid.: 31).

- The so-called Northern Cemetery at Kerma, excavated by Reisner, was dated by Williams (1991: 177, tab. 29, 187) to his phases IIIA to IVA, with possible earlier and later occupations in IIIB and IVB.

- The Middle Necropolis in Meroe covers late Meroitic and early Postmeroitic times. For the unguentarium from grave M300 (Fig. 11), Harden advocated a date of about 300 A.D. within a widest possible range of 200 to 400 A.D. based on comparative material from Egypt.

- Tumulus III at El Hobagi is probably of early Postmeroitic, i.e., later 4th century date.

Bulbous unguentaria from dated contexts outside the Meroitic world range from the 1st to the 4th century A.D. with a peak in the 4th century. The above list accords with this distribution: the type first appears in the later Meroitic period and is still present in earlier Postmeroitic times, as in Cemetery 153, the probably associated settlement at Wadi el-Arab, Firka and el-Hobagi. The best comparisons for the vessel from NTA2, in respect to general proportions and the detailed form of the neck, are with the vessels from Shablul, Faras and Meroe, and some specimens from Karanog and Cemetery 214. Including the very divergent size – which unfortunately could not be established for all specimens – as a criterion, the unguentaria from Faras und two pieces from Cemetery 214 offer the best parallels (Tabs 1f.). However, the specimen from the Middle Necropolis in Meroe is the only one with a comparable colour design (Fig. 11, Tabs. 1f.). Garstang (1911: 32, pl. 37.3) described it as blue and yellow; according to the photograph, some of the festoons have a more muted, possibly greyish colour.

59 Cf. also Török 1988: 189 with note 951 who thinks of an origin from Karanis.
60 Cf. Török 1988: 192 who suggests an origin from Karanis for all the glass from the tomb.
61 The discussion on its dating is summarized by Török 1988: 196-198 and 1997: 266f. Note that id. 1988: 198 confuses tombs M300 and M3; the glass vessel came from the former, whereas the archer’s looses were found in M3.
62 Quoted after Kirwan 1939: 42.
On this basis, the vessel from NTA2 can be dated to the end of the Meroitic period. Since, unfortunately, the fragments could not be attributed to a single stratigraphic context, this date cannot be correlated with a specific phase in the occupational history of NTA2 with absolute certainty. However, the vessel is definitely younger than the bowls from the main layers of pit (A), whose use must therefore either have extended over a substantial period of time; or else whose topmost layers did not belong to its deliberate filling. It is tempting to correlate the vessel with the latest occupation, represented by the sandstone wall. Without further investigation on the site, this must remain speculation. All the same, the vessel supports the argument for some sort of activity on the North Mound in the late 3rd or 4th century A.D. Minute as this evidence may be, it still provides a further piece in the reconstruction of the late occupational history of Meroe City.

From my experience in the archaeology of Meroe City, in using and producing its data, I would like to conclude with some general remarks. Although Meroe has been a focus of archaeological activity for many years, most of its history is still in the dark. The problems in dealing with the site are many and diverse. Its size seems to be incompatible with the means of modern small-scale excavation; even precise research strategies have to struggle with the results of their focussed activities which, as with the 50- and 79/80-Lines or NTA2, suffer from several drawbacks. First, they mostly reveal only small parts of structures, not even single house units or the like. Thus, it is problematic to define functional contexts and to reconstruct stratigraphical information to a meaningful end. Secondly, the correlation of separate excavation spots in a general occupational sequence is badly hindered by the fact that, thirdly, chronological analyses are still in a sorry state. This does not only apply for Meroe proper. In general, a ceramic sequence, especially for coarse and “semifine” wares, is not yet established. Likewise, detailed investigations into the dating significance of small finds, apart from such imports as glass, are next to nil.

Moreover, their isolated appearance in small-scale excavations divorces them from their past context and meaning, and finally leads to more or less mictulous catalogues, ending with the impression that the objects “are largely trivial in content, and do not, in the main, throw much light on Meroitic domestic life”. Thus, not only po-

tentative data are given away, but also time and energy of the researcher are bound into a finally fruitless endeavour.

Obviously there is no easy remedy for these problems, which have accompanied archaeology – not only in Meroe – since its beginnings. Possible perspectives seem twofold. Large-scale excavations would certainly be highly desirable, but are at present little feasible. Thus, it becomes even more important not to stop at stratigraphical sequences, but to really integrate the prospective finds, i.e., ceramics and other objects, into the advance scheduling of research strategies. Very often their coverage still limps behind or is just appended to the “hard” archaeological work. At the same time, analysis and publication of finds should aim at linking the data with those from other sites, in order to overcome the limits of small-scale excavations. But to conclude, it is certainly not enough to squeeze – as it was also done above – every excavation spot to the last drop:

“The step [...] from debris to a general theory of what the debris represents [...] is not to be gotten simply by pressing the analysis of the debris as far as it will go.” (Hymes 1970: 18)

Rather, theory and debris should be viewed together, informing each other and thus enriching our interpretations of the past and making archaeology a more rewarding endeavour.67

---

67 For exemplary studies in this respect cf. in the field of Meroitic archaeology, e.g., Edwards 1996 and in the analysis of small finds from settlement contexts, Shaw 1992 and 1995.
Tab. 1: Bulbous *unguentarium* from the Western Necropolis, Meroe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tomb</th>
<th>generation</th>
<th>group (Edwards 1999 = 1999a)</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>height of neck</th>
<th>diameter of rim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W306</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>fragments: neck and top of body; clear green glass</td>
<td>3.9 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W308</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>complete vessel; clear green glass</td>
<td>3.8 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W165</td>
<td>45-50 ?</td>
<td>Ib</td>
<td>fragments of two specimens; clear glass</td>
<td>3.4 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W159</td>
<td>50-55 ?</td>
<td>Ib b</td>
<td>fragments of two specimens; clear green glass</td>
<td>3.8 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W362</td>
<td>45-65 ?</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>fragment: neck and top of body; reddish glass</td>
<td>2.8 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W214</td>
<td>50-55 ?</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>unspecified fragments; clear glass</td>
<td>3.4 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W382</td>
<td>50-60 ?</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>fragment: neck; colour not mentioned</td>
<td>4.4 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W118</td>
<td>reuse 60-70</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>broken vessel; clear yellowish glass</td>
<td>6.2 cm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dunham 1963: 135, 137, 142f., 159, 237, 266, 269, figs. 99k, 100j, 104f, 107h, 107i.2, 115b, 162.12, 171.5, 171.13. Some measurements are taken from the drawings and, depending on their quality, may be approximations. N.B.: The vessel from W146 illustrated in Hofmann 1978: fig. 9 and 1979: fig. 9 is of alabaster; Dunham 1965 233, fig. 161.3. Note, moreover, some fragments of pinkish glass from W254, which may have belonged to another bulbous *unguentarium*; Dunham 1963: 248, fig. 164 (depicted upside down).

b. W159 is not included in Edwards' analysis, but can tentatively be placed in his group Ib in comparison to W165.

---

Tab. 2: Bulbous *unguentarium* from the Western Necropolis, Meroe [Thompson] site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>grave number</th>
<th>object number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wadi el-Arab, house 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery 153, grave 33b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Shabul, grave no. 5052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 33b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, not related to no. 5059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, not related to no. 5072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Karanog, grave no. 7341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery 214, grave 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Faras, grave 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemai, Cemetery 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemai, Cemetery 5, (object no. R1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 2: Bulbous *unguentaria* from Meroitic and Postmerotic sites (except: Western Necropolis, Meroe)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>site</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>height of neck</th>
<th>diameter of rim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wadi el-Arab, house 13 (object no. 12)(^b)</td>
<td>complete vessel; thin blue glass</td>
<td>ca. 5.0 cm</td>
<td>ca. 3.0 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery 153, grave 10(^c)</td>
<td>complete vessel; thin white glass</td>
<td>4.8 cm</td>
<td>4.6 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Shablul, grave 30b (object no. 5052)(^d)</td>
<td>complete vessel; total height 9.0 cm; no further details</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 33b (object no. 5053)(^e)</td>
<td>complete vessel; incised horizontal lines; no further details</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, not related to a grave (object no. 5059)(^f)</td>
<td>fragment: neck and top of body; according to photograph: probably white glass</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, not related to a grave (object no. 5172)(^g)</td>
<td>fragment: neck and top of body; no further details</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Karanog, grave 181 (object no. 7341)(^h)</td>
<td>complete vessel; remains of content; no further details</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 198 (object no. 7346)(^i)</td>
<td>complete vessel; incised horizontal lines; no further details</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 361 (object no. 7345)(^j)</td>
<td>complete vessel; incised horizontal lines; no further details</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 384 (object no. 7340)(^k)</td>
<td>complete vessel; colour called greenish-brown and purplish-brown; white thread applied; total height 9.9 cm</td>
<td>ca. 2.5 cm</td>
<td>ca. 3.0 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 518 (object no. 7344)(^l)</td>
<td>complete vessel; no further details</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery 214, grave 40 (object no. 4)(^m)</td>
<td>complete vessel; no further details</td>
<td>2.1 cm</td>
<td>2.7 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 73 (object no. 5)(^n)</td>
<td>fragment: neck; thick glass</td>
<td>8.0 cm</td>
<td>8.8 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto, grave 114 (object no. 5)(^o)</td>
<td>fragment: neck and top of body; no further details</td>
<td>3.5 cm</td>
<td>3.8 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Faras, grave 1028(^p)</td>
<td>complete vessel and fragments of a second; no further details</td>
<td>2.9 cm</td>
<td>2.8 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemai, Cemetery 5-X-40(^q)</td>
<td>complete vessel; no further details</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemai, Cemetery 100, grave 140 (object no. R1)(^r)</td>
<td>complete vessel; thin bright green glass</td>
<td>3.2 cm</td>
<td>1.8 cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note, moreover, that this type of vessel is paralleled in Meroitic contexts, and, depending on its form and decoration, can be ascribed in Hofmann's group I and III.*

\(^a\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^b\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^c\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^d\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^e\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^f\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^g\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^h\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^i\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^j\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^k\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^l\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^m\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^n\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^o\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^p\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^q\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.

\(^r\) From an anonymous manuscript in the possession of the author.
Tab. 2:  Bulbous *unguentaria* from Meroitic and Postmeroitic sites (except: Western Necropolis, Meroe)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Tumulus/Obj.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Diameter (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farka</td>
<td>A.11 (obj. 31)(^3)</td>
<td>Complete vessel; green glass with “S-shaped corrugations round sides”</td>
<td>5.2 cm</td>
<td>4.8 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farka</td>
<td>A.14 (obj. 46)(^1)</td>
<td>Complete vessel; thick greenish-white glass</td>
<td>ca. 5.2 cm</td>
<td>ca. 4.8 cm(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerma</td>
<td>Northern Cemetery, grave K27 (obj. no. 2)(^9)</td>
<td>Incomplete vessel; thin clear greenish glass with “gilt (?) filament wound spirally around body and fused on”</td>
<td>2.8 cm</td>
<td>4.1 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meroe</td>
<td>Middle Necropolis, grave M300(^9)</td>
<td>Complete vessel; blue and yellow glass (Fig. 11)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Hobagi</td>
<td>Tumulus III (obj. no. 218)(^9)</td>
<td>Complete vessel; brown glass</td>
<td>4.1 cm</td>
<td>3.3 cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^a\) Measurements are taken from drawings and photographs, and may be approximations.

---

a. Emery - Kirwan 1935: 120, fig. 103.
b. Emery - Kirwan 1935: 104f. (Wrongly: cemetery 152), fig. 82.
g. Randall MacIver - Woolley 1909: 31, pl. 22a.
h. Woolley - Randall-Maclver 1910: 37, 144f., pl. 37.
m. Emery - Kirwan 1935: 425, fig. 402.
n. Emery - Kirwan 1935: 429, fig. 405.
o. Emery - Kirwan 1935: 439, fig. 421.
r. Bates - Dunham 1927: 47, pls. 35, 3.1, 70.15.
u. According to Kirwan 1939: pl. 12.1, the neck of A.14/46 is of about the same size as that of A.11/31, while its body is larger; and thus the vessel is higher overall.
v. Reisinger 1923: 47, fig. 20.62.
w. Garstang 1911: 31f., 34 (glass vessel not mentioned), pl. 37.3. Cf. on this tomb also Török 1997: 267, fig. 145.
x. Lenoire et al. 1994: 62, pls. 8, 17. Fragments of a further glass vessel from the tomb could not be reconstructed to a specific form.
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