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THE proposal to build a new high dam at Aswan will have a profound effect on the antiquities of the Sudan. All the monuments from the Egyptian frontier to as far south as Akasha will be submerged if present plans are carried out. The list of the monuments which will be lost includes not only such well known sites as Buhen temple, Semna and the other Pharaonic frontier forts of the second cataract, and the church at Abd-el-Qadir with its unique paintings, but also a number of lesser known but equally important antiquities. Amongst these may be mentioned the Middle Kingdom fort at Serra which contains within its walls the remains of a medieval town including three churches, the monastery at Mainarti, many prehistoric sites, and a large collection of rock drawings. A large campaign will be necessary to make a proper record of this invaluable evidence for the history of the Sudan before it is lost for ever. It is much to be hoped that funds and personnel will be made available for the work.

This is the last number of KUSH for which I shall be responsible. Constitutional developments in the Sudan have resulted in the post of Commissioner for Archaeology being Sudanized on the grounds that its holding by an expatriate official might influence the free choice of their future by the Sudanese. As a result I have left the service of the Sudan Government. I would like to take this opportunity to wish the staff of the Antiquities Service the best of fortune, and to express the hope that under my successor, M. Jean Vercoutter, they will make the contributions to knowledge that the fascinating history of their country deserves.

P.L.S.
Kor est-il Iken?

Rapport préliminaire sur les fouilles françaises de Kor (Bouhen sud), Sudan, en 1954
par Jean Vercoutter

Le site de Kor1 (Bouhen sud), a été signalé à l’attention des égyptologues par un récent et important article de A. J. Arkell2. Ce dernier y écrit : ‘Buhen south . . . to which it seems that despite its eroded condition more attention should be paid than has been given hitherto. Its situation at the end of the easily navigable Shella-Wadi-Halfa reach of the Nile and its huge extent indicate that it must have been the Middle Kingdom Ikn of the Semnah boundary stele, while surface finds suggest that it must have an important base in New-Kingdom as well’.3

Ces remarques de A. J. Arkell mettent en valeur de façon parfaite l’importance théorique du site de Kor. Cette importance résulte d’un double fait : l’un historique, l’identité possible avec la forteresse de Iken, bien connue au Moyen-Empire ; l’autre géographique, la position même du site à l’entrée de la seconde cataracte. Les mêmes raisons, mutatis mutandis, qui sont à l’origine de la moderne Wadi-Halfa, sont aussi en faveur de l’existence, en cette région, d’un important entrepôt pharaonique et c’est pourquoi, en accord avec le Sudan Government Antiquities Service, la Mission archéologique française au Soudan décida d’explorer le site.

Je tiens à remercier ici les fonctionnaires du Gouvernement Soudanais dont la parfaite courtoisie et le dévouement ont considérablement amoindri les difficultés propres à l’installation d’un chantier de fouilles. M. P. L. Shinnie, Commissioner for Archaeology, en particulier, ainsi que M. Thabit Hassan, alors Antiquities Officer Northern Area, et M. Betek alors District Commissioner à Halfa, ont fait tout ce qui était en leur pouvoir, et au-delà, pour faciliter ma tâche ; je leur en suis très reconnaissant.

Commencée le 22 décembre 1953, la fouille a pris fin le 28 février 1954. Avant d’en exposer les résultats, je voudrais situer, dans l’espace comme dans le temps, le site de Kor.

Kor, souvent cité sous le nom de Bouhen sud4, est situé à 10 km au sud de Halfa, et à 4 km. 500 environ en amont de Bouhen nord, sur la rive ouest du Nil. Il est dominé à l’ouest et au sud par deux hauteurs gréseuses, connues localement, l’une comme le Gebel Sheikh Suliman (cf. PLAN A ci-contre, et PLANCHES I, a ; et VI, b) l’autre comme le Gebel Abd-el-Qadir.

Le site, beaucoup plus long que large, s’étend en bordure du Nil sur un terrain fortement en pente. Le rocher gréseux y affleure en de nombreux endroits ; ailleurs le sable s’est amassé dans les dépressions. A l’angle sud-est du site des rochers dominent

---

3 Id. Ibid., p. 27.
4 Kor, qui est séparé de Bouhen par plus de 4 km. de désert sablonneux, est entièrement indépendant de ce dernier site et c’est pourquoi nous abandonnons l’appellation de ‘Bouhen sud’ qui risque de créer des confusions pour adopter le nom local de ‘Kor’.
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de plusieurs mètres le cours du fleuve, et protègent une sorte d’îlot, aujourd’hui rattaché à la rive, mais qui en était, autrefois séparé comme le prouve l’existence d’un chenal, à sec au moment des basses eaux, mais qui reçoit encore les eaux du Nil lors de la crue.

Cette configuration est importante car elle explique pourquoi Kor a été choisi comme site dans l’antiquité. L'étude du terrain nous a montré, en effet, que la ville était installée à l'embouchure d’un thalweg dans le Nil (cf. PLAN B). Il ne fait pas de doute que, à l’époque pharaonique, la ville ne s’étendait que sur la partie nord du site. Le coté sud était essentiellement formé par une anse, naturelle ou aménagée, qui s’allongeait du nord au sud, parallèlement au fleuve. Protégée à l’ouest par des rochers et les remparts de la ville, à l’est par des récifs de grès et l’îlot rocheux, cette anse constituait un port fluvial remarquable (cf. PLAN B, page 7 et PLANCHE VI, c).

Les bateaux venus d’Egypte pouvaient y relacher commodément. S’il leur était impossible de poursuivre leur route vers le sud, en raison de l’étiage du fleuve ou de l’importance de leur tonnage, leurs marchandises pouvaient être confiées alors, soit à des
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bateaux aptes à affronter les rapides de la seconde cataracte quelle que soit la saison, soit à des caravanes terrestres qui, évitant le Batn-el-Haggar (le Ventre-de-pierres), et ses dangers, passaient par le Gebel Debbâ, Saras ouest, et rejoignaient à Semneh ouest le Nil de nouveau navigable (cf. PLAN C, ci-dessous, p. 34). Le fait que le système des forteresses égyptiennes de la seconde cataracte a manifester été conçu pour protéger le cheminement par la rive ouest, aussi bien que par le fleuve proprement dit, montre que la route terrestre était largement, sinon principalement, utilisée. Kor est admirablement situé pour servir de point de transbordement entre la route fluviale Assouan-Seconde cataracte, et la route terrestre vers Semneh.

Il semble donc que, du seul point de vue géographique, le site occupe une place privilégiée. Dans les conditions topographiques actuelles, toutefois, cela n’est plus évident. Au cours des âges — et du fait même que le site occupait le débouché d’un ouadi — l’anse s’est comblée peu à peu sous l’effet conjugué de l’accumulation éoliennes du remblaiement consécutif au ruissellement ; l’île s’est souduée au rivage et ce n’est plus qu’au moment des fortes inondations que le Nil revient dans une grande dépression qui n’est autre que le port d’autrefois.

De tous les problèmes susceptibles d’être résolus par la fouille de Kor, le plus important est sans contredit celui de l’antiquité du site. Déjà en 1899, Somers Clarke, alors qu’il étudiait le système défensif de la seconde cataracte, s’était demandé si les fortifications de Kor, d’un type très particulier, ne remontaient pas à l’Ancien Empire. Tout récemment, A. J. Arkell montrait que l’un des graffiti du Gebel Sheikh Suliman commémorait une expédition du roi Djer au Soudan. Or, ce graffiti se trouve à moins de cinq cents mètres des murailles de Kor. Est-il possible que le site ait été déjà occupé par les Égyptiens à l’époque Thinite et à l’Ancien Empire ?

Pour le Moyen Empire, si Kor est bien Iken, son existence est prouvée par un papyrus de la Seconde Période Intermédiaire, qui nous a conservé une liste des

---


7 Semneh, Shelfak, Mirgisah, Kor, Bouhen nord, sont tous situés sur la rive ouest du Nil et jalonnent la piste qui suit le fleuve (cf. PLAN C, ci-dessous). La stèle de l’an 8 de Sesostris III à Semneh, prouve que cette route était utilisée : ‘afin d’empêcher tout Nubiens de passer vers le Nord soit par terre (m hrt), soit par bateau’ (cf. Sethe, Lesestücke, p. 84, lignes 19–23) ; dernière traduction de T. Säve-Söderbergh, Ägypten und Nubien, p. 76.

8 Cela est rendu très sensible, sur le terrain, par le dépôt de limon. Au cours de la campagne de fouilles 1953–1954, nous avons pu observer, sur toute, l’étendue de la dépression (cf. PLAN B), une mince couche de limon qui y avait été déposée lors d’une récente grande crue du Nil, cette couche est très visible sur la photographie aérienne exécutée en 1954 (cf. PLANche VII). Sur les clichés en couleur que nous avons exécutés, le limon tranché nettement par sa couleur sur le sable environnant, dessinant ainsi la forme de la dépression.


forteresses égyptiennes en Nubie. Les noms y sont disposés selon l'ordre géographique, en allant du sud au nord, ce sont : (i) diir-hist = Semneh sud (?) ; (ii) shm-\(H^*-kw-R^*-ms^*-hw\) = Semneh ouest ; (iii) hitw-pdw = Kummeh (Semneh est) ;

---


11 Identification de Sève-Söderbergh, l.c., p. 81. Le site de Semneh sud, non mentionné par Porter-Moss, *Topogr. Bibliogr.*, t. vii, parce qu'il n'a fourni aucun objet publié, s'étend sous le tombeau d'un saint musulman et n'a pu être fouillé.
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(iv) hsfr-

Dwntwyw = Uronarti ; (v) wfr-

Histw = Shelfak ; (vi) dr-

Dwntwyw = Mirgissah ;

(vii) 'Ikn, localisation inconnue ; (viii) Bouhn = Bouhennord. Le reste de la liste se rapportant à des sites situés au nord de Wadi Halfa ne nous intéresse pas ici.

Comme on le voit, deux forteresses seulement n'ont pas été identifiées. Dir-

Hist, première de liste, est située trop au sud pour pouvoir être Kor. Si, ce qui est presque certain, la sixième forteresse dr-

Dwntwyw est bien Mirgissah, Iken, la septième, doit nécessairement être située entre Mirgissah et Bouhennord. Or, de tous les sites possibles entre ces limites, Kor est de beaucoup le plus étendu et c'est pourquoi son identification avec Iken a été proposée à maintes reprises.

Ainsi, le site de Kor aurait pu être fondé à l'Ancien Empire ; les Égyptiens, de toute façon, sont venus à proximité immédiate dès l'époque Thinite, et l'identification avec Iken est, à première vue, vraisemblable. Si tel est bien le cas, l'intérêt historique du site serait d'autant plus fort que la stèle de Semneh, érigée en l'an 8 de Sésostris III, interdit à tout Nubien (Nhsy), de franchir la bordure sud de la cataracte mais précise : 'à l'exception des Nubiens qui viendraient faire du commerce à Iken'. Iken doit donc être considérée comme une place privilégiée où les Nubiens pouvaient librement commercer avec les Égyptiens.

Les dépêches de Semneh, enfin, semblent montrer que Iken n'était pas seulement un marché mais aussi une place forte, ce qui, d'ailleurs, est confirmé par le nom même de Mnww, qui sert à qualifier Iken dans la liste des forteresses. Le texte de la troisième dépêche montre que le lashane qui y résidait se préoccupait de la surveillance des pistes désertiques.

En conséquence, si l'on admet l'identification de Iken avec Kor, le site devrait : (a) être assez étendu pour faire office de marché ; (b) comporter une forteresse importante, si l'on en juge par les ruines d'autres forteresses qui figurent dans la liste et qui ont pu être identifiées ; (c) occuper une position telle qu'elle pouvait surveiller la

---

12 Lecture incertaine proposée par Säve-Söderbergh, l.c., p. 93 ; cf. aussi, A. H. Gardiner, 

13 Sur la probabilité de cette identification, cf. Säve-Söderbergh, l.c., p. 93 ; Reisner, fouillait 

14 Notamment par Reisner, Gardiner, Säve-Söderbergh et Arkell ; pour Säve-Söderbergh 

15 Le scribe a employé ici le singulier mais il s'agit manifestement d'un collectif.

16 Cf. Sethe Lesestücke, p. 84, lignes 19-23 et traduction de Säve-Söderbergh, Ägypt. u. Nub., 

17 Cf. Smither, 'The Semnah dispatches,' JEA, 31, 1945, pp. 3-10 et plis. II-VII. Textes datés 

18 Cf. Wb., II, p. 82. Le mot s'applique exclusivement aux forteresses.


20 Semneh ouest, Kumneh (Semneh est), Uronarti, Shelfak, Mirgissah et Bouhen (cf. PLAN C, 
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route terrestre qui passait sur la rive ouest ; (d) être d’un accès assez facile pour con-
stituer une place commerciale commode.

Il nous reste à examiner maintenant ce que les fouilles françaises de 1954 ont
apporté comme éléments nouveaux pour la solution de l’identification du site de Kor.

---

**Diagram: Plan C. Les forteresses de la seconde cataracte**

Le site, nous l’avons vu, est très étendu ; sa longueur est de près de 1 km.\(^{21}\); sa
largeur d’un peu plus de 200 m.\(^{22}\). Il couvre donc en gros, *intra muros*, une superficie

\(^{21}\) 956 m. entre les murs sud et nord de l’enceinte II.

\(^{22}\) 203 m. entre l’enceinte III et le Nil.
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de 195.000 m², soit près de 20 hectares. C’est, et de beaucoup, le plus grand site de la seconde cataracte. Il était donc impossible de le fouiller entièrement. Il est vrai que toute la surface à l’intérieur des murs n’a pas été occupée dans l’antiquité. C’est ainsi que toute la moitié sud et un quart environ de la moitié nord ne semblent pas avoir jamais été habités (cf. PLAN D, hors-texte). Il fallait choisir les points susceptibles de fournir le plus de renseignements archéologiques.

Somers Clarke en 1899 avait fait établir un plan rapide du site. Ce plan indiquait deux enceintes imbriquées ; mais, alors qu’à Ikkur, Bouhen et Mirogissah par exemple, les enceintes s’enveloppent l’une l’autre, à Kor l’enceinte la plus occidentale s’appuyait simplement sur l’enceinte médiane (cf. plan D). Je décidai donc de fouiller la ’charnière’ de ces deux murs pour voir laquelle des deux enceintes était la plus ancienne (plan D, en B.1).

Trois jours de fouille suffirent à prouver d’une part que l’enceinte II était antérieure à l’enceinte III, d’autre part que l’angle sud-ouest de l’enceinte II comportait une porte, ou plutôt une ’poterne’ étroite, remaniée à deux époques et défendue semble-t-il par deux bastions semi-circulaires. En en endroit du site, comme partout ailleurs à Kor, l’érosion est telle qu’il ne reste plus que les fondations des édifices, encore sont-elles elles-mêmes bien souvent entièrement détruites, de sorte que l’interprétation des ruines est toujours incertaine. L’enceinte II ne comportait ni glacis, ni fossé ; l’enceinte III était précédée d’un glacis en pente douce constitué par une simple couche de terre crue entremêlée de paille (mounah), peu épaisse (3 cms au maximum), et posée à même le sable ; il ne semble pas qu’elle ait eu un fossé.

L’étude du terrain ayant montré que le site était en fait un port fluvial (cf. ci-dessus, pp. 4–5), il fallait porter l’essentiel de notre effort sur la bande de terrain la plus proche de l’emplacement assumé des quais et c’est pourquoi nous avons fouillé la zone A-B-C/3-4 (cf. PLAN D). Cette partie du site contenait un grand édifice à colonnade aperçu par Somers Clarke (cf. PLANCHES I, a et II, b). Nous avons fouillé en partant du Nil et en remontant d’ouest en est.

Près du Nil, j’ai d’abord rencontré une bande de sable aride (plan D, en A/3-4 et plan E), à l’exception d’un massif (marqué R sur les plans D et E), ruine sans forme précise, constituée par des pierres entassées et liées entre elles par un simple mortier de terre du Nil. Il serait tentant de voir dans ces restes, soit une partie du quai ancien, soit les fondations d’une enceinte parallèle au Nil, mais il ne subsiste que trop peu de choses pour pouvoir en tirer aucune certitude ; il n’est même pas exclu que ce massif soit postérieur à l’époque pharaonique, bien que l’appareillage des pierres soit très comparable à celui de l’enceinte III (cf. planche V, a).

Après la zone aride, où j’établiss le cavalier de déblais, je rencontrai des murs de briques crues, dirigés soit sud-nord, soit ouest-est. Le site était très érodé. Le plus souvent il ne restait qu’une seule brique des fondations des murs, encore, cette dernière brique était-elle souvent presque entièrement usée par l’érosion. En de nombreux

---

23 Pour comparaison, les deux plus grands sites de la seconde cataracte qui aient été identifiés, Bouhen et Semneh ouest, couvrent respectivement : Bouhen 100.000 m² environ et Semneh moins de 12.000 m².
24 Cf. JEA, 3, 1916, pl. xxvii, en face de la page 163.
25 Pour les plans de ces forteresses, cf. Id. ibid., pls. xxv, xxvi et xxviii.
Plan D. PLAN D'ENSEMBLE DU SITE DE IOR

Facing p. 10
endroits les murs avaient complètement disparu, détruits pas l’érosion ou enlevés par les chercheurs de sebakh (en soudanais maraq), pour toute cette zone (plan d, milieu des carrés /3/4), il était impossible de faire un relevé cohérent des restes épars.

Ce n’est qu’à flanc de colline (plan d, partie supérieure des carrés /3/4), que je rencontrais des constructions sinon intactes (les murs subsistants n’ont jamais plus de 50 cm. de haut), du moins suffisamment conservés pour que le plan puisse en être dressé (cf. PLAN E).

La fouille de cette zone nous prouve que la Mission française n’était pas la première à travailler sur le site, bien qu’il n’y ait jamais eu, à ma connaissance de rapport de fouilles publié28. Par place les murs subsistants étaient éventrés, ce qui, en cet endroit, ne pouvait être attribué à l’érosion puisque à quelques mètres plus loin ils étaient intacts. Les pierres des bases de colonnes, les crapaudines, les seuils et les montants de portes, tout avait été arraché, manifestement pour voir s’il n’y avait rien en dessous. Nous avons même trouvé, au niveau des fondations des murs, un crampon de rail de chemin de fer29, ce qui permet de dater les fouilles clandestines d’une époque toute récente.

Une enquête auprès des autorités du village voisin révéla, après beaucoup de réticences, que Kor avait été pillé durant sept années consécutives (de 1920 à 1927), par des Égyptiens venus de Karnak et commandés par un certain Khalil. Ce pillage a eu des effets désastreux, car il a été opéré sur un site très peu profond : le sol des chambres est, au plus, à 50 cm. de la surface actuelle, souvent il est encore moins profond ; il était donc facile de faire des fouilles clandestines sans avoir à déplacer de grandes masses de déblais et c’est ce qui a été fait.

Le pillage systématique du site l’a pratiquement vidé de tout objet ce qui rend très difficile de déterminer l’usage auquel étaient destinés les bâtiments fouillés (cf. plan E) ; ceux-ci, pour autant que l’état de délabrement du site permette de le préciser étaient au nombre de quatre. Le bâtiment 1, le plus grand, mesurait 112 mètres de long sur 40 de large. Il est construit à flanc de colline ; seules les chambres hautes, sous colonnes sont, en partie, conservées. La partie la plus basse, au sud, est presque entièrement détruite et seules les fondations des murs n’ont été conservées. La partie haute comporte quatre pièces et un couloir, en partie construits en briques, en partie taillés dans le rocher. Au centre, une cour entourée d’un péristyle et comprenant en contre-bas un large foyer rectangulaire. Les quatre pièces du nord étaient couvertes, le plafond étant supporté par des piliers qui reposaient sur des socles de grès. Les socles, ronds, sont encore en place ; on y voit, marquée en rouge, au centre, la trace des piliers sans doute de bois peint.

Le sol, comme dans les bâtiments 3 et 4, était formé d’un dallage de briques de grandes dimensions (0.35 x 0.18 x 0.09 m. en moyenne), recouvert d’un enduit noir, lisse et brillant (cf. PLANCHE III, b). Ces dallages, bien entendu sont fréquemment détruits, et c’est ainsi que la pièce de 2 située au sud de 1, n’en a plus un seul. Au demeurant, ce bâtiment situé très près du thalweg (cf. PLAN B, ci-dessus), a souffert encore plus que les autres, et il est le plus souvent, impossible de déterminer les passages d’une pièce à une autre. Ce bâtiment comportait une salle à piliers carrés ; on y remarque également la présence de deux silos (?), et d’un psiard.

Les bâtiments 3 et 4, plus petits, sont construits sur le même principe que le bâtiment 1. Ils comportent une cour avec foyer rectangulaire, des pièces multiples, parfois
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sous colonne. Ils donnaient sur des passages étroits, sortes de venelles qui se recoupaient à angle droit et qui étaient grossièrement dallées de briques ou de grès en certains endroits. Les murs des pièces, là où il en subsiste une hauteur suffisante pour pouvoir les étudier, étaient recouverts d’un enduit blanc (cf. PLANCHE III, b).

Dans les bâtiments 1, 3 et 4, les pièces étaient fermées par des portes à un seul battant, pivotant dans des crapaudines de pierre soigneusement taillées (cf. PLANCHE III, b). Dans le bâtiment 2, les sols sont en trop mauvais état pour que l’on puisse savoir si les pièces étaient fermées de la même façon.

A quoi servaient ces bâtiments ? Peut-être était-ce des habitations, on remarquera, en effet, qu’ils possédent un foyer rectangulaire dans la cour30 ; ils ont aussi des silos31, et des puisards32 (cf. PLANCHE V, b). Dans un cas, nous avons trouvé, à côté d’une meule en granit, les vestiges d’un coffret en bois stucqué qui pourrait avoir été une boîte à objets de toilette33. Il n’est donc pas impossible que nous soyons en présence de maisons privées. On remarquera toutefois que ces édifices sont très importants (cf. PLAN E), le plus petit comportait au moins douze pièces, et occupait un carré de plus de 28 m. de côté. Ils diffèrent donc des habitations privées découvertes sur d’autres sites soudanais34, et notamment des maisons de Semneh et de Kummeh. Ce ne sont pas non plus des ‘magasins’ à proprement parler35 ; la disposition des pièces ferait plutôt penser au ‘palais du gouverneur’ d’Amara36 ; nous inclinerions donc à y voir des demeures de fonctionnaires, mais, une fois encore, l’érosion du site et le pillage ne permettent plus aucune certitude quant à l’usage de ces constructions : maisons, magasins, ou, peut-être, les deux à la fois.

La découverte la plus intéressante de la fouille, a été celle d’une troisième enceinte, qui avait échappé à Somers Clarke. Celle-ci était recouverte par les grands bâtiments construits selon l’axe nord-sud, est-ouest, elle leur est donc antérieure (cf. PLAN D, en B/3, 4, 5 et PLAN E, cf. également, PLANCHE III, a). Cette découverte éclaire d’un jour nouveau l’histoire du site, et explique la disposition, en apparence aberrante, des enceintes II et III (cf. PLAN D). Il est évident désormais, en effet, que l’enceinte II, qui semblait être, à la seule vue du plan de Somers Clarke, l’enceinte intérieure de la ville, et en fait une enceinte extérieure, tout comme l’enceinte III.

Dans son état primitif, la ville était donc entourée d’une enceinte assez proche du Nil (ENCEINTE I, PLAN D). Cette enceinte était doublée au sud, à l’ouest et au nord, par une défense plus lointaine, l’enceinte extérieure (ENCEINTE II, PLAN D). A un moment donné, la ville connut une grande expansion ; elle couvrit l’espace certainement

30 Marqués F sur le plan E.
31 Marqués S sur le plan E.
32 Marqués P sur le plan E. L’existence de ces puisards semblerait indiquer un climat plus humide qu’actuellement, cf. à ce propos, les remarques de Fairman à propos de Sesebi (JEA, 23, 1937, p. 146).
33 Journal de Fouilles manuscrit, p. 10, journée du 14–1–1954. Seul le fond de l’objet subsistait pris dans l’épaisseur du mur. Le bois complètement désagrégé, ne tenait plus que par la mince couche de stuc qui elle-même s’effritait. Dimensions, long. 24 cm. 05, larg. 16 cm. Épaisseur du bois 7 mm. Pour les coffrets de ce type, cf. Petrie, Objects of daily use, pl. XXXIII, nos. 1–2 et p. 36.
34 Cf. notamment à Sesebi, Blackman-Fairman, JEA, 23, 1937, pl. XIX et p. 150 ; ibid., 24, 1938, pl. VIII et p. 152.
35 Pour comparaison, cf. les magasins de Sesebi, JEA, 24, 1938, pl. VIII, G et H 7. Le plan en diffère entièrement des constructions de Kor.
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inhabité autrefois, qui séparait l’enceinte I de l’enceinte II, et même en certains endroits elle atteignit ce mur qu’elle dépassa (cf. PLAN D, en B/4). Il fallut alors, pour protéger la ville ainsi agrandie, construire, un peu plus à l’ouest une nouvelle enceinte, l’enceinte III (cf. PLAN D). Tous les bâtiments fouillés appartiennent à la seconde époque du site, à la période d’expansion. Les nombreux tessons qui jonchent le terrain sont tous du Nouvel Empire ; on peut donc faire remonter à cette époque l’établissement à la fois des bâtiments I à 4 et du troisième mur d’enceinte.

Le site qui était entouré par l’enceinte I était-il de beaucoup antérieur au Nouvel-Empire ? L’absence de tout objet et de toute construction remontant avec certitude à ce niveau interdit toute précision. On sait que Somers Clarke s’était demandé si l’enceinte de Kor ne remontait pas à l’Ancien Empire37, mais T. Säve-Söderbergh a, depuis, montré qu’il y avait peu de chances pour que des forteresses égyptiennes aient été construites en Nubie sous l’Ancien Empire38. Les raisons qu’il donne, tirées de la critique textuelle, se vérifient par l’examen du terrain, au moins dans le cas de Kor. En effet, il est évident que les premières expéditions égyptiennes utilisèrent non pas l’actuel site de Kor, en bordure du Nil, mais le Gebel Sheikh Suliman lui-même, qui constitue un bon site défensif naturel.

La plateforme supérieure du Gebel Sheikh Suliman a été entourée d’un mur de défense, aujourd’hui ruiné, mais que l’on peut encore en voir de nombreux endroits. C’est là que s’étaient installées les troupes du roi Djé, comme en témoigne le relief qu’elles gravèrent à l’occasion de leur expédition. Ce relief est, pratiquement, au sommet même du plateau. C’est encore près du point le plus élevé que se trouvent les graffitis du Moyen Empire relevés par A. J. Arkell39, parmi lesquels figurent des Intef et des Montouhotep40, ce qui semblerait indiquer que jusqu’à la XIème dynastie encore, le site se trouvait sur la montagne même, et non au bord du fleuve.

Il ne semble donc pas que le site qu’entoure l’enceinte I puisse être antérieur ou contemporain de la XIème dynastie. La trouvaille d’une empreinte de sceau qui nous semble remonter à la XIIIème dynastie41, dans le périmètre déterminé par l’enceinte la plus ancienne, indiquerait peut-être, qu’il faut faire remonter l’établissement du site au Moyen Empire, ce qui serait confirmé par le type même du mur d’enceinte à bastions arrondis42 (cf. PLANCHE IV, a). Notons aussitôt, toutefois, d’une part qu’aucun bâtiment n’a été découvert qui puisse remonter à cette époque et qu’en conséquence, si le système défensif remonte bien au Moyen Empire, il entourait semblable-til un simple point de débarquement qui n’était pas construit43. Remarquons, d’autre part, que l’enceinte III, qui date certainement du Nouvel Empire (cf. ci-dessus, p. 10), est exactement du même type que l’enceinte I, de sorte que le critère du type de construction ne paraît pas absolument probant.

37 Cf. Somers Clarke, JEA, 3, 1916, p. 163.
40 Nous avons relevé pour notre part d’autres graffitis qui ont échappé à Arkell, parmi ceux-ci figurent un $\Sigma$ et un $\equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv$ . Ce qui confirme les remarques d’Arkell (ibid.), sur l’occupation de la Nubie jusqu’à la seconde cataracte par la XIème dynastie.
43 Il semble que le même fait se soit produit à Dabenarti, où la puissante enceinte fortifiée entoure un terrain manifestement toujours resté inhabité.
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Tous les autres vestiges que nous avons recueillis à Kor sont ou du Nouvel Empire ou plus tardifs. Le grand bâtiment du nord (cf. PLAN D, en C, 9/10), signalé par A. J. Arkell en 1950, et que nous avons fouillé, a livré des ostraca du type dit 'contenus de jarre', qui paléographiquement sont de la XIXe dynastie (cf. PLANCHE VI, a). La nécropole découverte à l'angle nord-ouest du chantier, juste au-dessus de l'édifice du nord (cf. PLAN D en D, 9/10), est de très basse époque, sans doute romaine. La seule indication d'une occupation permanente du site, antérieure au Nouvel Empire, que nous ayons pu observer, est celle des tombes sous tumuli qui occupent la bordure sud du site, entre le Gebel Abd-el-Qadir et l'enceinte sud de Kor (cf. PLAN A, en T, et PLANCHE VI, b). Malheureusement ces sépultures que nous avons explorées du 20 au 26 Février 1954, semblent avoir été toutes pillées. Deux sépultures intactes, situées un peu plus au nord que les grands tumuli (cf. PLAN D, à 300 m. environ au sud de C, 1), paraissent cependant contemporaines de ces derniers. Dans la (no. réf. BS.V.T.1) le corps avait été déplacé postérieurement à l'inhumation, sans doute par des animaux sauvages ; l'autre (réf. BS.V.T.2), était en meilleur état. J'ai noté la présence, sous les pierres du tumulus (de petite dimension), d'un bourrage de sable et de débris de pierres. Le corps était en position contractée, tête à l'est, face tournée vers le nord, couché sur le côté droit, les mains ramenées sous la tête. Le crâne reposait sur une pierre, sur les os on remarquait les traces d'un tissu ; à hauteur des genoux, j'ai recueilli les débris d'une vannerie. Le corps avait été déposé dans un creux du rocher, sans doute aménagé, puis il avait été recouvert de sable et de pierres du tumulus.

Aucun objet ne permet de dater ces tombes sous tumuli, ce qui est regrettable, car la présence de quelques briques de grandes dimensions, qui étaient prises dans les pierres de l'un des tumuli non pillé (ref. BS.V.T.1), pourrait indiquer que ces sépultures ont été établies à la même époque que les enceintes de Kor.

La nécropole dynastique signalée par A. J. Arkell, à l'ouest des enceintes (cf. PLAN D, en C/D, 5/6), est peu étendue pour l'importance du site. Elle a été systématiquement pillée et ne comportait ni tombes à puits, ni, semble-t-il, de tombeaux construits.

On notera qu'aucun vestige n'a été découvert qui puisse remonter soit à l'époque éthiopienne, soit à l'époque méroïtique. Tout se passe comme si, après avoir été

---

44 Cf. JEA, 36, 1950, s.v., Gebel Sheikh Suliman (a).
46 Cf. la tombe ref. BS. VI, t. 4, Journal de Fouilles manuscrit, p. 20, journée du 11-2-1954. Squelette de femme, couchée sur le dos, tête à l'est, pieds à l'ouest, le bras droit le long du corps, bras et mains gauches ramenés sur le pubis. Une poignée à anses, déposée à gauche de la tête (Inventaire K. 41, remise au Musée de Wadi Halfa), et une perle ronde de faïence bleue trouvée à proximité du corps, montrent que nous sommes en présence d'une sépulture de très basse époque.
47 Squelette masculin, crane dolichocéphale, long. o m. 18, humérus, long. o m. 41. L'absence de la machoire inférieure confirme le bouleversement de la tombe postérieurement à l'inhumation, qui était apparent déjà dans la disposition du tumulus.
48 Squelette masculin, longueur de l'humérus o m. 48 (ref. BS. V. t. 2—Journal de Fouilles manuscrit, p. 17 et 17a, journée du 30-1-1954).
49 Dimensions o m. 35 x 0 m. 16 x 0 m. 08 ; pour comparaison, une des briques du mur d'enceinte II mesurait : o m. 35 x 0 m. 18 x 0 m. 09.
50 On notera toutefois que le tumulus d'où proviennent ces briques avait été bouleversé, cf. ci-dessus, note 47, de sorte que les briques ne sont peut-être pas contemporaines de la sépulture. Dans les autres tumuli nous n'avons pas noté la présence de briques.
51 JEA, 36, 1950, p. 27, s.v., Gebel Sheikh Suliman (c).
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visité plus ou moins régulièrement depuis l'époque thinite jusqu'à la XIème dynastie, puis, après avoir été occupé du Moyen au Nouvel Empire, par les Égyptiens, le site de Kor avait été ensuite abandonné. Ce n'est qu'à très basse époque que des populations, d'ailleurs peu nombreuses, se seraient de nouveau installées à Kor. Aujourd'hui, le site n'est plus habité ; le village le plus proche étant installé sur les pentes mêmes du Gebel Abd-el-Qadir, à proximité de l'église copte (cf. PLAN A).

Tels sont, rapidement exposés, les résultats de la fouille 1953-1954 et nous pouvons maintenant examiner à nouveau le problème essentiel que pose le site de Kor, celui de son identification avec Iken.

Cette identification repose, nous l'avons montré, sur trois arguments : a) l'ancienneté supposée du site ; b) son extension ; c) sa situation qui correspond, en gros, à celle de Iken telle qu'on peut la déduire d'après la liste des forteresses égyptiennes de Nubie au Moyen Empire (cf. ci-dessus, pp. 7-8).

Si le site ne remonte certainement pas à l'Ancien Empire, son existence au Moyen Empire n'est pas inavraisemblable, bien que, il faut le rappeler encore, le plus grand nombre des vestiges apparents soit incontestablement du Nouvel-Empire. Cette constatation a une répercussion immédiate sur le second argument qui a été avancé en faveur de l'identification de Kor avec Iken. Si le site, au Nouvel Empire, a une très grande étendue, il n'en va pas de même à l'époque antérieure. L'enceinte découverte au cours de la dernière campagne de fouilles, en effet, est à environ 100 m. du Nil. Bien loin d'être plus grand que Bouhen nord, comme l'est effectivement le site du Nouvel Empire, Kor ancien est notablement plus petit52. Enfin, et surtout, rien n'indique que ce site ait jamais comporté d'édifices à l'intérieur de cette première enceinte. Ainsi deux seulement des trois arguments qui ont été avancés restent valables : il n'est pas impossible que la partie la plus ancienne du site remonte bien au Moyen Empire (trouvaille du sceau de la XIIème dynastie), et la position du site entre Mirgissah à 9 km. au sud et Bouhen au nord à moins de 5 km., conviendrait bien pour Iken. Mais ces arguments sont-ils suffisants pour prouver l'identité de Kor avec cette forteresse ? Je ne le crois pas. En effet, il résulte du travail accompli sur le chantier que :

1°—Kor n'est pas une forteresse du type habituel.

Kor diffère des forteresses de la seconde cataracte, autant par la faible épaisseur de ses enceintes (3 m. 50 au maximum à la base, parfois moins53), que par leur mode de construction : le moélon de grès non taillé, noyé dans de la terre à briques (cf. PLANCHE V, a)54 ; la forme de ses bastions, arrondis et non rectangulaires ; la hauteur de

52 L'enceinte la plus proche du Nil à Bouhen, en est quand même éloignée de 150 mètres. La destruction des murs sud et nord ne permet plus d'apprécier l'extension longitudinale de Kor ancien.

53 Pour comparaison, les murs de Bouhen nord ont 8 m. 50 d'épaisseur, ceux de Dabenarti de 6 à 7 m., ceux de Semneh ouest 7 m., ceux de Mirgissah 8 et 16 m., ceux de Kummeh 8 m. à la base 4 m. au sommet, ceux de Uronarti 6 m. alors que l'enceinte 1 de Kor ne mesure que 1 m. à la base.

54 Dans les autres forteresses le matériau employé est la brique (cf. Somers Clarke, *JEA*, 3, 1916, pp. 176-9. A Kor seuls les bastions arrondis sont construits en briques de dimensions similaires d'ailleurs à celles employées dans les autres forteresses, cf. 1d. ibid. (0.35×0.18×0.09).
a. ANGLE NORD-OUEST DE LA COUR DU BATIMENT 1 (cf. plan E)
    au loin le Gebel Cheikh Suliman

b. CHAMBRE A L'EXTREMITÉ NORD-OUEST DU BATIMENT 1 (cf. plan E)

    facing p. 16
a. ANGLE SUD-OUEST DU BATIMENT 4 (cf. plan E)
à l'horizon le Gebel Abel-el-Quadir

b. LE PÉRISTYLE DE LA COUR DU BATIMENT 1 (cf. plan E)
a. LE MUR D'ENCEINTE 1 (cf. plan D, Hors-texte, n°/4)

b. PORTE DANS LE BATIMENT 4
a. INTÉRIEUR D'UN BASTION-ENCEINTE II (cf. plan D, Hors-texte, n/1)

b. FONDATIONS DU MUR D'ENCEINTE II EN B/4 (cf. plan D, Hors-texte)
a. MAÇONNERIE DU MUR D'ENCEINTE II
(Jonction des murs II et III en n/1, plan D Hors-texte)

b. PUISARD DU BATIMENT 1 (cf. plan E)
Plate VI

a. Ostraca ‘Contenus de Jarres,’ Trouvé Dans Le Batiment Du Nord
   (cf. plan D, Hors-texte, en C/9-10)

b. Tumulus Entre Kor Et Le Gebel Abd-el-Qadir (cf. plan A, en T)
   Dans l'angle droit du cliché, le Gebel Cheikh Suliman
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ses murs : 2 m. 50 au plus\(^{55}\); ainsi que par l’absence de fossés le long des murailles\(^{56}\); et, enfin, par l’inexistence de tout système défensif le long du Nil.

En fait, les fortifications de Kor, telles que la fouille les a révélées, mettaient le site à l’abri, tout au plus, d’un ‘rezzou’ venant du désert. La ville était incapable de résister à un simple raid venu du Nil, et encore plus de supporter un siège : les terrasses entre le Nil et le Gebel Sheikh Suliman (sur le plan D ces terrasses occupent toute la bande marquée D, de 1 à 10 et au-delà), surplombent le site et ses murailles ; on ne saurait imaginer plus mauvais site défensif ! Or, Iken, dans la liste du Moyen Empire comme dans les dépêches de Semneh et sur les empreintes de sceaux recueillies dans d’autres sites, est qualifiée de ‘forteresse’. Cette appellation ne convient pas au site fouillé.

2°—Kor ne possède ni temple ni cimetière important.

Dans tous les autres sites de la seconde cataracte qui ont pu être identifiés sur la liste du Moyen Empire, les garnisons égyptiennes disposaient d’un ou plusieurs temples. Or, rien, ni dans les bâtiments fouillés, ni dans aucun autre endroit du site, où le roc est souvent à nu, et où, rappelons-le, le sol antique n’est jamais profondément enfoui, rien n’indique que Kor ait jamais possédé de temple.

Il faut ajouter à cette remarque que le cimetière dynastique (cf. PLAN D, en C/D, 5/6), est d’une étendue très petite par rapport à l’ensemble du site. Enfin, et surtout, il ne comporte ni tombes construites, ni hypogées comme à Bouhen nord, bien que la nature du sol se prête à ce genre de sépultures.

Tout se passe donc comme si Kor, qui n’est pas une véritable forteresse, n’avait jamais été habité, malgré son étendue et même au Nouvel Empire, que par une garnison soit non égyptienne, soit d’un rang social très inférieur (absence de temple et de tombes construites ou d’hypogées).

Cela dit, qu’il fallait souligner, à quoi correspond le site de Kor ?

Déjà en 1899, Somers Clarke avait été frappé par la ressemblance des fortifications de Kor et d’Ikkur (Koshtemna), en Basse Nubie\(^{57}\). Or, Ikkur, bien qu’ancien\(^{68}\) et très étendu lui aussi, ne figure pas sur la liste des forteresses du Moyen Empire ; de même, il semble ne posséder ni temple, ni cimetière important. C’est en fait un simple ‘emporium’, défendu en amont par la puissante forteresse de Kuban, qui est, elle, du type habituel\(^{59}\), et figure dans la liste du Moyen Empire sous le nom de Biki.

On voit les nombreux points communs entre les sites de Kor et d’Ikkur : fortifications faibles, plus faibles encore à Kor qu’à Ikkur ; murs d’enceintes d’un type particulier qui remonte peut-être au Moyen Empire\(^{60}\); absence de temples et de nécropoles importantes ; présence à proximité de forteresses puissantes.

---

\(^{55}\) Hauteur déterminée par la fouille du bastion d’angle du mur II (cf. PLAN D, en B/1). Ce bastion a conservé son escalier d’accès au mur d’enceinte où il aboutissait près du sommet (cf. PLANCHE IV, a). Pour comparaison, les murs de Mirgissah, bien qu’érodés eux aussi, ont encore une dizaine de mètres de hauteur.

\(^{56}\) Cf. Somers Clarke, Ibid., p. 160.

\(^{57}\) *JEA*, 3, 1916, p. 163.

\(^{58}\) Moins ancien que ne le croyait Somers Clarke, le site remonte cependant au Moyen Empire, cf. Säve-Söderbergh, *Ägypt. u. Nub.*, p. 32.
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Kor pourrait fort bien n’avoir été qu’un simple élément dans l’ensemble d’une région fortifiée ; cela expliquerait la faiblesse manifeste de ses défenses. Débarcadère protégé d’une attaque brusquée venue du désert, les fouilles ont révélé que ce n’était guère plus, semble-t-il, qu’un entrepôt. On devait y déposer les marchandises en provenance du sud et du nord, en attendant le transbordement vers l’Egypte des produits soudanais, et vers le Dongola du ravitaillement venu d’Egypte. Avec sa longue extension parallèle au Nil, son port, naturel ou aménagé, Kor était bien placé, en effet, pour constituer une place commerciale de premier ordre. Les Nubiens pouvaient y accéder par terre comme par le fleuve, et les Égyptiens avaient la possibilité de les y rencontrer sans courir le risque d’une attaque soudaine des tribus, protégés qu’ils étaient par la chaîne de forteresses de la seconde cataracte. Dans ce sens, et dans ce sens seulement, Kor répond bien à la fonction commerciale de Iken, telle que l’on peut la déduire du texte de la stèle de Semneh.

Il faut préciser, enfin, que de tous les sites de la seconde cataracte au sud de Bouhen nord, Kor est le seul qui soit adapté à la fois à une fonction commerciale et réponde en même temps aux conditions de localisation géographique qui résultent de la liste des forteresses du Moyen Empire (cf. PLAN c, ci-dessus, p. 9) ; Gemai et Murshid, bien que situés sur la rive ouest comme Kor, sont d’un accès plus difficile que ce dernier, et, de toute façon, sont trop méridionaux. Mirgissah, perché sur un piton rocheux est un excellent site de défense, mais il n’aurait pu être que difficilement un marché important, de plus son identification avec la forteresse Dr-ætwy²⁹ est presque certaine. Dans ces conditions Iken devrait se trouver parmi l’une des quatre ruines situées entre Mirgissah et Bouhen nord, à savoir : Dabenarti, Dorgonarti, Meinarti ou Kor.

Dabenarti, dont les murailles entourent un espace suffisant pour avoir été un grand marché, doit être écarté en raison de sa difficulté d’accès²⁴ ; Dorgonarti, situé lui aussi dans une île, est un très petit site²⁶ ; ce n’est manifestement qu’un fort, et peu important. Meinarti est plus considérable, mais comme Dabenarti, sa situation insulaire le rend incommodc pour un marché²⁴ ; en revanche l’importance de son kôm²⁶ pourrait convenir à une forteresse, pour le moins aussi considérable que Shelfak par exemple. Kor, admirablement situé en tant que marché commercial, n’est pas et ne pouvait pas être une forteresse.

On voit le dilemme : en tant que site fortifié, Meinarti pourrait être Iken tel que l’on peut l’imaginer d’après la liste des forteresses du Moyen Empire et les dépêches de

---


⁶² Dabenarti, situé dans une île, est entouré de rapides et même au moment des basses eaux il n’est pas facile d’y parvenir (cf. JEA, 3, 1916, p. 167). Borchardt, Altagyptischen Festungen an der zweiten Nilschnelle, p. 25, avait proposé d’y voir Iken, mais Smither, en se fondant sur le texte même de la stèle de Semneh, a fait valoir combien il était improbabile que Iken ait pu être situé dans une île (cité, d’après une lettre, par Gardiner, Onomastica, 1, p. 10 et note 4), cf. aussi, dans le même sens, Säve-Söderbergh, l.c., p. 93.

⁶³ JEA, 3, 1916, pp. 164–5, Säve-Söderbergh, ibid., se demande si le site ne date pas seulement de la XVIIIème dynastie.

⁶⁴ Cf. ci-dessus, note 63.

⁶⁵ Cf. JEA, 3, 1916, p. 164. Il n’y a pas lieu de retenir l’objection faite par T. Säve-Söderbergh (l.c., p. 93), que le site n’a fourni que de la poterie récente. Occupé successivement par les Romains, les Coptes, les Arabes, les Turcs, les Derviches et les troupes de Kitchener, le kôm est maintenant recouvert de plusieurs couches de débris modernes, ou relativement modernes. Le site ancien, s’il existe encore, est profondément enfoui sous ces ruines.
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Semneh. En revanche, il ne convient pas à un marché tel que devait être Iken si l'on suit le texte de la stèle de Semneh. Kor, de son côté, qui cadrerait très bien avec ce dernier texte, ne répond pas à la définition d'une forteresse.

Une solution permettrait peut-être de venir à bout de ces difficultés. Kor est situé sur le Nil juste en face de Meinarti, dont il n'est pratiquement séparé que par la largeur du fleuve. Ce pourrait être simplement le lieu de commerce, nous dirions presque 'la place du marché', ce qui expliquerait à la fois l'absence de toute protection du côté du Nil et le manque de toute construction ancienne. La forteresse réelle aurait été située dans l'île de Meinarti. En d'autres termes, Iken serait à la fois Meinarti et Kor. Telle est, à notre avis, l'hypothèse qui, dans l'état actuel de nos connaissances, explique le mieux les faits que nous avons pu observer au cours des fouilles de 1953-1954.
The Transfer of the Capital of Kush from Napata to Meroë

by H. F. C. Smith

NOT the least of the many mysteries which shroud the history of the kingdom of Kush is that of when exactly the capital of the country was moved from Napata to Meroë. Since (at the end of the First Great War) the first attempts were made to produce a chronology of events in the northern Sudan between the evacuation of Egypt by Tanwetamani and the final destruction of the city of Meroë, informed opinion concerning the date when Meroë superseded Napata as the seat of government of the Kushite kings has varied. In the very early days of Reisner’s king list it was believed that the capital moved from Napata on the death of Nastasen (c. 308 B.C.) when the kings ceased to be buried at Nuri and were instead buried at Bagarawiyah, and this belief seems to have persisted amongst laymen until comparatively recently. As early as 1919, however, Reisner himself tentatively put forward the theory1 that, although they continued to be buried at Nuri until 308 B.C., the kings had, in fact, been living at Meroë since about 453 B.C. No new ideas on the subject appeared in print until 1947 when Reisner’s collaborator, Dows Dunham2, produced evidence which, he thought, indicated that Meroë had become the capital as early as about 538 B.C. after the death of king Malanaqen. This last theory subsequently received support (1952) from G. A. Wainwright3.

Now that political and social developments in the Sudan itself are increasingly directing public attention there to local history, it may be opportune to gather together the available evidence on this matter, and attempt a re-assessment of the difficulties in the way of a reconstruction of the history of this period.

First let us consider the evidence brought forward in support of the various theories referred to above. The idea that the capital moved from Napata to Meroë on the death of Nastasen has been effectively discredited by the publication in 1940 by F. L. Macadam4 of a stela of the King Aman-nete-eryike from Kawa. This stela states that the king reigned in Baruat (Meroë), and his dates according to Reisner were about 418 to 398 B.C. He was buried under pyramid xii at Nuri.

Here we have confirmation of Reisner’s own opinion quoted above. The evidence which he brought forward, however, was of a different nature. He noticed that the pyramids of Nuri fell into four groups. These groups were differentiated chiefly by stages in the deterioration of Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions found in them, which corresponded with the accession of an unusually powerful (i.e. rich) king immediately after an unusually weak (i.e. poor) king. This he took to be evidence of changes in dynasty. Of the three changes the most marked occurred between the reigns of Nasakhma and Malewiebamani (pyramids Nuri xix and xi) or in about 453 B.C. In suggesting that this was the point at which the capital was transferred from Napata to Meroë, Reisner was, it must be said, extremely hesitant. And rightly so. For the evidence submitted, though perhaps sufficient to prove the accession of a new and less

---

1 SNR xi.
2 SNR xxviii.
3 JEA 38.
4 Temples of Kawa, vol. 1.
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Egyptianised dynasty, is certainly not by itself sufficient to prove that the new dynasty was Meroitic, or that its capital was at Meroē. An equally legitimate reconstruction might suggest that the new dynasty was of any one of those numerous though mysterious peoples of the Sudan who troubled the reigns of Amen-nete-ferike, Harsiotef and Nastasen. In speaking of the transfer of the capital, therefore, Reisner's evidence can only be used in confirmation of more direct evidence from other sources. We shall consider later whether, in fact, such evidence exists. For the moment all we can say with any certainty is that the capital moved to Meroē at some yet unknown date before the reign of Amen-nete-ferike, but not necessarily after the death of Nasakhma.

When we turn to the evidence submitted by Dows Dunham in support of the death of Malanaqen as the occasion of the transfer of the capital we find that it is of an equally inconclusive nature. In his article published in *Sudan Notes and Records* in 1947 he begins his advocacy of an early date for the transfer by presenting general evidence for the antiquity of Meroē as an important city, with royal connexions. It must be said at once, however, that this evidence is regrettably exaggerated. He states, for example, that Tahraka 'seems to have erected at least one building there'. There appears to be no better reason for believing this than the fact that Garstang in his early interim reports on the excavations there called a group of columns in the centre of the royal city the 'Tirhaqa building' merely because their architectural style was reminiscent of that used by Tahraka elsewhere. This, quite clearly, cannot be legitimately submitted to prove that Tahraka built at Meroē. Dows Dunham, however, goes on to say that the names of Anlaman, Aspalta, Amatalqa and Malanaqen 'occur frequently' at Meroē. This is again an exaggeration. Aspelta's name occurs once only at Meroē, and then not in the royal city but in the sun-temple court. The other names occur only in Garstang's Building 294 at the lowest level. This is admittedly in the royal city and may have been a palace, but even then the names in question were found only on three gold, and a number of small faience, objects. This provenance certainly does not justify the use of the word 'frequently'. And in any case it should be noted that, whatever weight may be attached to this evidence, it cannot be brought forward to support the theory that the capital was transferred in about 538 B.C. because, according to Reisner's king list which is accepted by Dows Dunham, all these kings lived before that date.

After this general attempt (of which we must be wary) to predispose us in favour of the great antiquity of Meroē as a royal city, Dows Dunham proceeds to the evidence which indicated to him that the date of the transfer was in fact about 538 B.C. A study of the royal tombs at El Kurru and Nuri showed him that of the 26 kings of Kush buried there, the first 12 (reigning during the period c. 760–538 B.C.) had, buried with them, an average of 'well over' 4 queens each: whereas the remaining 14 (c. 538–308 B.C.) appeared to have an average of 'less than' 1¾ queens each. This, he suggests, was not due to a change in social habits but to the fact that the remainder of the queens during the second period were buried in unidentified tombs in the west cemetery at Meroē. This shows, he concludes, that Meroē became an extremely important city in about 538 B.C.; that it was, in fact, the capital by then, in place of Napata. Here again, I submit, the evidence, though ingeniously collected, is by itself completely inconclusive and susceptible to equally legitimate alternative constructions.

Let us for the moment accept the suggestion that over half of the queens of Kush were from about 538 B.C. onwards buried at Meroē. What can this indicate? First of all it might indicate that from that date the Napatan kings, faced with the very great
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5 'Meroē, City of the Ethiopians'. *LAAA* iv.
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importance of the city of Meroë, found it prudent to marry daughters of the aristocracy of that place and to allow them the privilege of being buried in their native town. Secondly, it might suggest that as the Napatan kings, after the loss of Egypt, tended to look more and more to the south, they naturally tended at the same time to marry noble women from the southern tribes who were, however, not yet considered the equals of the Napatan queens and were thus denied the privilege of burial at Nuri, but were interred at Meroë, the natural centre of the southern lands. Thirdly, it might imply that in about 538 B.C. kings of Meroitic origin ascended the throne through intermarriage with Napatan princesses, and, in the interests of legitimacy, continued to have themselves buried at Nuri with their Napatan queens, while their queens of Meroitic origin had their tombs at Meroë. What, if anything, can we learn from these various indications concerning the date of the transfer of the capital? One may indicate that the capital was transferred to Meroë by 538 B.C. Two, however, suggests on the whole that it was not, and that Meroë may well have remained a provincial and not a national capital for an indefinite period after this date. Three is possibly neutral on this question for while change of dynasty sometimes means change of capital, at other times it does not. My point here is that upon the evidence submitted by Dows Dunham all of the constructions mentioned above can with equal legitimacy be placed, and that without other evidence, which he does not bring forward, there is no means of telling which is the right one.

But the situation is, I am suggesting, even worse than this. For it is by no means clear that we can accept the hypothesis that many of the queens of kings 13–26 were buried at Meroë. Up to the present no identification of their tombs has been published. Secondly the figures of 'average queens per head' are by no means as conclusive as is suggested by the straightforward comparison of 'well over 4' with 'less than 1½'. It is not in fact easy to see how the figure 'well over 4' is arrived at. From the tomb and king lists recently published by Dows Dunham it would appear that kings 1–12 had altogether 35 queens: an average of barely 3 each. The average for the second group is certainly 'less than 1½'. But the average 3 gives no indication of the number of queens which each king had, for only one of this group in fact had three (Taharqa): one had one, four had two, four had an average of three (not further identifiable), one had five and one six. Analysing the second group we find that three had none, five had one, five had two, and one one probably. Thus the apparent difference between the first and second groups is to a large extent illusory. This is made even clearer by the fact that the last king placed in the first group had only two wives, and could with equal logic be put in the second group. Here is no basis for historical reconstruction.

Alleged confirmation of Dows Dunham's hypothesis has, however, been published recently by G. A. Wainwright. Is this sufficient to single out this hypothesis from among the alternatives? The extra evidence submitted by Wainwright is, first of all, from Herodotus. It is noted that the latter does not mention Napata at all, but states that Meroë 'is said to be the mother city of all the other Ethiopians'. By 'other' Ethiopians he seems to mean 'other than those living in the neighbourhood of Elephantine'. Now Herodotus is thought to have visited Egypt some time about 450 B.C. Here, therefore, may be acceptable confirmatory evidence that by about that date Napata had ceased to be the capital of the Ethiopians, and that the transfer of the
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6 'The Royal Cemeteries of Kush', vol. 1 (El Kurru); vol. III (The Decorated chapels of Meroitic Pyramids at Meroë and Barkal).
7 Hist. II, 29.
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capital to Meroë had taken place sufficiently long before that date for the inhabitants of Elephantine (from whom Herodotus appears to have obtained his information) either to have considered it unnecessary to mention that Napata had once been the capital, or to have forgotten that it had been. What is the value of this evidence for placing the date of the transfer of the capital in the 6th century B.C.? I submit that it has very little value.

In the first place, we do not know exactly when Herodotus was in Egypt. Although it is usually held that he was there sometime between 449 and 443 B.C., W. W. How and J. Wells' support Meyer's hypothesis that 440 and 431 are the most likely dates, and it seems possible for him to have been there any time between 460 and 430 B.C. In the second place one should perhaps remember that least reliance can be placed on Herodotus's accounts of those places of which he had no personal knowledge (such as the Nile valley above Elephantine). The facts were that the river route connecting Elephantine with Napata had largely gone out of use since the Assyrian defeat of the Kushite pharaohs (588 is the last previous date from which we have evidence of Egyptian communications upstream from Elephantine, and this is only from Abu Simbel). This route had been replaced by the one in use in Herodotus's time which left the river just above the first cataract and cut across the Nubian desert in the direction of modern Abu Hamed, leaving Napata isolated far to the west. It is thus very doubtful if anyone in Elephantine between 460 and 430 (and by anyone I mean anyone of those few Greek-speaking people who could communicate with Herodotus) knew anything about Napata at all. It is also doubtful whether knowledge of Meroë itself was sufficient for us to be certain that when Herodotus uses the expression 'mother city' he means 'seat of the central government' rather than 'the most prosperous provincial capital'. Indeed we know that while Herodotus was in Egypt Napata undoubtedly still was both the burial place of the 'Ethiopian' kings and the religious centre of their kingdom. Nothing in this evidence, in fact, would seem to give appreciable support to the view that the transfer of the capital took place as early as 538 B.C.

But, as Wainwright points out, there is more in Herodotus than this. Elsewhere the latter records a story told him of spies sent into Kush by Cambyses to collect intelligence in preparation for a Persian invasion of the country. These spies (in 529 B.C.) saw, among other interesting things, 'the table of the sun' which may have been the sun temple at Meroë. Does this show that in Cambyses' time the capital of Kush was at Meroë? To begin with, Herodotus was here quoting from hearsay a tradition already perhaps 90 years old and crediting the Kingdom of Kush with such unlikely things as a spring of scented water and a prison where the prisoners wore fetters of gold. There seems little ground for historical reconstruction here. That the king of Kush showed the spies the 'table of the sun' does not mean that his capital was at Meroë. We cannot, in fact, be certain even that the 'table' was the Meroë sun-temple. The whole story is, in short, extremely vague, and really throws no reliable light on the question of the date of the transfer of the capital.

In view of this, the remaining evidence brought forward by Wainwright must be counted as irrelevant to our problem. He attempts to show that inscriptions of Darius,

9 'Forschungen zur alten Geschichte', vol. 1, p. 156, quoted in ibid.
10 A. Rowe, in 'Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte', vol. xxxviii. The famous Greek inscription.
11 Hist. iii, 20–24.
for example, which claim that he was master of Ethiopia indicate that the statement of Diodorus Siculus\(^{12}\) that Cambyses was the founder of Meroë, though not in fact true, is confirmed in so far as it means that Meroë was the capital of 'Ethiopia' from Cambyses' time onwards. But what is actually proved here is merely that there was a Persian invasion of Kush (if the Persian imperial inscriptions, unlike those of the Egyptian xivith dynasty, are to be believed), and that Diodorus Siculus was recording a tradition similar in nature to that recorded by Herodotus, but with far less authority (Herodotus' tradition cannot have been more than 100 years old, Diodorus' cannot have been less than 500 years old). And after all has been said, the date of the transfer of the capital from Napata to Meroë remains as much a mystery as before.

How much of a mystery? There are, I believe, two questions involved here. The first is how far can we accept Reisner's king list, within the framework of which we have been working? This is a very big problem which cannot be fully dealt with here. We must note, however, that from 663 B.C. onwards there are no dates in the king list which can be verified by external evidence. The alleged fixed point of the reconstruction of the great Temple of Amon at Jebel Barkal by Netekamon and Amantari is hardly more than conjectural because there is nothing to show that the Romans destroyed it in 23 B.C., or, if it was destroyed then, that it was immediately rebuilt. The list is in fact based on internal typological evidence from the royal pyramids. At best, therefore, it can only be an approximation to the truth. There is reason to believe, moreover, that in its later part it may be subject to very considerable modification\(^{19}\).

Supposing, however, that, with this caution (which is not to be lightly regarded), the Reisner list is accepted, we can say that the capital was definitely at Meroë by about 418 B.C. (the Amen-nete-ferike stela), and probably by about 450 B.C. (Herodotus and Reisner's own opinion quoted above). At the same time, we can say that the building of Taharqa and the interest of his successor in Egypt show that the capital was at Napata at least down to about 663 B.C. Our second question is, therefore, can we reasonably close this gap of about two hundred years?

Let us first consider what evidence there may be from the site of Napata itself. Griffiths from his excavations there gave it as his opinion\(^{14}\) that the flourishing period of Napata lay between the reigns of Piankhi and Amta' (i.e. 751-553 B.C. according to Reisner's king list). The chief reason for his saying this seems to have been that he found no mummy burials in the cemetery there which he could date later than the death of the latter king. This at first sight appears to be confirmation of Dows Dunham's theory. But, unfortunately, there are difficulties here also. The excavations at Napata were extremely inconclusive. The only sites dug were the temple of Amon, the so-called 'Treasury' and the cemetery. The whole site was very badly eroded and sanded up, and had been extensively robbed. Griffith himself admits to having lost many of the notes made at the time of excavation, and to having had to make part of his report from memory. One apparently very important building had, moreover, been excavated as early as 1908 by Messrs. Deiber and d'Allemagne, all record of whose work seems to have disappeared. In view of this, it does not seem to me to be possible to draw any
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\(^{12}\) L. 33.

\(^{13}\) See, for example, Macadam, op. cit., on the mystery of 'Queen MNIRN'; and Monneret de Villard, 'Storia della Nubia Cristiana', on the same, and on the date of the final decline of Meroë. I am indebted to Mr P. L. Shinnie, for drawing my attention to the very considerable difficulties involved in this king list.

\(^{14}\) LAAI 9.
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firm conclusion as to the date at which Napata ceased to be the capital from Griffith's evidence, though we can from it be fairly certain that the capital remained at Napata until at least the middle of the 6th century B.C.

This still leaves a gap of at least a century (c. 550–450 B.C.) during which the location of the capital is in doubt. This period, if we accept Reisner's king list, covers the reigns of the following kings:

Analma'aye  Amaniastabarqa
Amani-natakalebte  Si'aspiqa
Karkaman  Nasakhma.

None of these have left us inscriptions which tell us anything. Griffith states that the cemetery at Napata remained in use during their period, but this does not help us much.

On the same period also the excavations at Meroë are silent. Garstang, indeed, went so far as to say that the royal city there was probably not in use during the hundred years from about 400 to 300 B.C.15, which further confuses the question. It must be confessed that the excavations at Meroë were, in so far as our problem is concerned, just as inconclusive as those at Napata. All we can say from them, even if we accept Garstang's datings, which do not fit in too happily with Reisner's chronology, is that the great majority of buildings in the city seem to have been put up after 300 B.C.

What is the outcome of all this doubt which, I believe can be legitimately cast on any theory already published concerning the date of the transfer of this capital? It seems to be quite simply this: that in the present state of our knowledge we cannot say when Napata was superseded by Meroë, except that this probably occurred sometime between about 550 and 450 B.C. It is possible that the answer to the problem (and to many other problems) still lies hidden in the ruins of Napata or Meroë. It is perhaps too much to hope that much can be discovered from Napata, because of the excessive deterioration of the site. But Meroë will undoubtedly repay further investigation, even if this merely takes the form of a complete publication of Garstang's findings, or a translation of the Meroitic inscriptions.
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Clay Sealings of Dynasty XIII from Uronarti Fort

by the late G. A. Reisner

(Published by permission of the Egyptian Department, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, U.S.A.)

The fort at Uronarti, *Khesef-Yuwnw*, was excavated by the Harvard-Boston Expedition in 1928-9 and 1929-30. About five thousand mud sealings with seal impressions were found in the floor debris, or just outside the east wall of the inner fort. The sealings were unusually well preserved and are of especial importance because they are all of one short period, Dynasty XIII and probably the first half of that dynasty. The dating depends primarily on four letter sealings with the stamp of the Horus Khabau, that is, Sekhemra-Khuwtawi whom I would set as the first king of Dynasty XIII. This is supported by the archaeological evidence. The mass of the collection was found in the floor debris of the inner fort, a deposit of dust and decayed mud (from the walls) about 10-25 cm. deep. On this layer, later walls had been built indicating a reoccupation of the fort perhaps in the New Kingdom. The temple of that period, it is to be noted, is outside the fort in the angle between the narrow northern end and the long northern curtain wall. I reconstruct the history of the fort as follows:

2. Cleaned for the last time about the end of Dynasty XII and continued to be garrisoned during Dynasty XIII but for no very long period.
3. The outer fort which is by construction later than the inner fort, contains material that is homogeneous with that found in the inner fort (Dynasty XIII). It was therefore in occupation during Dynasty XIII. I would place its construction about the time of the renovation of the inner fort at the end of Dynasty XII. It was perhaps occupied by a miscellaneous civil population which had gathered on the island but could not be admitted to the inner fort.
4. Abandoned as a military fortress before the end of Dynasty XIII.
5. Early in Dynasty XVIII, the viceroy Tuwre visited the fort and constructed the temple of crude brick on the site afterwards occupied by the New Kingdom stone temple. The chief purpose of the temple was the establishment of Sesostris III as a god of Ethiopia undertaken for political reasons. At that time the religious endowments of Sesostris III were re-established and the temple priests occupied the fort temporarily.
6. When Thothmes I, Thothmes III, and Amenophis II constructed and reconstructed the stone temples at Senna East and West, the crude brick temple at Uronarti was lined with stone and perhaps also reconstructed. I would ascribe to this period the great house at the southern end of the island.

No objects datable to Dynasty XII were found except the ten memorial objects of plastered wood inscribed with dates of the reign of Amenemhat III. These were found in the floor debris of the large building (A) in the southwestern quarter of the inner fort which I tentatively identify as a temple of the Middle Kingdom.
CLAY SEALINGS OF DYNASTY XIII FROM URONARTI FORT

1. The Sealings and their Classification as Sealings

The collection of sealings from Uronarti consists of 4543 pieces of mud or clay. Of these 2547 have been stamped with official seals, and 2514 with private seals. The identifiable official seals are 45 and the identifiable private seals are 473 in number.

The number of sealings is of importance for two reasons. In the first place, it is difficult to read seals represented by only one or two impressions, because the impression is so often imperfect. The seal was not pressed home; the seal slipped sideways; or the clay was pinched between the fingers as the seal was lifted. But with a number of impressions to compare, the seal-design can usually be properly drawn. Again the large number of sealings permits a study of the uses to which the sealings were put and an insight not only into the exchange of letters and packages with Egypt and other Nubian forts, but also into the red tape of the local administration.

The material of the sealings varies, according to Mr Lucas, from ordinary Nile mud to a fine black clay obtained by washing out the coarser particles from ordinary Nile mud. The fine black clay is still hard and durable, similar in consistency to dried modelling clay. The ordinary material is usually fairly hard; and only a few of the sealings are in a soft or crumbling state. The clay of the store sealings of Uronarti shows particles of yellow mica which is very plentiful in the local Nile mud. Mr Lucas found that these sealings on heating turned to a rich red-brown colour.

The upper surface of the sealing has been stamped with one or more impressions, usually of the same seal. The underside (reverse) of the sealing bears an impression of the object to which the clay or mud has been applied. A proportion of the sealings are quite intact although a majority are either broken or fragmentary. Even in the case of perfect sealings it is not always easy to determine the form or character of the object sealed. The following list gives the various forms, and such explanation as I am able to find for them:

1) The Letter Sealing is unmistakable, being of fine black clay and bearing the imprint of papyrus on the reverse side. The letter or document has been folded into a flat packet about 3–8 cm. in width and of indeterminable length (probably 12–25 cm.). A flat cake of clay has been laid on the upper side and the packet tied around the middle with a string which passed over the clay. Half of the cake of clay was then folded back over the string and the stamp applied once only to the upper surface of the clay.

2) The Funnel Sealing of ordinary dark grey Nile mud, has a flat base, finely striated like wood graining. From the centre of the flat base rises a hole with flaring top. Around the lower part of the hole, inside, is the print of a string passing two or more times around the hole. It appears as if the neck of a sack of cloth had been drawn through a hole in a wooden plate and tied close to the plate. The mud was applied to the top of the plate around the tied neck of the sack, and worked into a

---

1 The numbering of the illustrations has caused some difficulty. Every illustrated sealing bears two numbers. The right hand number is the seal number (presumably a consecutive series of numbers given to the seals as they were found). The left hand numbers, referred to in the text as the figure numbers, are a consecutive series given to the seals as arranged in the illustrations. Unfortunately as left by Reisner this series begins twice; firstly in Fig. 1 and again in Fig. 2. It has not been possible to renumber all the drawings but in all cases where seal numbers of Fig. 1 are referred to the words Fig. 1 occur before the number. Numbers preceded by the words Fig. No., without the addition of 1, refer to the numbers as given from fig. 2 onwards.
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rough rectangular form or circular form, and impressed two or more times with a
stamp. These funnel-shaped sealings are of several sizes, two of which pre-
dominate—one very large (diam. about 8 cm.) and the other, very small (diam.
about 3 cm.). The large size generally bears the stamp of the ‘storehouse of the
fortress of Khesef-Yuwuuw (Uronarti)’ or of the ‘treasury’ of that fortress.
The large funnels with the seals of the fortress must have been used locally, I
suggest for sealing bags of grain and other provisions kept as rations for the soldiers
and officials. The smaller funnels appear to have been applied to smaller sacks,
and bear the impressions of private seals. Many of the mud sealings found at
the fort at Kerma were of the funnel type.

(3) The Double Funnel Sealing, of the same material as the funnel seal, appears to have
been applied to the neck of the sacks similar to those of the funnel sealing but
without the plate. The examples are only three or four in number, and bear the
large official stamp of the store-house or treasury of Uronarti.

(4) The package Sealing of ordinary mud, is generally of circular or oval form and bears
the print of tied strings on the under side. A pat of mud had been laid on a pack-
age over the string and stamped on the upper surface. Some of the package-seals
bear the print of cloth on the under side, some the print of basket work.

(5) The Box or Door Sealing, of ordinary mud, appears in several different forms, but
chiefly in a slot form and a corner form. In the slot form the mud appears to have
been pressed between three wooden surfaces, the exact nature of which it is
difficult to reconstruct, but indicate perhaps, the lock of a door or box. Some of
these sealings bear the official fortress stamps of Uronarti and others bear private
stamps. Each corner seal had been applied to three wooden surfaces forming a
corner. They seem to occur in sets of four, and to have sealed some kind of door-
lock or box-fastening. Neither the slot-sealing nor the corner-sealing have any
string mark.

(6) The Key-hole Sealing, of ordinary mud, is a lump of mud which appears to have been
pressed into a hole like a key-hole and smeared slightly over the wooden surface
surrounding the hole. The upper surface is stamped with a private seal.

(7) The Sample-Sealing, of ordinary mud, consists of a cone or of a circular (or oval) pat
of mud on the upper surface of which a single impression has been stamped. The
sides of the lump show finger prints, and the sealing has not been attached to any
object. The list is as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 28</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 98</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 100</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 245b</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) 306</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) x-174</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seal No. 20 (No. 1 above) is one of the three official letter seals of the fortress of
Semna West. It seems to me probable that it was sent from the fort at Semna West
to that at Uronarti as a sample of the seal for comparison with impressions on
official despatches from the one fort to the other. The occasion may have been a
CLAY SEALINGS OF DYNASTY XIII FROM URONARTI FORT

change in the seal of Semna West (we have the impressions of two different seals of that fort), a change of the person of the commandant at Uronarti, or some dispute as to the authenticity of the sealing on some despatch. I take it that the other sample sealings are of the same character sent by some person at a distance to his correspondent at Uronarti, to permit the control of the sealings on packages and letters (see below, the discussion of a registry-office for seal designs).

(8) Sample Sealings with Incised Designs, of the material and form of the sample sealings described above bear, with one exception, an impression of an impression. The list is as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 62</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 129</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47 ; possibly hand cut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 130</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) x-59</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) x-98</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seal designs cut in relief, and thus giving incised impressions, are extremely rare, and unknown to me in this period, except in geometrical patterns (see Kerma). The impressions Nos. 1, 2, 4–6 above, are imperfect and seem to be reversed impressions made from other impressions of the usual incised seal. The presence of the sample sealings mentioned above, suggests that these impressions of impressions were taken by the recipient of parcels as evidence of the integrity of the sealing in case of dispute as to the contents of the parcel.

In addition to the forms of sealings described above, a few odd forms such as basket and jar sealings occur along with some which have been used for sealing objects which are quite indeterminable. The sealings prove the despatch of letters and packages of various sorts from other places including Thebes, and also the local use of seals to safeguard magazines, chests, and sacks at Uronarti itself.

2. STAMPING AND OVERSTAMPING OF THE SEALINGS

The stamping of the sealings with seal impressions has several interesting features, as follows:—

(1) The letter sealings and the sample sealings were stamped with one impression on each.
(2) The other sealings usually had as many impressions (one or more) of the same seal as the surface of the sealing would carry. The funnels as preserved are only half of the original sealings, and the box sealings although complete appear to be merely parts of the original sealing.
(3) The large official sealings stamped with the store-seals were so often over stamped with the private seal of an official that such over stamping appears to have been customary.
(4) Four cases occur in which a sealing was stamped with the impressions of two private seals.

The over stamped seals were those of the 'Granary of Khesef-Yuwnuwy' (No. 5a; Fig. 1, 10), the 'Treasury of Khesef-Yuwnuwy' (No. 5b; Fig. 1, 11), the store-seal of the endowment of Sesostris III (No. 6b; Fig. 1, 6), the seal of the 'Treasury (?) of Yeqen'
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(No. 507, Fig. 1, 16), the seal of the nomarch (?) of Yeqen (No. 502; Fig. 1, 15), the seal No. 505 (Fig. 1, 23), and one of the small stamps (No. 11; Fig. 1, 28):—

(a) Overstamped on No. 5a ... ... *15 sealings.
(b) " " Nos. 5a or 5b ... ... *7 "
(c) Total ... *503 sealings of which 441 from 47 seals were legible.

(d) Overstamped on No. 6 ... ... *7 sealings from 2 seals.
(e) " " 507 ... ... 3 " " 1 scal.
(f) " " 502 ... ... 2 " " 2 scal.
(g) " " 505 ... ... 2 " " 1 scal.
(h) Total ... 518 sealings from 54 seals.

The purpose of the overstamp was obviously to add an additional guarantee to the sealing to make plain the responsibility of the official for the contents of the sealed room or receptacle, and to prevent an illicit use of the official stamp by a subordinate official. It is to be assumed that the owners of the 47 seals used as overstamp on No. 5 were resident at Uronarti at the time of the overstamping.

The sealings stamped with two private seals are as follows:—

(i) A fragment of a medium sized funnel of black mud, Reg. No. 28-11-237, from rooms 3-4, was stamped with seals No. 8 (Fig. No. 348: group 45) and No. 14 (Fig. No. 371: group 49). No. 8 also occurs overstamped on three fragments of sealing of Fig. 1, No. 10 from the same rooms, but No. 14 was not found on any other sealing.

(ii) A complete box or lock sealing, Reg. No. 28-12-90 from room 47, was stamped with seals No. 65b (Fig. No. 257: group 36) and No. 160 (Fig. No. 363: group 68). No. 65b occurs on 13 box sealings from the same room, and on one box and one package sealing from room 120. No. 160 occurs on one other small fragment from room 60.

(iii) A complete box or lock sealing, Reg. No. 28-11-452 (1), from room 27, was stamped with seals No. 86 (Fig. No. 333: Group 43) and No. 113 (Fig. No. 283: group 37). No. 86 also occurs on a package sealing from room 120; and No. 113 occurs on a funnel from room 42 and on a package sealing from room 47.

(iv) A complete wad sealing without string mark apparently from a parcel (not a sample sealing), Reg. No. 28-11-391, from room 29, was stamped with seals No. 49 (Fig. No. 395: Group 52) and No. 50 (Fig. No. 260: Group 36). No. 49 occurs also on a fragment of a similar wad sealing from room 28 (adjoining room 29 in same house). No. 50 was found on no other sealing.

I infer that these are simply cases of persons living at Uronarti sealing jointly various boxes, or parcels in which they had a joint interest.

3. DISTRIBUTION OF THE SEALINGS THROUGH THE FORT

The distribution of the deposits of sealings among the rooms of the fort is also of importance for deductions as to the use of the sealings. Inside the fort, there are three large buildings and one smaller which have thick well-built walls (110-140 cm. wide), which were built before the other apartments. The largest of these (Building A), is in
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the southwestern angle of the fort and consists of a nucleus of the temple type with a hall of columns and three cells. Adjoining this on the south are four smaller cells while on the west a long corridor led to a stairway rising along the northern and eastern sides to an upper story or to the roof and probably also to the rampart of the fort wall. West of the corridor but part of the same construction were two large magazines, in front of which on the south was another hall of columns. In the angle of the street (rooms 3–4) between these two parts of the building under the later walls of the plan was a deposit of 243 sealings bearing stamps as follows:—

Seal 5a ... ... ... 30 sealings.
Seal 5b ... ... ... 38 , *1 overstamped with 1 private seal.
Seal 5a or 5b ... ... 158 , *9 overstamped with 6 private seals.

Total of 5 ... 226 sealings *10 overstamped.

Seal No. 4 ... ... 1 royal letter sealing.
Seal No. 6 ... ... 2 sealings of endowment of Sesostris III.
Private seals ... ... 24 sealings including 10 overstamped.

253

Less counted twice ... 10

243 sealings.

Near this on the eastern side of Middle Street is another large building (B) including rooms No. 63 to 81, but this has been so cut to pieces by reconstructions and repairs that its original plan is uncertain. In this building only 8 sealings were found scattered through three different rooms:—

Seal No. 5a ... ... ... 2
Seal No. 5b ... ... ... 1 with illegible overstamp.
Seal No. 5a or b ... ... ... 2
Seal No. 24 ... ... ... 1

6

Private seals No. 302, 245 ... ... ... 2

8

A little north of the structure B, on the western side of Middle Street is the smallest of the four buildings with thick walls, including rooms 97–104 (Building C). This seems to be a residence rather than an office or shop. In room 102 one sealing was found (No. 259, Fig. No. 25, of group 7) and four of the hemispherical lumps of mud with an impression of a large wooden stamp.

The fourth building, the one covering the greatest area occupies the northern end of the eastern block of apartments and is called hereafter ‘The Commandant’s House’ or Building D. The nucleus consists of a hall of columns (room 157) on which opens three long narrow rooms 158, 159, 160. From the SW corner of court 157 a doorway gives access to four large rooms 155, 156, 144 and 154. From 154 a back door opens into Cross St. East which ran along the south side of the ‘Commandant’s House’, from Middle St. to East Wall St. Returning to court 157, another doorway opening northwards led to room 162 and so to the series of connected rooms, Nos. 161 to 169 which appear to have had no other entrance. It was the ‘Commandant’s House’ which contained a majority
of the clay sealings. They were found chiefly in court 157, in room 154, and in room 162. A small number evidently thrown out of the house was found in East Wall Street, and a large number outside the East Wall ('Ex. E. Wall'):—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Sealings</th>
<th>Rooms:</th>
<th>Ex. E Wall</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal seals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store seals</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(endowment)</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store seals</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khesef-Yuwnuw</td>
<td>x-9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store seals</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>28 (*1)</td>
<td>50 (*1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other fort</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a or b</td>
<td>354 (*111)</td>
<td>1282 (*259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x-172</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x-7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>502</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>507</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (*1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x-42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>504</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>505</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official letter</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x-11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>508-511</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total official sealings</td>
<td>384 (*112)</td>
<td>1365 (*261)</td>
<td>279 (*95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sealings over stamps</td>
<td>*112 (19)</td>
<td>*261 (35)</td>
<td>*95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sealings not over stamps</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less counted twice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is evident that while a certain amount of official business was transacted in the so-called 'Temple' in the sw. corner, the great activity was centred in the 'Commandant's House' at the northern apex of the triangular fort. In the temple (Building A) were 229 official and 24 private sealings, of which ten are overstamps on official sealings, while in the 'Commandant's House' (Building D) were 2207 official sealings of which 495 were overstamped. There were only 26 private sealings in the whole deposit of 2231 sealings.

The spaces between the four more important buildings were occupied by a series of 26 apartments with thinner walls (45–60 cm.). These were built after the thick walls but are of the same period, and were originally three-room apartments with slight variations caused by the triangular form of the fort; but later, several adjoining apartments were thrown together (apartments 3 and 4, 9 and 10) and various alterations were introduced which increased the number of rooms. The rooms were numbered in order of excavation so that the numbers of the rooms do not follow the order of the apartments. The apartments lie in four blocks.

(a) Between Buildings A and C, abutting on A but separated from C by 'Cross St. West'. Contains apartments 1–8 in two rows with a common wall between. Apartments 1–4 open on West Wall St. while 5–8 open on Middle St. Nos. 5–8 are of uniform size while Nos. 1–4 beginning with the unusually large apartment No. 1 decrease in size from 1 to 4 owing to the slant of West Wall St. Nos. 3 and 4 have been thrown together to make the largest thin-walled apartment in the fort.

(b) In the apex of the triangle formed by South Wall St., West Wall St., and Middle St., abutting on the north wall of Building C. Contains apartments 9–12, very irregularly arranged owing to the form of the block. Nos. 9–11 are three-room apartments, while No. 12 is badly preserved. Nos. 9 and 10 have been thrown together to form one.

(c) In the southeastern corner of the fort, bounded by Middle St., South Wall St., South east Wall St., and Building B, abutting on Building B. Contains apartments 13–16, of which Nos. 13–15 of regular three-room plan open on Middle St. while No. 16 of irregular form opens on Southeast Wall St.

(d) Between Buildings B and D, abutting on B and separated from D by Cross St. East. Contains apartments 17–26, in two rows of five equal apartments each separated by a common dividing wall. Nos. 17–21 opened on Middle St., Nos. 22–26 on East Wall St. This was originally the largest and most regular of all the blocks but the apartments have been considerably altered and overbuilt by later rooms. Apartment 17 was opened into Building B and several adjoining pairs were thrown together.

In these twenty-six apartments only six considerable deposits of sealings were found, distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal types</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3+4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal letter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort stores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>12 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small stamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official letter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total official</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal types</th>
<th>Apartment Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name seals</td>
<td>48 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other private</td>
<td>18 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegible private</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private</td>
<td>72 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM TOTALS</td>
<td>77 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less counted twice</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td>77 (21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. The figures show the number of sealings, and the following figure (in parentheses) shows the number of seals represented. The numbers of seals in the total in the right hand column are omitted owing to distribution of sealings of the same seal through several apartments.

The paucity of official sealings in these apartments is striking (32 out of a total of 1828). The greatest number (14 from 4 seals) was in room 120 which is not far from the great deposit in the 'Commandant's House' (Building D). Apartment 1 (room 13) contained one royal letter seal (No. 4), two store seals (Nos. 5 and 9), and two official letter seals (Nos. 20 and 27), a total of 5 out of 77 sealings. Room 28 in apartment 3 + 4 contains all five examples of the four small official stamps of group 5. One of these also bore the stamp of a private seal (No. x–75). But the whole of the sealings from these apartments is dominated by the private sealings (1796) of which 71 are stamped with name seals. The sealings were mostly of the small funnel type and of the box (or lock) type. It is obvious that a large business was carried on, particularly in apartment 8 (room 47), probably of a private character. I imagine that the occupant of apartment 8, who may have been an official or an officer, carried on an unofficial business, perhaps supplying merchandise to the garrison and carrying on a small export and import business with Egypt.

The business carried on between owners of the seals and the occupants of the different apartments as well as with the officials is illuminated further by the occurrence of sealings from the same private seals in several different apartments and in the larger buildings. For example, apartment 7 (room 42) and apartment 8 (room 47) contained sealings from the same seals as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>Number of sealings in Apartment No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apartment 7 (room 42) is connected only with 8 and 3 + 4 (room 27) as shown above, but apartment 8 (room 47) is linked with other rooms and the latter with still others, as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>Number of Sealings in Apartment No. 8</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65b</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x-22</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39a</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x-145</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142b</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly the deposit in apartment 1 is connected with that in Building A by seal No. 13 (Fig. No. 346) and with that in D by seal No. 26 (Fig. No. 90). The deposit in A contains one example of the private seal No. 299 (Fig. No. 95) and that in D two of the same seal. The deposit in D is further connected with apartment 17 by seals No. 245b (Fig. No. 381) and No. x-17 (Fig. No. 275), with apartment 19 by seal No. x-37 (Fig. No. 315). Room 87 is connected with room 90 by seal No. x-46 (Fig. No. 224) and with room 56 by seal No. 240 (Fig. No. 225); room 20 with room 29 by seal No. 30 (Fig. No. 34); room 28 with room 29 by seal No. 49 (Fig. No. 395).
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The occurrence of sealings from the same private and official seals throughout the fort is so general that it can hardly be due to accidents of subsequent disturbance of the deposits, and appears to prove that the private business in the fort was carried on between the same owners of seals and the same occupiers of the apartments. All this confirms the conclusion that the series of deposits are of the same period.

4. Classification of Seals: Official Seals

Turning from the classification and the distribution of the sealings to the seal designs, the first obvious division is between the official seals and the private seals, which are represented by a nearly equal number of sealings for each division (about 2500; see page 27). The official seals were those of the king of Egypt and of administrative offices in Thebes and in the Nubian forts. The finest of these are the official letter seals of three kings, seals Nos. 4, 10, and 30 (referred to hereafter as group 2). The seal was in each case a long rectangular stamp, not in my opinion a cylinder, and was beautifully engraved with fine lines giving the Horus-name of the king.

![Fig. 1](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. 4 bears the name of the Horus Kha-bauw, that is King Sekhemra-khuwtawuwy (Sebekhotep II ?) whom I regard as the first king of Dynasty xiii. In each of his first four years a record was left at Sennu West of the height of the Nile at that place. Four examples of the impression of the seal of this king were found, the four are from two different seals. One was found in the deposit of official seals in Building A and the other three in or near the 'Commandant's House' at the north end of the fort. The second royal seal bore the Horus-name Deduwy-kheperuwy. This name is the same as the Horus-name read by M. Daressy on the cenotaph of Osiris found by Amélineau at Abydos, but it is otherwise unknown. Fragments of ten impressions were found. One large fragment (28-11-319) was found in room 20 at the south end of the fort and the other nine (29-1-314) at the north end in the 'Commandant's House'. The latter were in the same deposit that contained three sealings of Sekhemra-khuwtawy, and I have no doubt that the Horus Deduwy-kheperuwy whoever he may be was also a king of Dynasty xiii living just after Sekhemra-khutaawy. Another fragment (seal No. xxx) bore a third Horus-name Merytawuwy (?) followed by the words 'beloved of Anubis' but I am unable to identify the king.

Another group of official seals (group 3) left impressions which were about 3 cm. wide by 3-4 cm. high. The greater part of these had a continuous spiral scroll all
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around inside the outer border line with an inscription in three horizontal lines within the scroll. These gave the name of Sesostris III:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>‘The Good God, Lord of the two Lands Khakauwra.’ Eight sealings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Complete box (lock ?) sealing and a fragment, from Building A. Nearly complete package sealing and a fragment of large funnel, from Building D (room 157). Fragment of box (lock ?) sealing from apartment 25, (room 120). Three large funnel sealings, from Building D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thirty-eight sealings. Five fragments of large funnels, from apartment 14 (room 52) with one official letter sealing (group 6) and six private sealings which were in room 55. One box (lock ?) sealing from Ex. E. Wall. Two large funnels from Ex. E. Wall. Thirty large funnels from debris of South Wing. Two of these were overstamped with seal No. 519 (group 10, Pl. 1, 39): and five with seal No. 530 (group 38, Pl. 1, 49).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>‘The great seal of the granary of the Good God, Lord of the two lands, Senwesret (in cartouche).’ Without scroll border. Four examples. Three package sealings from Building D (room 162). One complete lump-sealing, from Ex. E. Wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>‘The great (seal of the granary of the Good God, Lord of the two lands (Khakauwra) (in cartouche).’ One example. Fragment of package-sealing, from apartment 23 (room 108) with four other official and nine private seals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seals, Fig. 1, 8, 9, are of the same type as 7, but are both different seals. It is obvious that these seals, which appear all to have borne the name of Sesostris III were not the royal seals of that king. Seal Fig. 1, 7 (501) does not define the king, and all the sealings were found in deposits of Dynasty XIII. I suggest that they are the official seals of the temple endowments founded by Sesostris III, and prove the actual existence of these endowments as mentioned by Thothmes III when he renewed them in Dynasty XVIII. The archaeological evidence is conclusive that they are not of the New Kingdom.

Group 4 contains mud sealings stamped with official seals of the storehouses and the treasuries of the various forts, and in particular of the fort Khesef-yuwnw (=? Uronarti). These usually have scrolls inside the plain border and are either plain rectangles or rectangles with either the upper or lower line curved outwards. Thus they are of the same type as the seals of group 3 just described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>‘The Granary of the fortress Khesef-yuwnw.’ Plain rectangle with scroll-border. There are 160 identifiable sealings, of which *15 were overstamped with the private seals of officials. In Building A, 30 examples. In Building D, 108 examples (*10).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fig. Seal Description
No. No. in débris, Ex. E. Wall. 15 examples (*5).
10 5a Scattered in apartments, 7 examples.

11 5b The treasury of the fortress, Khesef-yuwnu. Rectangle with outcurved base-line, with scroll-border.

There are 113 identifiable sealings, of which *7 were overstamped with private seals.
In Building A, 38 examples (*1).
In Building D, 33 examples.
In débris, Ex. E. Wall, 35 examples (*5).
Scattering, 7 examples (*1).

5a or b There were 2138 sealings which could be identified with seal 5 but without distinguishing between 5a and 5b. Of these *481 were overstamped with private seals.
In Building A, 158 examples (*9).
In Building D, 1843 examples (*454).
In Ex. E. Wall, débris, 112 examples (*14).
Scattering, 25 examples (*4).

SUM TOTAL 2411 sealings, *503 overstamped.

The original number of the sealings represented by the 2411 pieces now available is indeterminable. Even the largest fragments are only half-sealings, and many are quite small. I would imagine that the total may have come from about 500 sealings, but many others may have entirely disappeared.

The sealings of seals 5a and 5b, were made in Uronarti itself, and the 503 overstamped sealings assume a special importance. The official in charge of receipts and payments at the storehouse and the treasury, when they had sealed or resealed the doors or receptacles, applied each one his private seal to the official sealing as an additional safeguard to protect himself against an abuse of the office-seal by some subordinate. Other official sealings were overstamped (seven of seal Fig. 1, 6; two of Fig. 1, 15; three of Fig. 1, 16; and two of Fig. 1, 23), and overstamping appears to have been a general custom in the Nubian forts. Of the 503 overstamps of seals No. 5a and b, 441 were legible and represented the seals of 47 officials. The following list gives these 47 seals and their frequency of occurrence in the fort:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>No. of Sealings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>*56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>*37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>*14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>*7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>*6 (and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seals, 15; sealings, 389.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>No. of Sealings</th>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Group No.</th>
<th>No. of Sealings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*1 and 3 others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>x-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>x-36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>*1 and 1 other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>x-28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>*1 and 1 other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>x-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>x-17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>*1 and 2 others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>x-16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>x-37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>x-163</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*1 and 1</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>142c</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>x-14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>x-38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seals, 21; sealings, 47

SUM TOTAL, 47 seals; 441 sealings.

It is obvious that seals No. 5a and 5b were official seals of the fortress administration and were kept and used in Uronarti itself. The conclusion follows that the officials who overstamped the official sealings were also at the time actually in the fort at Uronarti, and in the case of the more frequent sealings the official was resident for a period in the fort. An examination of the unofficial sealings showed that a few of the private seals used to overstamp the official seals, occur also on private sealings:

237, seal No. 228, group 35:—
   One small funnel, from apartment 8 (room 47).
   Two small funnels, from apartment 18 (room 106).
   *5 overstamped, seal No. 5, from Building D (room 154).
   *2 overstamped, seal No. 5, from Building D (room 157).

315, seal No. x-37, group 40:—
   Two funnels from apartment 19 (room 115)
   *1 overstamp, seal No. 5, from Building D (room 157).

348, seal No. 8, group 45:—
   One medium funnel impressed with seals 8 and 14.
   *3 overstamped box-sealings of seal No. 5.
   All four from Building A.

79, seal No. 296, group 12:—
   One small funnel, from Building D (room 155).
   *1 overstamp, seal No. 5, from Building D (room 157),

181, seal No. 321, group 29:—
   Four sealings (2 corner; 2 funnel), from apartment 8 (room 47).
   *3 overstamps, seal No. 5, from Building D (room 157)
   *1 overstamp, seal No. 5, from apartment 25 (room 120).

102, seal No. 275, group 18:—
   One small funnel from apartment 18 (room 106).
   One box-sealing from Ex. E. Wall.
   *1 overstamp, seal No. 5, from Building D (room 157).

275, seal No. x-17, group 37:—
   One funnel, from apartment 17 (room 84).
   *1 overstamp, seal No. 5, from Ex. E. Wall.

Summed up, at least seven of the 47 seals used as overstamps occur on other sealings at Uronarti. None of these were letter sealings. It is possible of course that these private
sealings were on packages sent to Uronarti at another time, but the probability seems to me that they present a use of the private seal for personal purposes while the official was in the fort.

The mud impressions of seals No. 5a and 5b were widely distributed throughout the fort, but the great majority (all except about forty) were found in two large deposits. The smaller of the two (226 examples) was in the street (rooms 3-4) outside Building A (temple ?) in the southwestern corner of the fort; and the other deposit (2149 examples) was in the 'Commandant's House' at the northern end (rooms 154, 157 and 162) or thrown from it over the E. Wall. Along with these were examples of official sealings of groups 2 and 3 (see above) and a few private sealings.

I include in group 4 other seals represented by fragments of sealings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 1 No.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>'Granary of the fortress...' No scroll-border. One fragment of large funnel, from Building D (room 157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>x-7</td>
<td>'... of the fortress We'afl-khasatiyuw.' One package sealing, from Building D (room 157).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>x-8</td>
<td>'The treasury of Yeqen (det., mountain): four examples. Three fragments of package sealing, from Building D (room 157). One large fragment package-sealing, from Building D (room 162).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>'Seal of the nomarch (?) of Yeqen'; three examples. Frag. package sealing, from D (room 162). *1 frag. funnel, from Building D (room 162), overstamped with seal No. 285 (Fig. No. 105). *1 frag. funnel from Ex. E. Wall, overstamped with seal No. 5 (Fig. No. 42).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>'Seal of the (treasury?) of Yeqen'; four examples. One frag. package-sealing, from D (room 162). *2 frags. package-sealing from D (room 162), overstamped with seal No. 71 (Fig. No. 61). *1 frag. package sealing from D (room 157), overstamped with seal No. 71 (Fig. No. 61).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>x-20</td>
<td>'Buhèn (det., mountain); seven examples (perhaps ten). One frag. package-sealing (and perhaps three others) from apartment 22 (room 87), with 22 sealings (one royal seal xxx; one store seal, x-42; two official letter seals No. 248; and 14 private sealings). Three frags. large funnel, from apartment 25 (room 120). One frag. package-sealing (basket?) from E. Wall St. North, probably from room 120 or 144. One frag. from s.e. Wall St. One frag. large funnel, from apartment 17 (room 84), with 14 sealings (eight store-sealings, Nos. v, x-20 and xxvi; one official letter, No. 20; and seven private seals (*2 overstamps).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>x-42</td>
<td>'Fortress of Buhèn (no. det.), three examples. One frag. package-sealing, from apartment 22 (room 87; see preceding seal). Two frags. package-sealings from Ex. E. Wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>'Seal of (the fortress? of) Senmut'; one example. One large box (lock?) sealing, from Building B (room 72).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FIG. 1 Seal Description
No. No. 20 504 . . Treasury of Se(n)mut' (no. det.); one example.
One package-sealing from Ex. E. Wall.
21 503 . . Seal of the (treasury ?) of the fortress of Senmut.'
One frag. package-sealing from D (room 162).
22 9 . . Sealing with scroll border, not identifiable with any of the legible
store seals.
One frag. package-sealing from apartment 1 (room 13).
23 505 . . 'Steward of . . .'; smaller seal.
*2 frags. package-sealings, overstamped with seal No. 514 (Fig.
No. 443; 'the steward . . . Si-Amen').
24 26 . . 'Seal of . . .'; no scroll border.
One frag. large box sealing from apartment 17 (room 84); see
Fig. 1, No. 17.
25 32 . . 'Seal of . . .' (det., city); one example.
One complete package-sealing, from apartment 9 (room 121),
alone, perhaps strayed from D.
26 506 . . Illegible; appears to refer to Elephantine.
One frag. package-sealing from Ex. E. Wall.
27 23 . . Obscure impression of a seal of the same sort as above.
One frag. package-sealing, from apartment 15 (room 56), with
26 sealings of which 17 were illegible fragments and one a frag-
ment of official letter seal No. 257 (Fig. No. 1).

The seals of the above groups (group 3 and 4) were of the same general types, of
about the same size, and were used on the same types of sealings. Those of group 4
are the official seals of the granaries and storehouses of the fortresses and those of group 3
which are also of Dynasty XIII are the official stamps of the offering endowments of
Sesostris III, established for the maintenance of the temple services.

Group 5 again contains sealings impressed with small official stamps. The five
examples were all found in apartment 3 + 4 (room 28):—

FIG. 1 Seal Description
No. No. 28 11 . . 'Caused to be established' (rdy-t smn-t); probably a control-
stamp equivalent to 'witnessed.'
One fragment of a large slab of mud which has been lain on red-
painted wood. One impression of No. 11 and the edge of another
with one impression of the private seal No. x–75. Is No. x–75
an overstamp (like the other overstamps) on seal 11; or is seal
No. 11 a counterstamp on a private sealing stamped by x–75 ?
29 12 . . rdy-t snn snwt ...; similar to No. 11.
Two fragments, one on wood, one on a package.
30 13 . . . snn t3wy (?) . . .; straight top line but cutting like the above.
One fragment of package-sealing.
31 66 . . 'Kha(kauw)ra' (vertical cartouche).
One fragment of package sealing.

The small stamps are evidently official stamps of an administrative character used
in the storing of supplies, but I am unable to give any more exact explanation.
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The final group of official seals (group 6) are small seals found usually on small letter sealings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>‘Sekhem-Khakauwra’; two whorl scroll at top and bottom; four examples. Four letter-sealings, one each from apartments 3+4 (room 27), 15 (room 56), 23 (room 96), and Building D (room 157).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>‘The fortress of Sehem-Khakauwra’; three examples. One sample sealing from apartment 1 (room 13). Two letter sealings, one each from apartment 17 (room 88) and Building D (room 162).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>‘Khesef-yuwnw’; three examples. Two funnels from Building A. One letter-sealing from Building D (room 162); perhaps stripped from a letter which was never sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>‘We’af-Khasatiyuw’; two examples. Two letter sealings, one each from Building D (room 162), and apartment 25 (room 120).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x–11</td>
<td>‘The fortress of Yeqen’; two examples. Two letter sealings from Building D (room 157).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>‘The fortress of Buhene.’ One letter-sealing from apartment 1 (room 13). The above were all official fortress seals of smaller size than the granary seals in order to adapt them to the sealing of letters. With them I include the seals of the administrative offices in Egypt:—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>‘The office of the vezier of Thebes’; two-whorl scroll, at top and bottom. Four letter-sealings, two from apartment 22 (room 87); one each from apartment 14 (room 55), and Building D (room 162).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>“... tp (?) rsy ...”; larger than 307. One large fragment of funnel of black clay, from apartment 18 (room 92); the impression is partially obliterated by finger prints.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were also five letter seals which could not be read with any certainty; total 31 sealings of which 28 were letter sealings. The number of official letter sealings of small size is, like that of the large letter-sealings, comparatively small, 11 from other fortresses, 11 from the Egyptian administrative office, and five uncertain. The letter-sealings are perhaps better preserved than the others and it may be taken that their small number in proportion to the local store sealings is significant of the shortness of the period which is under discussion.

5. CLASSIFICATION OF SEALS: THE PRIVATE SEALS: NAME SEALS
The second great division of seals are those used by individuals and called by me ‘private seals’. These fall again into two divisions, (1) name-seals which give the name
and usually the titles of the owner, and (2) seals with a pattern or with symbols. The name-seals form groups 7–9 as follows:

I. Enclosed in continuous scroll with flat whorls:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>286a</td>
<td>&quot;Nubkara-seneb-nefer.&quot; Two fragments of package sealing, apartment 25 (room 120).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>&quot;The door-keeper Huw.&quot; five sealings. Three small funnels and two package sealings from apartment 25 (room 120).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Enclosed in continuous scroll with circular whorls:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>&quot;The citizen (?) Senebuw Si-Hapy.&quot; ten sealings in No. 5. *6 from D (room 154); *2 from Ex. E. Wall; and one each from apartments 17 (room 84) and 25 (room 120).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X-114</td>
<td>&quot;Khakhepperra&quot;; perhaps not a name seal. One fragment package sealing, apartment 8 (room 47).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Connected circular whorls at sides and loops above and below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;The bow-bearer Si-hapy.&quot; *1 fragment overstamped on No. 5, from Building A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Connected flat whorls at sides and loops above and below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>&quot;Overseer of the tm-t nb (?) Nebesuw.&quot; 41 sealings, funnels and package-sealings, from apartment 1 (room 13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;Overseer of the city, the vizier, Pth-deduw.&quot; *2 box sealings, overstamps on No. 5a, from Building A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&quot;The great one of the Upper Egyptian Ten. Sesi . . .&quot; One letter sealing from apartment 1 (room 13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>X-3</td>
<td>&quot;The attendant of rmn-tp, Bebi, true of voice.&quot; *1 overstamp on No. 5 from D (room 157).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot;... of the Mount of Horus, Ya.&quot; One funnel from Building A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>&quot;The admiral, Senetbify, true of voice.&quot; *4 overstamps on No. 5, from D (room 162).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>&quot;The doorkeeper of the chamber of offerings (?) . . .&quot; *1 overstamp on No. 5 from D (room 162).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>&quot;The steward of . . . Si-Amen.&quot; *2 overstamps on seal No. 505, from Ex. E. Wall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Scroll with broken flat whorls and loops at top and bottom:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>&quot;The doorkeeper of the Pharaoh, the scribe, Bener.&quot; One complete package-sealing, from apartment 17 (room 84).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>&quot;The attendant, Kheniti-kheti.&quot; *18 overstamps on No. 5, of which 14 are from D (rooms 154, 157 and 162), and two Ex. E. Wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X-4</td>
<td>&quot;Chief of the attendants of rmn-tp . . .&quot; *2 overstamps on No. 5, from Building D (rooms 157 and 162).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>&quot;(Chief of the attendants of rm)j-n-tp, Sebek-hotep.&quot; *1 overstamp on No. 5, from D (room 157).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>X-69</td>
<td>&quot;(Nomarch of Sema . . .)&quot; The inscription is imperfectly preserved. Four funnels from apartment 1 (room 13).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Fig. Seal Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>x-64</td>
<td>‘The commandant (wctwrw ?) of ... Hetepuw.’ Above Hetep an is visible. One funnel from apartment (room 13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>‘... Seneb ...’ One package seal, from Building C (room 102).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>x-52</td>
<td>‘The butler (?) Yebeb-Hes (?)’ One complete letter sealing, from apartment 8 (room 44).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Unintelligible, but not one of those read. One fragment of package sealing, from D (room 157).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>x-5</td>
<td>‘Attendant of rmn(?)-tp (?), Her (?).’ 2 overstamps on No. 5 from D (room 157).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Interlaced border with loop above and below:—

29  | 52  | ‘Seal of ...’ One fragment of package-sealing, from S. Wall passage. |

VII. Miscellaneous fragments:—

30  | x-27| One fragment of small funnel, from apartment 25 (room 120). |
31  | 29  | Fragment of funnel, from apartment 2 (room 20). |
32  | x-65| Small fragment of package-sealing, from apartment 1 (room 13). |
33  | x-15| One large funnel. 1 overstamp on No. 5, from A (room 3-4). |
34  | x-16| One large funnel. 1 overstamp on No. 5, from A (room 3-4). |

VIII. With double or single rope border:—

34  | 30  | ‘The steward Sebek-Wer, true of voice.’ Two small funnels, from apartment 2 (room 20) and apartment 2+3 (room 29). |
35  | 311 | ‘The attendant, Yeri.’ 12 large funnels overstamps on No. 5a, from D (room 157). |
36  | 310 | ‘The attendant, Gebuw.’ 2 large funnels overstamp on No. 5, from D (rooms 157 and 162). |
37  | 18  | ‘... Khnum-neferuwa.’ Sample sealing, impression of an impression, from A (room 6). |
38  | 312 | ‘The attendant of rmn-tp, Ya.’ 13 overstamps, from D (four from room 157), (eight from room 162) and Ex. E. Wall (one). |
39  | 295 | A small funnel from apartment 20 (room 128). |
40  | 244 | One fragment of funnel from apartment 15 (room 56). |

IX. With plain line border:—

42  | 5   | ‘mr ś-t, Ameny-Seneb.’ One fragment package sealing, from A (room 3-4). |
43  | 309 | ‘The attendant of rmn-tp Kemnebetsen (?)’ 8 funnels overstamp on No. 5, from D (two from room 154, six from room 157). |
44  | 518 | ‘The attendant of the rmn-tp, Yapepy, true of voice.’ 3 funnels overstamped on No. 5, from D (room 162). |
45  | 110 | ‘The doorkeeper, Sebek-nefer, true of voice.’ Two fragments of package-sealing, from apartment 7 (room 42). |
46  | 213 | ‘The attendant (wb), Amen-em-hat-sekhem.’ Three sealings, two funnels, one package, from apartment 8 (room 47). |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>‘The hairdresser (nš-t, fem.), Yakuw-wakka...’&lt;br&gt;Two complete funnels, from apartment 8 (room 47).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>‘(The overseer of the) cabinet, Yay, lord of honor.’&lt;br&gt;One fragment of a funnel, from apartment 18 (room 106).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>‘The gatekeeper (iry śḥ-t)...’&lt;br&gt;One package-sealing, from apartment 8 (room 47).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>x-130</td>
<td>‘... of the king’s mother (?), sebek-neferaw, Iuw...’&lt;br&gt;One complete funnel from apartment 8 (room 47).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>x-162</td>
<td>‘The scribe Senebtify...se’ankh.’&lt;br&gt;One funnel from A (room 3-4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>‘Hetep-Ma’at,’ perhaps not a name.&lt;br&gt;Two package-sealings, from apartment 25 (room 120).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Perhaps not a name seal.&lt;br&gt;One funnel from A (room 3-4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52b</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>‘Overseer of the (šn)bht, Neferi, true of voice.’&lt;br&gt;One fragment of package-sealing from apartment 7 (room 42).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>x-81</td>
<td>One fragment of package-sealing, from apartment 3+4 (room 28).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>x-39</td>
<td>One letter-sealing, illegible, from D (room 157).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These name seals of groups 7–9 are 51 in number represented by 181 sealings. Of this number 92 sealings from 17 seals are overstamps on the store seals Nos. 5a or 5b. It is necessary to conclude I think that the owners of the 17 overstamped seals were temporarily at least present in the fort at Uronarti. The frequency of the sealings from the 17 seals throws a certain amount of light on the length of the stay of the officials concerned. In order of frequency they are as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. No.</th>
<th>Seal No.</th>
<th>No. of Sealings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>*18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>*13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>*12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>*10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>*10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>*8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>*5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>*4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>x-5</td>
<td>*2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>x-4</td>
<td>*2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>x-3</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>x-16</td>
<td>*1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 seals 92 sealings.

There are 30 other seals used as overprints but they are all pattern or symbol seals which give no clue to the office or identity of the owner. Of these 17 name seals only 14 give
the name or title clearly. Three of the persons have the title smsw and six that of smsw n rmn tp of which one was perhaps a shd smsw n rmn tp; one, 'nh n wrt; one gry pd-t; one, mr wj; one mnt t;ty; and one, gry -t n -t hmk ( ?). It is noteworthy that nine out of the fourteen men held the title of smsw in some variation. The mnt t;ty is perhaps the same as the vezier Pth-debu in Newberry, Scarabs, xi, 1, but the seal is not the same. He may have been in Uronarti on a tour of inspection. The question now arises as to how often the sealings of the granary and the treasury at Uronarti were broken and new sealings attached. It may also be asked what proportion of the original sealings have been preserved among the fragments cast aside in the streets and courtyards of the fort. Five other seals without names occurred over stamped on 81, 66, 56 and 37 sealings respectively (see page ' 10'). The most that can be said is that the greater the number of sealings, the longer probably was the stay of the official at Uronarti.

On the other hand the officials who stamped the three letter seals Fig. No. 16, 26 and No. x-39 above, were almost certainly at some other place at the time that the letters were despatched. The sample impression of an impression (Fig. No. 37, above) was certainly made from a seal sent from elsewhere. Fig. No. 443 (Seal No. 514) was represented by two over stamps on the seal No. 505, so that the owner of No. 514, Si-Amon, was also probably not resident at Uronarti.

Thus there are six sealings (from 5 seals) which originated elsewhere, and 92 sealings (from 17 seals) of local origin. There remains in groups 7-9 (name-seals), 83 private sealings (of 29 seals) which may have originated at Uronarti or elsewhere. Fig. 2, 14 (Seal No. 21), seal of hry n tm-t nb(?) Nbsw, is represented by 41 sealings all found in room 13 (apartment No. 1). Many of these were box (or lock) sealings without string marks, and I conclude that this Nebesu occupied apartment 13, filling on probably a private business in that place.

6. Classification of Seals: Private Seals: Patterns and Symbols

The pattern and symbol seals have been divided into forty-eight classes (groups 10-57). As the seals were registered in the field they were numbered and drawn roughly but well enough for identification. The quantity was however, so great that many seals difficult to read after being numbered had to be set aside. When the expedition reached Cairo, the whole lot was re-examined and drawn more carefully to a scale of 2:1 each on a separate card, numbered in order as drawn. The number on each card is the 'Seal No.' Wherever the same design was encountered, the sealing was entered on the first card made. At this stage, there were 354 cards, but a large number of sealings remained unread or unidentified. The cards were then arranged in the groups enumerated above and this classification led to the discovery of several cases of repeated numbering of the same seal. A final examination revealed about 170 new seals (those numbered x-1 to x-174) and permitted by means of the classified list the identification of a considerable number of the fragmentary or obscure sealings. With the final knowledge gained, a better classification would have been possible but would have required a very laborious revision of all the lists and notes made before that time, and would not have added materially to the value of the results. I have, however, rearranged the groups so that groups 28-34 precede groups 20-27 and have shifted the groups 46-47 into the order 48, 47, 49, 46, but in the plates they remain in the old order. I present the following summary of all the private seals, including the name seals (groups 7-9) described above. (Number of seals is given in parentheses after number of sealings; over stamps are on Seal No. 5 unless otherwise stated). Numbers given after description are the Figure numbers.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Name Seals</th>
<th>Description of designs</th>
<th>Seals</th>
<th>Sealings</th>
<th>Overstamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Name in scroll-border</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>*44 (12) : 2 (1) on No. 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-33 ; 441-443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Name in rope border</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>*35 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Name in plain border</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*13 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42-52 ; 444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total groups 7-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>*92 (17) : 2 (1) on No. 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Connected systems of circular whorls</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>*82 (2) : 2 (1) on 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*3 (1) on No. 507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Interlaced circular whorls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65, 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Single or double systems of scrolls with reversed circular whorls</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>*2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lines of connected circular whorls separated by bars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81-82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Groups of two-whorl and three-whorl scrolls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Two-whorl scrolls enclosed in oval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Three-whorl scrolls enclosed in oval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Two-whorl scrolls connected by loops</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*1 (1) on No. 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92-99 ; 446-447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Groups of disconnected scrolls with reversed whorls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>*1 (1) : 1 (1) on No. 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100-106 ; 449-450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Misc. combination of whorls and loops</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107-116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of groups 10-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>*87 (7 seals) on No. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Designs with circles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172-174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Interlaced cords (looped cords)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>*6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>175-198 ; 451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Twisted rope designs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>*1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>199-201 ; 452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rosettes, oval and round</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202-210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tied flowers (with small symbols)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211-219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Designs composed of rows of loops, horizontal and vertical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>*37 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>220-226, 230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Connected loops</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>231-233 ; 453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>*44 (5 seals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The Overstamps column indicates the number of seals with overstamps and the position of the overstamp on the seal.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description of designs</th>
<th>Seals</th>
<th>Sealings</th>
<th>Overstamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d) Mixed designs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mixed scrolls-symbols</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mixed scrolls and symbols</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mixed scrolls and flowers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mixed scrolls and symbols</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>*7 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Symbols in scroll border</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>*14 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Symbols enclosed by connected and disconnected systems of scrolls</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>*50 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*1 (on No. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*71 (4 seals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1) on No. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Symbol designs, dominated by one sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Groups of signs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*6 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>upright oval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>horizontal oval</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Groups of signs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>*1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Groups of signs based on</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>*5 (1) on No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>288–302 ; 454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Group of signs based on</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303–310 ; 455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (1) on No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Symbol designs in two rows separated by a bar or a line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>One symbol above and three below</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>*1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three symbols above and one below</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>*1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Two above and three below</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Three above and three below</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>*66 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Same symbols above and below</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Horizontal oval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description of designs</th>
<th>Seals</th>
<th>Sealings</th>
<th>Overstamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>Symbol designs in two rows without dividing bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Vertical oval with signs in two rows . . . 358–368</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>*56 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Vertical oval, asymmetrical groups of signs . . . 355–357</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Horizontal oval, Misc. groups 369–375</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Horizontal oval groups with reversed ends . . . . 249 : 354</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249 : 354</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>*56 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>Six or seven signs arranged around a central design which in group 50 is enclosed in an oval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Signs around central oval . . . 376–387</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>*6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Central group not enclosed . . . 388–394</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>388–394</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>*6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>Groups of small signs arranged symmetrically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Large groups of small signs, symmetrical . . . . 395–408; 457</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>*5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Large groups of small signs asymmetrical . . . . 409</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Medium sized groups, three rows . . . 410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Frags. of small groups . . . . 411–419</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>411–419</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>*7 (4 seals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Figures of gods and other symbols</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>Obscure and fragmentary designs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Obscure and fragmentary designs . . . 431–440, 458</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is to be noted that only about thirty basic designs underlie the large number of individual seal-designs of the various pattern types (groups 10–34). The individual seals present variations of the basic designs obtained often by very simple methods. In a few cases, two seals have identical designs distinguished only by differences in size (see Fig. Nos. 203 and 204, 205 and 206) which may force almost imperceptible changes in the design (197 and 198). Frequently differences in size permit obvious variations (such as in 54, 55, 57), or the increase in the number of similar elements used (as in 223–225). Sometimes in seals of the same size, the variations are very small as in the ends of the scrolls (see 48–60), or in the space-fillers (see 85 and 88). Another type of variation is obtained by changing the design from the prevailing vertical position on the oval plate to a horizontal position (cf., 54, 55, 57 with 53, 58–60), or combining vertical and horizontal designs (see 56, which I reckon however as a basic design). Variations
are also obtained by changing the system of connecting loops (65 and 66, 92–99) or the number and arrangements of the separate scrolls (85 and 86, 84 and 87; 136–138). We found that it required a certain amount of practice to detect the minor differences especially in the small seals, but it was possible to pick out at sight the impressions of the fine large seals and those with complicated designs. Many other seals with pattern designs are published in the books, but it is obvious that all the known designs taken together have by no means exhausted the possibilities of the variations of the known basic designs. Take for example, the series of beautiful looped patterns, 175–198. The craftsmanship which produced this rich group was without any doubt perfectly capable of inventing other combinations of the same character.

The symbol-seals, groups 35–56, present only about five different basic designs, placed vertically on the oval plate. The number is nearly doubled by the adaptation of the same designs to the horizontal position on the oval. The individual seals within each basic design were composed by the selection of different hieroglyphic signs, or by variations in the arrangement of those signs. The larger dominating symbols (or signs) may be distinguished from the smaller subordinate signs which fill the empty spaces around the main symbols. But taking both large and small signs, only about 35 were used in the seals drawn on our plates. Those most frequently employed are ፤ and ፥, and next to these come the signs

ማ, (often in pairs), ፤, ፤, ፤ (often in pairs), ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤.

The signs which occur less frequently are

፤, ፤, ፤ (often in pairs), ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤, ፤.

It is obvious that the great body of symbol signs were less expensive in cutting, and easier to compose. An enormous number of other seal-designs would have been made possible by the addition of a few signs and by a further development of the types of variation already in use.

In several cases, two or more seals show the same symbol designs, Fig. Nos. 244 and 245, 248 and 249, 253–257, 265 and 266, 267 and 268, 269 and 270, 380 and 381, 382–386, 388 and 389. In most of these cases, the difference in size is a sufficient distinction; but in some cases it required a careful re-examination of the actual impressions to detect the differences in details, size and cutting. The question immediately arises whether these similar seals were the seals of different men or different versions of the seal of one man. Seals get lost or broken and have to be replaced.

A total of 473 private seals was recorded at Uronarti of which 296 were represented by single sealings. As there were over four hundred illegible sealings, in all probability these contain impressions of a number of seals not included in our list. Certainly over 500 different seals were in use by the men of Uronarti and their correspondents in the other forts and in Egypt. It seems to me that this extensive use of seals in view of the slight differences in many designs, must have required some system of official registration. At the present time in Egypt, where the practice of sealing is similar to that in ancient times, the seal engravers are licensed by the provincial authorities and are required to keep a registry of all the seals cut with particulars of their owners. I believe that system of seal-registration was in use in ancient Egypt which was equal to or better than the modern Egyptian system with its obvious defects. When I first noticed the type which I call 'sample'-sealing I suspected that it might have been part of a system of seal registration but the small number of such sealings, their diffuse provenience, and the occurrence of the type with an impression of an impression led me away from that idea. It is impossible even to answer the question whether there were seal-engravers working
at Uronarti (or Semna). Most of the officials brought their seals with them, and the official seals were no doubt cut in Thebes or Elephantine and sent up to the forts.

7. **Summary Lists**

The private seals give the following summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Seals</th>
<th>*Seals</th>
<th>Sealings</th>
<th>*Sealings</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 7 Names in scroll border</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>*46</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Names in rope border</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>*35</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Names in plain border</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total groups</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>35.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 10–19 Scroll patterns</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>*11</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>*94</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 28–34 Other patterns</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>*5</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>*44</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 39, 33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>*5</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>*44</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, 31, 32, 34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>(--)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 20–27 Mixed scroll-symbol</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>*5</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>*72</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total groups</strong></td>
<td><strong>191</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1031</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 35–39 Dominating symbol</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>*12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 40–45 Two rows and bar</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>*71</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. 46–49 Two rows, no bar</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>*56</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. 50–51 Central designs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Central design in oval</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>*3</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>*6</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Central design, no oval</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>(--)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 52–55 Large groups</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52–53 Fine seals</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>*7</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54–44 Poorer seals</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>*2</td>
<td>(--)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. 56 Large symbols</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>*1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>712</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. The starred seals are those used as overstamps; the starred sealings are official sealings over stamped with private seals. In the right hand column the percentages give the per cent of the private seals of each class which are used as overstamps.

The percentage column which gives the proportion of over-stamped seals to total seals is significant. It shows clearly the types of seals which were favoured by officials and men of higher rank. The percentages figures for the three great divisions, 35.3% for the name seals, 11% for the pattern seals, and 7.4% for the symbol seals, correspond in general to the excellence of the three division. If the details of the list be examined, the higher percentages mark unerringly the more expensive seals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7, names in scroll border</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, names in rope border</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, central design in oval</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-53, fine large groups</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Group 10–19, scroll pattern .... ... ... 16.4%
" 9, names in plain border .... ... ... 13.3%
" 29, 30, 33, patterns .... ... ... 12.5%
" 40–45, two rows symbols and bar .... ... ... 10.3%
" 20–27, mixed scrolls and symbols .... ... ... 8.8%
" 35–39, dominating symbols .... ... ... 3.7%
" 46–49, two rows no bar .... ... ... 3.7%

The numbers of the sealings indicate approximately the length of the stay of the owner of the seal in Uronarti but not his importance nor the expensiveness of the seal.

Finally I give the summary of all the seals and sealings of Dynasty XIII found by us at Uronarti:

A. Official Seals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Seals</th>
<th>Sealing</th>
<th>Overstamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>*7 on No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2411</td>
<td>*503 on No. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>*3 on No. 507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*1 on No. 602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*2 on No. 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*2 on No. 511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 45 sealings, 2547 overstamps

B. Private seals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Seals</th>
<th>Sealing</th>
<th>Overstamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7–9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>*94 of 18 private seals on official sealings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–34</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>*210 of 21 ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–56</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>*152 of 15 ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Classified list: 473 sealings, 1970 overstamps, *456 54 seals

Illegible: 545 sealings, *62

Sum Total:

A: 45 sealings, 2547 including 518 overstamped sealings.
B: 473 sealings, 2515 including 518 overstamped sealings.

Deduct counted twice: 518

4544 sealings.

1 That the total number of seals (518) is the same as the total number of over stamped sealings (518) is a mere coincidence.
The Harvard-Boston Archaeological Expedition in the Sudan

A Progress Report on Publication

by Dows Dunham

Readers of Kush are doubtless familiar in general terms with the series of excavating campaigns carried out in the Sudan by the Harvard University-Boston Museum of Fine Arts Expedition under the direction of the late Professor George A. Reisner. Those campaigns extended over a period of twenty years, from 1913 to 1932, covered a range in time from 2000 B.C. to A.D. 350, and have added greatly to our knowledge of the history and archaeology of the Sudan from the Egyptian Middle Kingdom to the end of the Kingdom of Meroë.

Owing to failing health and eyesight Reisner himself was unable to produce most of the definitive publications which the importance of the work called for, although he had published from time to time a series of preliminary reports in the Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, in the Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, in Sudan Notes and Records and elsewhere, which have been of great value in giving us a general picture of his results and the main outline of his historical and chronological conclusions. With the exception of his definitive report on the main site at Kerma, however, the full story of the numerous sites excavated remained untold at his death in 1942.

It devolved upon the writer, who had worked with Reisner on a number of the sites in question, who was familiar with his methods of recording, and who fell heir to his position in the Museum in Boston and to the scientific obligations of the Harvard-Boston Expedition, to do what could be done to fill out the record. In the winter of 1946-1947 he went to Egypt to pack up and return to Boston the records on which this work must be based, records which had been stored at the Expedition headquarters at Giza. At the same time he made a brief survey trip in the company of Mr. A. J. Arkell, then Commissioner for Archaeology in the Sudan Government, in order to refresh his memory of the sites he had known and to see those on which he had not himself worked. During the ensuing eight years the writer has devoted the major part of his time and energies to the task of publication, and it seems to him appropriate now to make a progress report to the people of the Sudan as of this time.

The Sites Excavated by the Harvard-Boston Expedition and Publications Referring to Them

Kerma. Between Tumbus and Argo Island on the East Bank of the Nile, above the head of the Third Cataract. Two large mud-brick structures and an extensive cemetery of Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period date. Also outlying Nubian cemeteries of later date.

Preliminary Reports

Bulletin, MFA, Boston
xii, No. 69, (Apr. 1914). 'A Garrison which held the Northern Sudan in the Hyksos Period, about 1700 B.C.' Reisner.
HARVARD-BOSTON ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXPEDITION IN THE SUDAN

_Bulletin, MFA, Boston_


xiii, No. 80 (Dec. 1915). 'Excavations at Kerma.' Reisner.

_Journal of Egyptian Archaeology_

vi (1920), pp. 77-98. 'The Tomb of Hepzefa, Nomarch of Siut.' Reisner.

**DEFINITIVE PUBLICATION**

_Excavations at Kerma_


*Note.*—The outlying Nubian cemetery at Kerma has not yet been published.

_EL KURRU._ Five miles downstream from Merowe (Northern Province) on the West bank. Cemetery of ancestral tombs and of pyramids of the early Kings and Queens of Napata.

**PRELIMINARY REPORTS**

_Bulletin, MFA, Boston_

xix, Nos. 112–113 (Apr.-June 1921). 'The Royal Family of Ethiopia.' Reisner.

_Journal of Egyptian Archaeology_


vi (1920), pp. 61-4. 'Note on the Harvard-Boston Excavations at El Kurruw and Barkal in 1918-1919.' Reisner.

_Sudan Notes and Records_

11 (1919), pp. 237-54. 'Discovery of the Tombs of the Egyptian xxv Dynasty at El Kurruw in Dongola Province.' Reisner.

**DEFINITIVE PUBLICATION**

_The Royal Cemeteries of Kush, i. El Kurru_


_BARKAL PYRAMIDS._ Two groups of pyramids lying South-west of Gebel Barkal (near Kareima Railway Station). Tombs of Kings, Queens and others dated sporadically from early to middle Meroitic.

**PRELIMINARY REPORT**

_Bulletin, MFA, Boston_

xv, No. 89 (June 1917). 'Excavations at Napata, the Capital of Ethiopia.' Reisner.

**DEFINITIVE PUBLICATION**

(The Decorated Chapels only)

_The Royal Cemeteries of Kush, iii. Decorated Chapels of the Meroitic Pyramids at Meroë and Barkal_


(The Pyramids and their contents)

_The Royal Cemeteries of Kush, iv. Royal Tombs at Meroë and Barkal_


_BARKAL TEMPLES._ Buildings lying close to the East and South-east faces of Gebel Barkal, in particular the Great Temple of Amun of Napata which dates from the Egyptian xviii Dynasty to Meroitic times.

**PRELIMINARY REPORTS**

_Bulletin, MFA, Boston_

xv, No. 89 (June, 1917). 'Excavations at Napata, the Capital of Ethiopia.' Reisner.
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Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
vi (1920), pp. 247-64. ‘The Barkal Temples in 1916.’ Reisner

Sudan Notes and Records
iv (1921), pp. 59-75. ‘Historical Inscriptions from Gebel Barkal.’ Reisner.

DEFINITIVE PUBLICATION
Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde

NURI. Cemetery of pyramids lying one mile south of the Nile and about six miles upstream from Kareima. Pyramids of Kings and Queens of Kush from Taharqa to Nastaseh.

PRELIMINARY REPORTS

Bulletin, MFA, Boston
xv, No. 89 (June 1917). ‘Excavations at Napata, the Capital of Ethiopia.’ Reisner.

Harvard African Studies
Cambridge, Mass., 1918.

DEFINITIVE PUBLICATION

The Royal Cemeteries of Kush. ii. Nuri

MEROË. Three cemeteries adjacent to the ancient city of Meroë, which is situated on the East bank of the Nile, 24 miles downstream from Shendi and close to the village of Beqrawiyeh. These three cemeteries are:

I. The South Cemetery, in use from early Napatan times to about 250 B.C., containing private and princely graves and mastaba tombs, and the pyramids of the first three kings and their queens to be buried from Meroë.

II. The North Cemetery contained only pyramids of kings, queens, and princes of Meroë from about 250 B.C. to A.D. 350.

III. The West Cemetery, the largest of the three and the nearest to the city, contained graves, mastabas, and pyramids extending throughout the entire range of both Napatan and Meroitic periods of the Kingdom of Kush.

PRELIMINARY REPORTS

Bulletin, MFA, Boston
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Bulletin, MFA, Boston


Journal of Egyptian Archaeology

Sudan Notes and Records

Two Royal Ladies of Meroë. Communications to the Trustees.

DEFINITIVE PUBLICATIONS

The Royal Cemeteries of Kush. III. Decorated Chapels of the Meroitic Pyramids at Meroë and Barkal

The Royal Cemeteries of Kush. IV. The Royal Tombs at Meroë and Barkal

NOTE.—Vol. III deals only with the chapel decorations of those pyramids in the three cemeteries where the decorations are sufficiently preserved to warrant it.
Vol. IV is the archaeological report of all the tombs in the North Cemetery, on the royal tombs in the South Cemetery, and on all the pyramids at Gebel Barkal.

SECOND CATARACT Forts. Five sites in the Second Cataract region consisting of military outposts and dating from the Middle and New Kingdoms to Napatan times, as follows:

Semna. Two forts on opposite sides of the Nile at the upper end of the Second Cataract: Semna East (also called Kumme) and Semna West, the latter with an outlying cemetery of the Middle and New Kingdoms. Here are important rock inscriptions recording Nile levels of the Middle and New Kingdoms.

Uronarti. Fort on the island of Uronarti, about 2½ miles north of Semna. Middle and New Kingdoms.

Shalfak. Near Sarras. Fort on the West bank about 4 miles downstream from Uronarti. Middle Kingdom.

Mirgissa. Fort on the West bank, about 13 miles upstream from Wadi Halfa. Middle Kingdom.

PRELIMINARY REPORTS

Bulletin, MFA, Boston
xxiii, No. 137 (June 1925) 'Excavations in Egypt and Ethiopia, 1922–1925.' Reisner.
xxvii, No. 163 (Oct. 1929). 'Ancient Egyptian Forts at Semna and Uronarti.' Reisner.
xxviii, No. 167 (June 1930). 'The Art of Seal Carving in Egypt in the Middle Kingdom.' Reisner & Wheeler.

Sudan Notes and Records
xii (1929), pp. 144–61. 'Excavations at Semna and Uronarti by the Harvard-Boston Expedition.' Reisner.
xiv (1931), pp. 1–14. 'Uronarti.' Reisner.
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HISTORICAL AND GENERAL

Journal of Egyptian Archaeology

Sudan Notes and Records

‘I. Outline of the Ancient History of the Sudan.’


‘II. The Egyptian Occupation of Ethiopia during the Middle Empire.’ Reisner. Vol. I (1918), pp. 57–79.


Publications projected, but not yet in active preparation

Kerma, Nubian Cemetery. It is hoped that it may be possible to ask Mr A. J. Arkell of University College, London, to study and publish this material, on which some preliminary work has been done by Mrs Stephen M. Weld (Elizabeth Eaton).

Barkal Temples. Publication of the objects found in excavating the temples at Barkal, and, if available material warrants, further plans of the buildings.

Meroë. Royal Cemeteries of Kush. V. The Private Tombs at Meroë. The earlier part of the South Cemetery and the whole of the West Cemetery. Material in hand and preliminary work already done. Planned to follow Vol. IV in this series. Dunham.

Royal Cemeteries of Kush. VI. Inscriptions from the Royal Cemeteries. (Title not yet fixed). It is expected that this volume will be entrusted to Dr M. F. Laming Macadam.

Second Cataract Forts. Dr Josef Janssen of Leiden and the writer have completed preliminary work on the sites of Semna East and Semna West and this material is now in preparation for delivery to the printer.

It will be seen from the foregoing that the attempt being made by the writer to complete the publication of Reisner’s excavating campaigns in the Sudan has made some progress during the past eight years, but that much remains to be done. The unfinished task is a heavy one, but thanks to the generous co-operation of the scholars mentioned above there seems to the writer to be good reason to hope that it may be accomplished.
Two Neolithic Sites near Khartoum
With an Appendix describing a Stone Palette

by H. N. Chittick

Numbers of sites of the neolithic period are known in the Khartoum area, all of them within a short distance of the Nile; in consequence they appear all to have been considerably disturbed, chiefly by graves, in later times. This was the case with the site at Esh Shaheinab excavated by A. J. Arkell in 1949–50; for this and other reasons it has not hitherto been possible clearly to distinguish any stages in the Shaheinab culture.

During the autumn of 1954, Mr P. Z. Mackenzie, Keeper of the Natural History section of the Sudan Museum, and Mr J. L. Read, of the University College of Khartoum, discovered two sizeable mounds with pottery and artifacts some 18 km. north of Khartoum and 7 km. east of the Nile. They lie in flat sandy country dotted with bushes of the acacia family. They are 1½ km. distant from each other; the more westerly has been named Kadero East Site I, and the more easterly Kadero East Site II. The latter bears 130° from the former.

The mounds are both oval, and the longer axis of both runs north and south. Mound I measures about 180 m. by 160 m. and rises to about 3 m. above the plain, its highest point being towards the southern end. Mound II is smaller, measuring about 145 m. by 120 m. and its height is about 2 m., the highest point being in the centre. They present a perfectly even profile; this and the extreme rarity of sherds other than neolithic suggests that the sites have been little disturbed since they were abandoned. The great concentration of artifacts on their surface indicates, however, that they have suffered much erosion, as could be expected in view of the light and sandy nature of the soil of which they are composed. Nevertheless the central part of the mounds should not have been affected, and they are the most impressive and promising sites of this culture I have yet seen.

Their great interest, however, lies in the fact that though very few artifacts lying on either of them are different in type from those found at Esh Shaheinab, there is a very clear difference between those to be seen at Site I and those at Site II. This difference suggests that Site I represents an early stage of the Shaheinab culture.

I give below an account of the general characteristics of the finds at the two sites. It should be emphasized, that the absence of objects of bone is probably due to the fact that only a surface collection has been made.

---

1 Published in Shaheinab, by A. J. Arkell. The fine plates of this book cover the material so comprehensively that in most cases a close parallel can be found for objects belonging to the culture found elsewhere. They will be frequently referred to in this article, the book being designated Shaheinab.

2 For a discussion of the nomenclature of the prehistoric cultures of the region, see the note by O. G. S. Crawford, Kush ii, pp. 88–90.

3 The exact position of Site I is 15° 44' 25" N 32° 36' 45" E, about 5 km. SSE of Kadero station.
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SITE II

The pottery is more plentiful than at Site I. It includes the following types:

(a) **Impressed ware.** This is the commonest ware. It is found with designs of triangles with dots, of vee, and of zigzags. Widely-spaced lines of plain dots are not found. Some of the sherd are burnished and the top of some of the rims decorated.

(b) **Incised ware**, commonly burnished and often with decorated rim. The surface is usually brown.

(c) **Black top red ware**, with dog-tooth decoration.

One sherd of 'wavy-line' ware and one of 'dotted wavy-line' type were also found.

Stone Tools. The mound is littered with fragments of sandstone rubbers, grinders and small lower grindstones, similar to those found at Shaheinab. Polished rhyolite tools occur more freely than on any site we have yet seen; both 'gouges' and celts are found. Flaked fragments of rhyolite, probably from unpolished celts, also occur. One scraper was found together with a fragment of a pyriform macehead of meta-gabbro and another fragment perhaps of a disc macehead. Characteristic of the site were flat fabricators of fossil wood. These have been made by splitting the stone along the grain of the 'wood' to produce a tabular fragment about 1.6 cm. thick. The edges were subsequently worked round to produce a rough oval, the flaking being more or less effaced by subsequent bruising. An example of this tool, which does not appear to have been observed before, is shown in FIG. 1.

---

4 Catalogue no. SM 11429. 6 Shaheinab, pl. 30. 8 op. cit., pl. 31, fig. 7.
5 op. cit., pl. 32, figs. 5 and 6. 7 op. cit., pl. 31, figs. 4 and 5. 9 op. cit., pl. 37.
10 op. cit., pl. 33, figs. 3-5. 11 op. cit., pl. 34, figs. 1-4; the Kadero examples, however, have longer 'dog-teeth' than the sherd illustrated.
12 Arkell, Early Khartoum, pl. 66. 13 op. cit., pl. 72. 14 Shaheinab, pl. 10, bottom.
15 op. cit., pl. 19, figs. 4 and 5. 16 op. cit., pl. 6, fig. 7.
17 When complete probably similar to Shaheinab, pl. 23, figs. 6 and 7.
18 For this and other identifications of rocks, I am indebted to Dr J. B. Auden, Acting Director of the Sudan Geological Survey.
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(SM 11432 a). Also of interest is a flake of translucent quartz with a notched edge of a type not hitherto remarked on sites of this period. (SM 11432 c, FIG. 2).

It is also noteworthy that one fragment of a sandstone lower grindstone is so big as to suggest that it was not used for grinding ochre, which is thought to be the purpose of the querns of the Shaheinab culture.

SITE I

The pottery\(^{19}\), which is less plentiful than at Site II, is almost all impressed ware. Very little of this ware is burnished, and very few examples have been observed with decorated rims. Much the commonest of the impressed designs is composed of rows of widely spaced dots\(^{20}\), often giving the (false) impression of having been made with

---

\(^{19}\) Catalogue no. SM 11429.

\(^{20}\) Shaheinab, pl. 31, figs. 4 and 5.
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a string. Most of the other designs found at Shaheinab occur, including triangles with dots, vees, and zigzags, but they are rarer than the foregoing. One rim sherd has unusual decoration made with a toothed instrument (FIG. 3), and another belonging to the 'dotted' class has rows of double and single dashes (FIG. 4).

Only one fragment of 'incised ware' has been seen and black top red ware is entirely lacking. Only three sherds found appear not to be of 'Shaheinab' type; one of these is a 'wavy-line' sherd of 'Early Khartoum' type and the other two are probably Meroitic.

Stone Tools. Apart from a large variety of sandstone rubbers, etc. (including pierced stone rings) similar to those found on Site II and at Shaheinab, stone tools are rather rare. A few flake tools were found, including a chisel-ended blade of rhyolite (SM 11425 v, see FIG. 5) and two scrapers of rhyolite (SM 11425 p and w, see FIGS. 6 and 7). The thin tabular fabricators of fossil wood, common on Site II are lacking. Thicker examples, comparable with fabricators found at Shaheinab21, do, however, occur, though rarely. The one thin tabular fabricator found was not of fossil wood, but of bonded quartzite.

21 op. cit., pl. 20, fig. 6.
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This is illustrated in Fig. 8. Neither of the flat sides of this tool has been worked. Polished stone artifacts are very rare, only two tools of the ‘gouge’ type having been found, and no fragments of polished celts or maceheads. From this site, however, comes the unique polished stone palette which is the subject of an appendix to this article, and also a spherical ‘marble’ of meta-diorite\textsuperscript{22}. The latter is slightly irregular in shape the diameter varying between 2.4 and 2.5 cm.

A fragment of a large quern similar to that found at Site II was also picked up. The more important differences can conveniently be put schematically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site I</th>
<th>Site II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impressed ware</td>
<td>All designs, strings of dots predominating. Decorated rims very rare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised ware</td>
<td>Very rare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black top red ware</td>
<td>Lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polished stone</td>
<td>Two gouges and the palette only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabular fabricators of fossil wood</td>
<td>Lacking, except thicker examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be observed that the objects from Site I are less varied and less sophisticated than those from Site II. This and the extreme rarity of polished stone tools at Site I tempts one to conclude that its period of occupation is earlier than that of Site II. Esh Shaheinab produced no evidence of the practice of agriculture, and only 2 per cent of the bones were of domesticated animals. If the culture represented at Shaheinab can now be divided into two stages, it is likely that the domesticated animals belong to the second.

APPENDIX

A stone palette from Kadero East Site I

During a visit by Mr Mackenzie and myself to Site I, I picked up fragments of what appears to be a palette. A missing corner of the object was found some weeks later by Mrs Brain, and the palette is now complete except for a nick in one edge and a hole in its centre, where it appears to have been shattered by a pick or like instrument.

The palette\textsuperscript{23} is of quartz–diiorite speckled black and white with a greenish tinge and mica flecks. It is illustrated in Plate VII. It measures 12.0 cm. by 8.3 cm., and is roughly rectangular.

\textsuperscript{22} Catalogue no. SM 11428.

\textsuperscript{23} Catalogue no. SM 11427. It has not been possible firmly to identify the provenance of the stone, though rocks of this nature are common in the Red Sea Hills.
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in shape but with rounded corners; one of the shorter sides, however, is curved throughout its length. The maximum thickness is 0.9 cm. One face is very slightly convex, and the other is flat at its centre; it is presumed that this was intended for the grinding surface. All four sides taper to a square-cut edge, which varies in depth from 0.45 cm. at the centre of the long sides to 0.1 cm. at the corners. A transverse section across its centre is shown in Fig. 9.

The standard of workmanship is very high. Though there are slight irregularities in the surface of the palette, the outline is regular and the stone has been well polished. The colour and the texture of the stone is pleasing, and the palette was obviously conceived as a work of art.

I have been unable to find an exact parallel to this palette either from the Sudan or Egypt. The palettes found at Shaheinab are of sandstone and very rough. Palettes and fragments of palettes in hard stones and limestone of not dissimilar form have been found in the Fayum, at Merimde beni Salame, and Deir Tasa. From the time of the Badarian civilization onwards the palettes are almost entirely of Slate and of different forms, though isolated examples comparable with our piece occur.

The tools of Shaheinab culture show more resemblance to Fayum neolithic than any other. The publication of the Fayum excavations shows that palettes were in use, but were mostly of alabaster and of rather irregular form; one example, however, is described as being of diorite. It is only slightly thicker than the Kadero palette, but it has a more rounded profile and its edges are rounded instead of square.

Fig. 9. Scale 1

At Merimde was found a basalt palette of not dissimilar shape, but rougher, and the curve on one of the shorter sides is much more exaggerated. Two palettes from Deir Tasa are rather similar in shape, though irregular, and with round edges. The materials, however, are alabaster and limestone.

At Badari the palettes were all of slate except two described as being of black and white porphyry, rectangular, with rounded corners. They are unfortunately not illustrated, and since the author himself omits them in his comparison between Tasiian and Early Badarian palettes they presumably do not much resemble the Tasiian examples. One, a typical slate palette, is, however, of similar outline to the Kadero specimen.

Of the palettes dating from later periods, one from a grave of the First Dynasty at Gerzeh is of interest. This palette is apparently of porphyry; though it is much thicker than the Kadero

---

24 The only example having any real form is that shown in Shaheinab, pl. 22, fig. 2. It is perhaps worth remarking that no graves belonging to the Shaheinab culture have yet been found.
26 From Kom W. See Desert Fayum, p. 40 and pl. xii, fig. 22.
27 See Vandier, Manuel d'Archeologie Egyptienne, i, p. 135. We unfortunately do not have access to the original publication by Junker.
28 Brunton, Mostagedda and the Tasiian Culture, pl. xxii, figs. 17 and 20, and pp. 29–30.
29 Brunton and Caton-Thompson, The Badarian Civilization, p. 6 (Grave 5548).
30 Mostagedda, p. 30.
31 The Badarian Civilization, pl. 20, fig. 16 (Grave 5739).
32 See Petrie, Wainwright and Mackay, The Labarynth Gerzeh and Mazghuneh, pl. xii, fig. 6, and p. 22.
a. UMM RUWEIM SITE No. 1. ROOM IN THE MIDDLE RANGE OF BUILDINGS (see p. 89)

b. UMM RUWEIM SITE No. 2 FROM THE EAST (see p. 90)
PLATE XI

BOWL WITH PATTERN ALTERNATELY IMPRESSED AND BURNISHED, FROM MAAMEREHL

Slightly less than actual size (see p. 95).

Courtesy Brooklyn Museum
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specimen and of quite different shape, the profile of the edge is precisely similar.\textsuperscript{33} It may possibly be of significance that a marble similar in appearance to those found at Gerzeh\textsuperscript{34} was found on the surface of Site I.

Palettes of hard stones and of outline not unlike the Kadero specimen were found in ‘B-Group’ graves by the Archaeological Survey of Egypt,\textsuperscript{35} but the other finds at Kadero make a date as late as this extremely improbable.

Extensive search of the mounds on which the Kadero palette was found has failed to produce any finds dateable between the Neolithic and Meroitic periods, and, as we have seen, the great majority of the artifacts seem to represent an early stage of the Shaheinab culture, which, it has been suggested, is in its developed form roughly contemporary with Fayum. It is tempting then to suggest that among the parallels cited, the Kadero palette should be linked with the Fayum and Merimde examples. If this assessment of its date is correct, the Kadero palette is, for the excellence of its workmanship, unparalleled by any other object of the period yet found in the Nile Valley.

\textsuperscript{33} For the details of this object, which is in the Petrie Collection, University College, London, I am indebted to A. J. Arkell, Esq. Mr Arkell suggests that the Kadero specimen may be a model of an axe such as that illustrated in Petrie, Tombs of the Courtiers and Oxyrhynchos, pl. v, no. 7, but I think this most unlikely in view of the profile of the edges of our palette.

\textsuperscript{34} See The Labarum, pl. 14, fig. 4.

\textsuperscript{35} See The Archaeological Survey of Nubia, Report for 1907–08, pl. 63, fig. c, especially no. 18.
The Fall of Meroë
by P. L. SHINNIE

THE determination of the reasons for and the date of the fall of Meroë remains one of the most important of the many problems of Sudan archaeology. The ending of many centuries of unified rule and the collapse of the culture that went with it brought about profound changes in the northern Sudan. After Meroë had collapsed there was a change in the material culture, there was a change of language, and probably, so far as the meagre anatomical material studied shows, a new racial element.

The traditional view is that Meroë collapsed in about the year A.D. 350 as a result of conquest by Aezanes, king of Axum. This view was accepted by Reisner who used A.D. 350 as the terminal date for his reconstruction of the chronology of the Meroitic kings, and has been followed in recent times by Dunham and Arkell. I suggest in this paper that the date of this event is somewhat earlier. This is not an original idea; it had already been put forward by Monneret de Villard in 1939 but, since his view does not seem to have met with the attention it deserves, it is perhaps worth restating the meagre evidence and re-examining it. Far more work will be necessary before any finality can be reached on this problem, and the full publication of Reisner's excavations of the royal burials at Meroë may well throw much more light. It would perhaps have been better to await the final publication of Reisner's material before attempting to express an opinion on this vexed matter; but, since it may be some years before the volume on Meroë is published, and in view of possible developments in the Sudan, it seems as well to publish my views on the problem using the available evidence. The views expressed here may well be found to be erroneous in the light of further knowledge.

The evidence for the last years of Meroë is twofold, there is, firstly, the literary evidence to be found in the famous Aezanes stela, and in the small fragment of Axumite inscription found at Meroë, and there is the archaeological evidence from the excavations of Garstang and Reisner at Meroë, and those of the Antiquities Service at Ushara and Tanqasi.

The small fragment (Sudan Museum No. 508) found at Meroë is unfortunately too broken to be of much help. It is certainly of Axumite origin, mentions a king of the Axumites, the God Ares, and describes the ravaging of somewhere. Sayce has restored some of the text, but his restorations are largely guesses and are of little help here. It has been suggested that the space does not allow of the long protocol usually associated with the name of Aezanes and that it therefore probably belongs to one of his predecessors. The mention of Ares is good evidence for dating it before the conversion of Aezanes to Christianity in A.D. 350.

---

1 *JE A* 9, pp. 75, 76.
2 *SNR* xxviii, p. 10.
3 *History of the Sudan to A.D. 1821*, pp. 171–3.
4 *Storia della Nubia Cristiana*, p. 37.
5 Published by Sayce. Originally in *PSBA* 31, p. 189 and more fully and imaginatively in *LAAA* iv, pp. 64–5.
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The second and more important document is the inscription from Axum⁶. This inscription was written after Aezanes had become Christian and can therefore be closely dated. It describes a campaign in the Island of Meroë (the modern Butana) and along the rivers Atbara and Nile and has been assumed by many to describe the campaign by which the rule of Meroë was brought to an end. Beginning with a list of the titles of the king, in which he states that he was king of Kasu (Kush, i.e. Meroë) it goes on to describe how he made war upon the Noba who had revolted and boasted that the king of Axum would not cross the river Takkaze (Atbara). The Noba had attacked the Red People, had broken their oath, killed their neighbours, and plundered envoys sent to them by Aezanes. Aezanes took the field against them and fought on the Takkaze at the ford of Kemalke; the Noba fled and were followed by the Axumites for 23 days. The Axumites then took booty and burnt their towns of brick and straw, took their corn, their ore, and their dried meat, and destroyed their stocks of cotton. A battle was fought on the river in which a boat belonging to the Noba was sunk. Aezanes then came to Kasu and fought a battle at the junction of the Nile and the Atbara. He sent troops upstream of the Nile against the towns of brick and straw, of which the brick ones were called Alwa and Daro. Then troops were sent downstream against the Nuba towns of straw. The towns of brick which the Nuba had taken from the Kasu were Tabito and Fertoti. Aezanes' troops went to the region of the Red Noba and returned victorious, after which, a throne was erected at the junction of the Nile and Atbara.

Many of the details of this inscription are obscure and few of the places named can be identified. But what is clear is that Aezanes was king of Kasu before the campaign began, and that the campaign was to put down a revolt by a people called the Noba, who themselves had captured towns from the Kasu, or people of Kush. Nowhere is Meroë mentioned unless the town called Alwa is to be identified with it. I can see no reason for such a suggestion, and it is more reasonable to assume that Alwa is, as its name implies, Soba, which became the capital of the medieval kingdom of Alwa.

The evidence of these two inscriptions so far as it goes suggests, then, that there had been an earlier Axumite raid on Meroë, and that Meroë was not of any importance at the time of the Aezanes campaign. I can see no grounds for suggesting as Arkell does⁷ that Meroë was a trade rival, even a weak one, at this time. It also makes it clear that a people called the Noba who had oppressed the people of Kasu were in possession of the Island of Meroë, and were different from a people known as the 'Red' Noba.

This is the extent of the literary evidence, and for further light we must turn to archaeology. Here there are the excavations at Meroë itself by Garstang and by Reisner, and the two small excavations at Ushara and Tanqasi, which add some details. There is little point at this late date in doing other than regret the lack of full publication of Garstang’s work, but, since little attention was paid to stratigraphy, it is not certain that even full publication would have answered the problems as to the latter days of the city, of Meroë.

Reisner’s work on the royal cemeteries is vital for the chronology of the period. Here again we have only partial publication and a summary list of dates without detailed argument. Dunham’s magnificent publication of Reisner’s work on other royal Kushite cemeteries shows that, when his publication project is completed, there will be a wealth of

---


⁷ op. cit., p. 171.
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information available, and study of the material from the latest pyramids may make more accurate dating possible. So far as the excavations in the town are concerned, there is very little to be got from the published reports as to what may have happened during the closing stages of Meroë’s power. There are few references in the interim reports concerning the latest buildings in the town and their fate, and for several seasons Garstang’s chronology was badly adrift, through his assumption that Meroë was the object of a military expedition as late as the 7th century.\(^8\) This same report also describes late rubble stone walls, which are said to belong to the period when the city wall was in ruins, but no date is given and there may not have been evidence on which chronology could be based.\(^9\) By the fifth interim report\(^10\), Garstang had revised his views, and, in his chronological table, says ‘period of decline following partial destruction or desertion. Main wall largely in ruins. Final overthrow about A.D. 340.’ This date is presumably based on the Aezanes inscription, but nothing is said in the main body of the report about the archaeological evidence for the partial destruction.

The most important evidence provided by Garstang’s excavations is to be found in the tombs lying east of the city and on the plain which stretches to the ridge on which the royal pyramids were built. As is now well-known, the original dating of these cemeteries was incorrect\(^11\). Instead of the graves with coarse pottery representing a primitive early stage, they in fact represent a decadent late one. The correct chronological order is that cemetery 500, which contains fine painted Meroitic ware, is the oldest; it is followed by cemetery 400, while cemetery 300 and the graves numbered 1–99 are the latest. There can now-a-days be no doubt that this is the correct order. The late group of graves contain little evidence for precise dating, and, as in so much Sudan archaeology, the material is mainly native and cannot supply the chronology on internal evidence alone. Two graves, however, contained imported objects, of which an at least approximate date can be given. Tomb 300 contained a glass vessel of Alexandrian type\(^12\), which Dr Harden dates between A.D. 200 and 400\(^13\). Tomb 361 contains an amphora of a type which may be as late as 5th to 6th centuries A.D.\(^14\) It may well be that, if and when the contents of these graves are fully published, evidence will come to light to allow for more precise dating. The main ceramic type found in the tombs of cemetery 300 is a large ‘beer pot’ with a long narrow neck above a large bulbous body, the exterior being marked with the mat on which the pot was made; a type of pottery common in the Sudan from this period onwards, and still made in many parts of the central and western Sudan today. Similar pottery was found in the mounds excavated at Ushara\(^15\) on the west bank of the White Nile, and some 120 miles south of Meroë, and others have been found in the much larger mounds at Tanqasi\(^16\).

Looking at the scanty evidence, both literary and archaeological, the following picture seems to emerge. There was still a king of Meroë powerful enough to send an embassy to Philae in the year A.D. 254\(^17\). After that the only fixed date is that provided

---

\(^8\) *LAAA* v, p. 82.
\(^9\) *LAAA* v, p. 80–1.
\(^10\) *LAAA* vii, p. 10.
\(^11\) This was first pointed out by Crowfoot, *SNR* vii, pt. 2, p. 27.
\(^12\) Garstang, *Meroë, City of the Ethiopians*, pl. xxxvii, 3.
\(^13\) Kirwan, *Firka*, p. 42.
\(^14\) Kirwan, op. cit., pp. 30–1.
\(^15\) Marshall and Adam, *Kush* i, p. 40 et seq.
\(^16\) Shinnie, *Kush* ii, p. 66 et seq.
\(^17\) Teqiraraman.
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by the Aezanes inscription. It would appear, therefore, that at some time between about A.D. 250 and 350 Meroë decayed and the Noba moved in, since at some period which must be after, and probably well after, A.D. 200 a new ceramic material appears in the graves of a completely different tradition from any that had gone before. It is not unreasonable to equate the Noba with the people of cemetery 300. The existence of a 5th to 6th century amphora in one of the tombs does not invalidate such a suggestion, since these people may well have continued to inhabit the area for several centuries after Aezanes, and there is no reason to suppose that there was any cultural change until the development of the kingdom of Soba with its characteristic culture, which appears to date in the main from the 9th to 12th centuries. The people of Ushara and Tanqasi must have been the same as those of the late Meroë cemetery, and it is significant that Nubae are described by Eratosthenes as living west of the river at a much earlier date. Strabo, somewhat later than Eratosthenes, also speaks of Nubae west of the Nile.

The question of Nubian origins is a vexed one and has been well summed up by Kirwan18. I would suggest that the Noba were the people of the Ushara and Tanqasi graves and the people responsible for the thousands of burial mounds, which are to be seen along the west bank of the Nile from well south of Khartoum to opposite the mouth of the Atbara, and right across the Bayuda Desert to Tanqasi, that these people moved into Meroë in either the late third or early 4th centuries, when Merotic power was already at a low ebb, occupied the town and buried their dead in cemetery 300. It may well be more than a coincidence that Diocletian called in the Nobadae from the western oases to guard the Dodekaskoenus in about the year 287. This date would fit in well with the evidence as an approximation of the time when the Noba caused the end of Meroë.

18 SNR xx, p. 47 et seq.
An Exploratory Journey in the Bayuda Region

by H. N. CHITTICK

FROM perhaps 500 B.C. until 300 B.C. the political capital of the Northern Sudan was situated at Meroë (modern Begrawiya, north of Shendi), while Napata and Jebel Barkal, home of the kings of the 25th dynasty, retained their religious pre-eminence and the rulers of Meroë continued to be crowned and buried there. Napata was still a place of importance in 23 B.C. when Petronius sacked the town¹, at a time when Meroë was at the height of its power. It is evident that there must have been much traffic between the two towns and, seeing that the route by river is very circuitous and involves the navigation of the difficult Fourth and Fifth Cataracts, it is probable that the majority of the traffic went by caravan across the Bayuda Desert².

The presence of a large walled structure, which might have served as a caravanserai, in the Wadi Abu Dom some 15 miles from Napata suggested that the caravans might have approached Napata by this route, which the topography of the region also favours. A journey was, therefore, planned with the object of seeing whether there were any other remains further in the interior, taking the least known of the alternative routes to the Meroë region on reaching the Gilif massif. It was also hoped to carry out a preliminary reconnaissance of the unexplored Gilif hills themselves.

The party consisted of Mr. P. L. Shinnie, the Commissioner for Archaeology, and myself, with four men, mounted on two riding and four baggage camels. We started from Ghazali, situated about 16 km. east of ancient Napata, at the close of the season’s excavation on the monastery there at about 10 o’clock on 5 March 1954. The route taken is shown on the sketch map³ (FIG. 1). We proceeded up the Wadi Abu Dom to Umm Merwa Wells and thence southwards down the Wadi Kalas, the Wadi Daiqiqa and the Wadi Magaga to Bir el Fiki. From Bir el Fiki we moved eastwards to Abu Halfa Wells and thence to Jakdul Pools. Here I left the party and went on foot across the hills to El Fura, walking on a compass bearing, while Mr. Shinnie and the camels went round the south of the massif, the two of us meeting again at El Fura Wells.

Leaving El Fura, we travelled south-east, more or less on the direct line to Abu Tuleih Wells. This took us across the neck of the area of sand dunes known as ‘Qoz Abu Dulu’, and so into the Wadi Sereih, where we found a small village with a recently dug well, which is not marked on the existing maps. Thence we made straight for Abu Tuleih Wells and from there by the well-known track to Metemma.

The total distance travelled was about 300 km. and the time taken was nine days. There was ample grazing all through the journey, although a quantity of grain was taken as fodder for the camels. Water was also plentiful, the greatest distance travelled between wells being about 70 km., from El Fura to Wadi Sereih. The only permanent dwellings seen through the whole journey were the few houses in the Wadi Sereih and one at Bir el Fiki, which is the residence of a local holy man. There is, however, a considerable amount of rain cultivation in the area to the south of the Gilif Hills. Although

¹ See Pliny: Natural History, vi, xxxv, 181.
³ References to map sheets in the text refer to the Sudan 1:250,000 series.
Fig. 1. MAP OF ROUTE ACROSS BAYUDA DESERT
neither I nor Mr Shinnie had had much previous experience of camels, no difficulties were encountered on the journey.

Many graves were seen during the journey, the number being such as to suggest that the population in the Bayuda region was once much greater than it is now. The graves are confined to two main types: (1) Stone or gravel tumuli of very various sizes. These are likely to be post-Meroitic in date, judging by similar mounds excavated further south. None have been dug in the Bayuda area. (2) Box graves. These are rectangular structures built of dry stone, in general about 2.50 metres long by 1 metre wide by 1 metre high. They are similar to the graves in the extensive cemeteries at Ghazali and they are almost certainly to be dated to the Christian period. No remains of inscribed tomb stelae, which are common at Ghazali, were found, though one fragment was picked up the previous year near Umm Ruweim.

See, for example, Marshall and Abd el Rahman Adam, 'The excavation of a mound grave near Ushara,' in *Kush* 1, p. 46.
AN EXPLORATORY JOURNEY IN THE BAYUDA REGION

Sherds typical of the ‘Shaheinab’ culture were picked up on a fairly extensive site near Umm Merwa and are interesting evidence of the occupation of this area in the early Neolithic period. Typical painted Christian sherds and what are probably hut circles, besides box graves, were found in the hills to the north of Jakdul Pools, and indicate that the valleys of this massif may have carried a sedentary population in the Christian period.

Our hopes of finding further buildings that might have served as caravanserais were disappointed, and it, therefore, seems less likely that such was in fact the function of Umm Ruweim and the two similar but simpler structures discovered by Mr Shinnie a few weeks before we started on our journey. The latter, named Umm Khafur and Umm Kuweib, are only some 4 km. up the Wadi Abu Dom from Umm Ruweim; they therefore cannot possibly represent the station before Umm Ruweim.

Umm Ruweim is the most elaborate of these structures. It lies on the right bank of the Wadi Abu Dom, at a point where a small tributary wadi descends from the north, and about 11 km. from Ghazali. It consists of an outer and an inner enclosure wall, with a building in the centre. The position of the entrance in the outer wall is not clear; that in the inner wall is on its east side. The two enclosure walls have rooms in their thicknesses throughout their length. Not far distant is a simple enclosure without interior buildings. The site has already been described in KUSH I (p. 87); sketch plans, taken from an air-photograph, are now published (FIGS. 2 and 3). On PLATE VIII is shown a general view of the main site from the west, and PLATE IXA gives a view from the south of
one of the rooms in the North wall of the inner enclosure. Plate 16b shows a general view of the simple second enclosure, from the east.

Umm Khafūr lies on the left bank of the Wadi Abu Dom about 3 km. east of Umm Ruweim (at 18° 23' N, 32° 2' E). It consists of a plain enclosure about 50 m. square, built, like the others, of rough granite slabs. There are no rooms in the thickness of the wall, and no buildings in the interior. Nearby is a group of about 20 box graves of Christian type. Umm Kuweib is on the opposite (right) bank of the Wadi and only about 1½ km. upstream of Umm Khafūr. It consists of a rectangular enclosure about 65 by 38 m. externally, with long narrow rooms in the thickness of the wall. There is an entrance on the east side. A sketch plan, taken from an air photograph, is shown in Fig. 4.

The few sherds found in association with these buildings seem to be of Meroitic date; but they are all of rough wares, and it would be rash to be dogmatic on this point.

The original function of these three sites is, as has been indicated, obscure. The two simple enclosures might reasonably be supposed to have been for the accommodation of animals, and the others chiefly for human beings, or goods, or both. The resemblance of the enclosures provided with rooms to the Roman watering station (Hydreuma) named Qasr al Banât on the Wadi el Hammamat route from the Nile to the Red Sea is striking.
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AN EXPLORATORY JOURNEY IN THE BAYUDA REGION

The only other building of similar character in the Sudan which has come to my notice is the ruin at Kufryat el Atash\(^6\). This is situated in the Wadi el Qasr some 41 km. south of Ed Debba (at 17° 41' N, 31° 03' E.) and consists of a thick rectangular enclosing wall, with small rooms built against the inner side. Close by are a number of stone-lined wells. It also lies at the Northern end of one of the caravan routes that cut across the great bend in the Nile, and, like the buildings in the Wadi Abu Dom, is roughly a day’s march away from the river.

One might guess that these buildings were used for the assembling of groups of caravans or herds before they arrived at their destination on the Nile, or, less probably, before embarking on a journey southwards. It is, however, difficult to envisage the conditions that would make it advantageous to carry out this operation at such a distance from the river.

The following is an account of the antiquities seen during the remainder of the journey.

About 2½ km. upstream of the mouth of the W. Dayamon, on the left bank of the Wadi Abu Dom, is a group of box graves (18° 19' 30" N, 32° 7' 45" E).

Below the north-western tip of J. Ab Merah, on the right bank of the Wadi, is an occupation site with sherds of the 'Shaheinab' culture. Nearby, and partly encroaching on the site, is a group of mound graves, together with some box graves (18° 11' N, 32° 19' E).

About 1 km. further on, still on the left bank of the Wadi, is a large cemetery consisting of about 150 box graves and a number of disc barrows (18° 11' 15" N, 32° 19' 45" E).

In the Wadi Kalas, about 1 km. south of Et Tuweina Well, is a group of about 50 box graves (18° 0' 0" N, 37° 32' 30" E).

No further antiquities were seen during this crossing of the Gilif hills. The '80 Anag graves' marked on the map (sheet 45 J) as lying in the Khor es Sidr were not visited.

Box and mound graves are scattered all along the foothills of the southern side of the Gilif massif. The following were observed on the stretch between Bir el Fiki and Abu Halfa Wells (Sheet 45 J):

25 low mound graves at 17° 41' 0" N, 32° 40' 45" E.

Scattered cairn graves all along the hill immediately to the south of the route taken.

A group of about 20 large box graves and 12 disc barrows were seen below the hills at 17° 42' 30" N, 32° 44' 0" E.

Just short of Abu Halfa Wells and at a distance of about 1 km. from them is a cemetery of about 100 box graves and a group of four large box graves about ½ km. south-west of these (17° 37' N, 32° 51' E approx.).

On the stretch from Abu Halfa to Jakdul a small group of disc graves was seen at 17° 41' 15" N, 32° 45' 0" E.

A group of about 20 box graves on the foothills at 17° 40' 30" N, 32° 47' 30" E.

Scattered mounds and box graves all the way along the whole scarp to the north.

Approaching Jakdul, at a distance of about 2½ km. from the pools, is a group of nine box graves, and, at about 1½ km. from the pools, an extensive cemetery of perhaps 200 of the same type (latter at 17° 37' 45" N, 32° 51' 30" E).

---

\(^6\) See Edmonds, 'A ruin in the Wadi el Qasr'. *Sudan Notes and Records*, xxiii, p. 112.
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In the course of walking between Jakdul and El Fura the following antiquities were seen.

About 1 km. north of Jakdul, on a saddle among the hills, are about 9 very low box graves and two hut-squares (?) (17° 39' 15" N, 32° 52' 30" E). Associated with these was characteristic painted Christian pottery of the 'Dongola' type.

Some 5 km. from Jakdul, on a bearing of about 80° at approximately 17° 40' 30" N, 32° 54' E, is a bowl-shaped plain enclosed by the hills. Here there is a large number of burials. On the west side of the plain these consist of scattered rectangular graves, the pebble covering of which is flush with the surface of the ground. In association with these, sherds of painted 'Dongola' ware were found. There are also some circular graves (?), also of flush type.

Rather further to the east are about 20 mound graves, with two box graves. Here also 'Dongola' ware was found, but none of it in association with the mounds.

About 1 km. south of El Fura is a large group of mounds and box graves (17° 40' 15" N, 32° 58' 45" E).

No other antiquities were observed until the region of Abu Tuleih, where there are a large number of mounds on the ridge to the north of the wells.

Metemma, where we reached the river, lies at the southern end of an area where almost all the high ground near the river is dotted with mound graves.
Notes

AN EGYPTIAN INVASION OF THE SUDAN IN 591 B.C.

Everyone interested in the history of the Sudan should read the brilliant article 'La campagne nubienne de Psammétique II et sa signification historique' by Serge Sauneron and Jean Yoyotte which appeared in the Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie orientale, vol. 50, pp. 157–207. From a study of two fragmentary historical inscriptions of Psammetik II, one from Karnak (known since 1905) and the other from Tanis (discovered by P. Montet in 1937) and the well-known Carian graffiti at Abu Simbel, they suggest the following reconstruction of events in 591 B.C. (the third year of Psammetik II's reign) and of the relations between Cush and Egypt in the years preceding 591 B.C.

Rivalry had existed between the Cushites and the rulers of Sais in the Delta ever since the rise of the 25th dynasty. (We can indeed be certain that the dynasty of the Delta had never forgiven the deportation by Taharqa of their womenfolk to Cush, when some of their princesses were made to serve as slaves in the temple of Kawa). Several times they had striven to throw off the yoke of Cush; and Piankhy, Shabako, possibly Shebitku, and finally Tanutamon had had to go to the Delta, one after another, to assert the authority of Cush. Even after the final expulsion of Tanutamon from Egypt, the Kings of Cush had continued to give themselves the royal titles of Egypt and to wear the double uraeus, indicating that they still hoped once more to go down into Egypt and to reunite it with Cush under their sceptre. Thus when Necho II had been defeated at Carchemish in 605 B.C., it must have seemed to Cush that the time was ripe for tackling the Saite whose hands were more than full in Asia. Apparently Anlamani was threatening to invade Egypt when Psammetik II came to the throne in 594, while at the same time Babylon was advancing on Egypt through Palestine. The accession stele of Aspelta, c. 593 B.C., records that on the death of his predecessor, Anlamani, the army of Cush had been in the region of the Pure Mountain, which, while clearly not Jebel Barkal, presumably must have been Abu Simbel. If that is correct, it must have been there to threaten Egypt. In such a dangerous situation it would have been prudent for Psammetik II to decide to dispose of the least dangerous of the two threats first, and he may have trusted to the superior skill and armament of his Greek mercenaries to inflict a crushing defeat on the old-fashioned army of Cush. And indeed this is exactly what seems to have happened. He sent against Cush an army, which he accompanied himself in person as far as the First Cataract. The contingents of the army in charge of Pdi-sma-tawy (Potasimto) and Amãsis, two of his right-hand men, passed the Second Cataract, reached Pnubs (= Tenupsis, modern Tumbus, see Macadam, Temples of Kawa II, p. 241) beyond the Third Cataract at the beginning of the navigable Dongola Reach (just as the army of Tuthmosis I had done before them); and then inflicting a crushing defeat on the Cushite forces near Ta Dehne 'the mount, the bluff', had occupied the land of Shãs. On their return journey at Abu Simbel some of the Greek mercenaries boasted of having gone 'upstream of Kerkis, as far as the river allowed'. Our authors recognize the difficulty of identifying these place names. They suggest Ta Dehne may be Old Dongola, and so it may, although one wonders whether it may have been the invaders' name for Jebel Barkal, while literally its name means the same as that of the modern Debba in the middle of the Dongola Reach. The land of Shãs certainly seems to have
been the environs of Napata. For Kerkis they suggest either a locality near the Fourth Cataract, possibly Jebel Koukei, or Kurgus beyond the Fifth Cataract, where Eighteenth Dynasty boundary inscriptions have recently come to light. The first suggestion seems the more probable. At Kurgus they would have passed the very difficult part of the river which begins at the Fourth Cataract (and which incidentally I have recently realized is probably the district known in medieval times as El Abwāb ‘the catarracts’ or ‘rapids,’ for bāb besides meaning ‘door’ can mean ‘rapids,’ literally ‘door through the rocks at a cataract’; see Amelia Edwards, *A Thousand Miles up the Nile*, p. 20). At the Fourth Cataract, the river would to all intents and purposes not have allowed them to proceed. At Kurgus they would have again reached reasonably navigable water with only the Sixth Cataract ahead as a possible obstacle: but before the Sixth Cataract they would have reached Meroē, the other residence of the King of Cush apparently mentioned on the Tanis stele, and it is certain that we should have heard more of Meroē, if that had happened.

Our authors suggest very reasonably that the palette of Senkamanisken found at Memphis may have been part of the Saite booty taken on this expedition, and that the hammering out of the royal names on the accession stele of Aspelta, etc. at Jebel Barkal, as well as the smashing of the statues of Taharqa, Tanutamon, Senkamanisken, Anlamani and Aspelta may well have been done by the Saite troops. I would even go further and suggest that this, more than anything else, would best account for the move of the capital from Napata to Meroē, where as far as we know at present the earliest temple and palace were built by Aspelta. After the return of their victorious army which had removed the threat of aggression by Cush, Psammetik II appears to have had the names of the 25th dynasty kings hammered out in Egypt; and this reaction is the probable reason why until recently the Saites have been given all the credit for the reformation in Egypt, with its associated archaizing policy, whereas the credit for that was certainly due in the first place to the Cushites.

An important point to which Sauneron and Yoyotte draw attention is that in both the stele of Psammetik II, as well as in the ‘Second Story of Kha em wās’ translated by Griffith in the *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*, the ruler of Cush is given a title which they suggest should be read as Kūr, and which may be equivalent to the Meroitic qēre for king. This is of great interest, for whether or not this title survives in Kurru, the modern name of the village near the 25th dynasty royal cemetery, it certainly seems to explain the royal title aba kūrī= ‘sultan’ in the Fur language in Darfur. This is now explained by the Fur as meaning ‘the father of a bow or obeisance’= ‘one to whom obeisance is due.’ But all important titles at the Darfur court were preceded by aba or abo, which is presumably derived from the Arabic abu= father, e.g. Abo Tokenyawi, Abo Gabbayin, etc. In Turra too at the north end of Jebel Marra, the old home of the Fur sultans, the village where the sharīt or chief of Turra lives is called Kurra or Kura, which was explained to me on the spot as being so named because the chief lived there. The ruined palace of sultan Tunsam in Turra is known as Dulo Kuri, dulo meaning ‘ruin’. The Fur royal title aba kūrī seems probably to be a survival of the Cushite title kūr, and so presumably is the Zaghawa word kiri= ‘sultan’; and a link in time between the present and the kingdom of Cush is to be found in the medieval Tumagera min ahl Kira, which has apparently turned into Tungur Kirāt; see my *History of the Sudan*, p. 201. (For some other words for ‘chief’ possibly cognate with kūrī see my ‘History of Darfur’ in *Sudan Notes and Records*, xxxii, p. 60; see also pp. 54 ff.). There thus seems little doubt but that Sauneron and Yoyotte’s suggested reading of kūr for the title of the King of Cush is sound.

A. J. ARKELL.
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AN EARLY PREDYNASTIC SUDANESE BOWL FROM UPPER EGYPT

In January 1908, M. Henri de Morgan excavated some graves in the predynastic cemetery which surrounded the police station at what he calls Mohamerieh, apparently Ma'amerieh, which is on the west bank of the Nile, just north of the Pyramid of el Koula, itself opposite El Kab and about 3 miles north-west of Hierakonpolis. One of them No. 2 (see Annales de Service, xii, p. 32), was an oval grave containing a contracted burial with, at the feet two small urns in coarse red clay, two red vases with black border at the top, a small dish, and a semi-spherical cup decorated with engraved basket-like ornamentation.' Near the skull at the south end of the grave was apparently a U-shaped 'fishtail' flint, for it is compared with J. de Morgan, Recherches, i, p. 124, fig. 131 (which must be a misprint for fig. 181), and two painted clay figurines (see Plate x, a). The contents of this grave all went to Brooklyn Museum, and it is by courtesy of that museum and particularly of Mr John D. Cooney, Curator of the Department of Egyptian Art, that I am able to publish it and the fine photographs supplied by the museum. 'The semi-spherical cup decorated with engraved basket-like ornamentation' (Plates xi and xii) is numbered 07.447.404 in the Brooklyn Museum catalogue and described in their records as follows: 'deep conical bowl of red-polished brown clay. Small flattened base with rounded edge. Sides very gently curving, almost straight. Plain rim. Bottom inside marked around central low hump. Decorated inside and outside with panels apparently produced by scraping the surface with a comb. Inside, six such panels, in the shape of windmill wings, radiate regularly from base to rim. Outside, they are irregularly dispersed in irregular shapes . . . with a border-band along rim and a broad band around base. Measurements: height 8.9 cm., max. diam. 19.2 cm., diam. of mouth 18.5 cm., diam. of base about 4 cm.' It is particularly because of this bowl that I wish to draw the attention of readers of Kush to this grave, for I have no doubt that it was a product of the Sudan. Both the method of the decoration and the design proclaim its origin. For the impressed zigzag of curved continuous lines, which was frequent in the Khartoum Neolithic, see my Shaheinab, p. 73 and pl. 32, fig. 6. Burnished panels alternating with areas decorated with impressions to resemble basket-work apparently did not occur as early as the Khartoum Neolithic, but they did occur in the Khartoum area in the Protodynastic (or late predynastic) period, cp. Shaheinab, pl. 40, figs. 11 and 12, and pp. 82 and 84-5; also Early Khartoum, pl. 92, figs. 1 and 2; and also at Faras in Wadi Halfa District in an A Group grave, see F. I. L. Griffith 'Oxford Excavations in Nubia' in AAA, 1921, pl. 5, fig. 1. The arrangement of the plain burnished areas on this bowl from Ma'amerieh is simpler than on the protodynastic pots mentioned, so that it may well be earlier; and that is what is indicated by what is known about the other contents of the grave. Mr Cooney reports that owing to the inadequate records of the excavations, it has been impossible to identify the other pots and the fish-tail, although they undoubtedly are at Brooklyn. The black-topped pots are perhaps more likely to have been Amratian than Gerzean, and the fishtail was probably almost certainly Amratian, for it is compared by H. de Morgan to an Amratian type fishtail depicted in his brother's publication. The figurines found in this grave are numbered 07.447.505 and 502 in the Brooklyn Museum catalogue. As far as I can discover, figurines of this type have never been dated. We have in the Petrie Collection at University College, London, a damaged example of a somewhat similar figurine (published in Petrie, Prehistoric Egypt, pl. 4, fig. 4, and republished here in Plate x, b). The London figurine, in which the legs are distinguished by a groove, was presumably purchased in Egypt, and so it is not dated; it also apparently had the arms (now missing) raised, as in the case of the Ma'amerieh figurines, in the
position still used in the Dinka ‘cow dance.’ The ‘wedge’ shape below the waist in the Ma'amereh figurines seems to indicate an early date, for it occurs as early as the Badarian in a squatting female figurine (University College Catalogue No. 9080) published in Brunton, *Badarian Civilization*, pl. 24, fig. 3.

On the above considerations, I am inclined to date this grave to the beginning of the Amratian period. A. J. Arkell.

AIR PHOTOGRAPHS OF SEMNA AND URONARTI FORTS

Very few air photographs of ancient sites in the Sudan have ever been published, so it is perhaps worth while to reproduce the two shown as PLATES XIII and XIV, which were taken recently by the Sudan Government Survey Department.

PLATE XIII is of Semna and shows the two forts, Semna East and Semna West, marked on the photograph as E and W, guarding the narrows where at times the whole flow of the Nile is concentrated through a narrow gap only some 20 feet wide. These forts, excavated by Reisner in the 1920's, have not yet been fully published. They were built by Sesostri III as part of the Egyptian frontier defences and are the most southerly of a string of forts through the Second Cataract area. At the point marked S on the photograph is the walled enclosure, presumably another fort, known as Semna South. This site has never been excavated and there is strong local superstitious prejudice against work there. In the area to the north of this site traces of Egyptian New Kingdom occupation have been found by Arkell. The photograph reveals a rectangular enclosure on the hill to the east of Semna East fort. This has not yet been examined on the ground and no indication can be given of its date or purpose.

PLATE XIV shows the island of Uronarti. (This is its Nubian name. It is, on occasion, also called by the Arabic translation Gezirat el Melik). This island contains another of the forts built by Sesostri III at its northern end, where the peculiar triangular shape of the fort conditioned by the local topography can be clearly seen, together with the long wall that runs out to the north along the crest of the hill. This fort was excavated for Reisner's expedition by N. F. Wheeler from 1928 to 1930. It also remains unpublished except for one short article.† At the southern end of the island can be seen the large rectangular enclosure with buildings inside, which Reisner considered to be a New Kingdom 'palace.' To the north-east of this 'palace' can be seen a number of circular enclosures stretching northwards towards the centre of the island. There is no account of them in the article referred to and they have not been examined on the ground in recent times.

P. L. Shinnie.

A CHRISTIAN NUBIAN PAINTING

In his 'Christian Antiquities of the Nile Valley,' Somers Clark referred to traces of painting in a much ruined mud brick church, of which he gives a plan,¹ near to Kulubnarti at the south end of the Batn el Hagar, some miles south of Wadi Halfa.² A visit

---

¹ There is a preliminary account by Reisner in *SNR* XII, p. 143 et seq. in which he discusses the problem of the large number of records of Nile floods far above the present high water mark.

² *SNR* XIV, pt. 1, pp. 1–14. From this fort came the seals described in Reisner's article on pp. 26–69 of this number of *Kush*. A plan is published in Borchardt, *Altägyptische Festungen*, pl. 13.

¹ p. 49 and plate vi, fig. 1.

² The area in which the church stands is called *Andukay* according to local informants.
THE FORTS AT SEMNA (see p. 96)
PAINTING AT KULUBNARTI (see p. 96)
SUAKIN. ROSHAN IN KHORSHID’S HOUSE (see p. 100)
SUAKIN. HOUSE No. 23, TYPICAL OF THE TURKISH PERIOD
(see p. 99)
PLATE XIX

SUAKIN. HOUSE OF MOHAMMED BEY AHMED
(see p. 99)
SUAKIN. HOUSE No. 30/31. RECENTLY RESTORED
(see p. 99)
to this island on 20 January 1955, some 46 years later than Somers Clark, showed that while his description and plan of the church can still stand as substantially correct, at least one painting is in a better condition and is of greater importance than his comment ‘a few painted figures, sadly broken, can be traced on the fragments of the vaults which still cover a part of the western end,’ would lead one to believe.

The painting illustrated on Plate XV is on the north wall at the west end of the nave at the point marked on the plan. It is remarkably well preserved in comparison with most paintings of this type and the usual destruction of the face has been limited to a removal of the eyes. The main damage has been due to hornets’ nests which can be clearly seen on the plate. Some of these nests were removed from the face before photography—but it is a difficult business to remove them without removing the underlying paint. Some damage has been caused by rain, but as this area is almost rainless it is not considerable. However, in view of the exposed nature of the painting with most of the church collapsed around it, the standard of preservation and the brightness of the colour is remarkable.

The figure, which is 1.3 metres high, is that of a winged man. The head surrounded by a halo has the wrinkles on the forehead carefully picked out, and the face is heavily bearded.

The figure is dressed in a long yellow robe, edged in blue, draped in cowl-like folds round the neck and upper part of the chest. The bent right arm makes a peculiar angle with the body as though resting on a crutch. He has a bracelet or embroidered cuff round the wrist and the fingers appear to be covered by an embroidered glove, which leaves the thumb and upper part of the hand free.

Identification of the figure is not possible, but it is likely on the analogy of other medieval Nubian paintings that it represents an archangel. The nearest parallel is painting no. 33 from the Rivergate church at Faras, published by Griffith, though there are many differences of detail.

P. L. SHINNIE.

OLD DONGOLA CHURCH

The well-known church at Old Dongola has been briefly described on many occasions but still lacks detailed examination and definitive publication. During a recent visit, photographs of the interior were taken and, since no others have to my knowledge been published, the opportunity is now taken of doing so. A plan, made in 1905, was found in the archives of the Antiquities Service and has been retraced as Figs. 1 and 2.

Plate XVI a, taken from the west end of the church, shows the two northern columns, of which the eastern one is of wood. The famous inscription can be half seen to the right of the wooden column. The mihrab of the mosque can be seen in the far (eastern) wall. Plate XVI b shows the southern columns, the eastern one being inverted.

Close examination of the walls of the church showed even more paintings than those seen by Crawford, and there can be no doubt that the building, in spite of its peculiar design, was at one time used as a church. There must, however, have been much rebuilding and alteration which only a full examination and the stripping of a great deal

---

3 *LAA* XIII, pl. LVIII.
1 For full bibliography up to 1935, see Monneret de Villard ‘La Nubia Medioevale,’ pp. 246–8. For the most recent description, see O. G. S. Crawford, ‘The Fung Kingdom of Sennar,’ pp. 34–7.
3 loc. cit.
of plaster can reveal. The disorganized arrangement of the columns suggests that they are not in their original position. They may have been brought in from outside during a period of reconstruction or may represent three of an original four internal columns overturned at some time and re-erected perhaps by Muslims. P. L. SHINNIE.
NOTES

SUAKIN POSTSCRIPT

My previous article, 'The Red Sea Style' (KUSH I, pp. 60-86) on Suakin was based on material collected during two visits in 1950, the first when making a survey for the Commissioner for Archaeology, Sudan Government, and the second on local leave. My third visit in March 1955 has allowed me to gather further information to add to that already published, and also to allow me to confirm or qualify opinions formed in 1950, the lapse of time and publication of the earlier material being helpful in determining what else is essential in the understanding of Suakin. It is also interesting to compare the state of the buildings now with their condition in 1950.

The drawings show the additional information I have been able to collect.

Fig. 1 shows the metal lamp holders at street corners and in the square outside the Mahafa. Fig. 2 contains more metal-work; 'cabin-hooks' for roshans, and a typical hinge. Even here the arabesque quality is evident.

Fig. 3 illustrates the two types of interior plaster decoration in the houses: incised patterns, and pebble-work. Such patterns occur in Saracenic architecture from India to Spain, and are not an indication in Suakin of any particular origins.

Fig. 4 illustrates the variety of decorative niches, containing shelves in rooms. The niches in one room may each have a different design at the top. Other features in the main rooms are the carved lamp-hangers (Fig. 5), in the crown of internal arches.

The constructional detail of an internal arch consists of corbelled masonry, relieved above by the cantilever action of the longitudinal wall timbers (Fig. 6). Arches usually have flat boards built in between the voussoirs.

Fig. 8 shows the design of ventilator openings in external walls. The wooden door-lock in Fig. 7 is typical of the form of the Suakin style. This method occurs also in the Nile Valley and in Arabia. The construction of the wooden door lock was described by G. W. Titherington in Sudan Notes and Records, XXIII, 1940, part II. The Architects' Journal (9th Sept., 1954) refers to ancient Egyptian wooden locks.

The design of a small shop in the street behind Shennawi Bey's house is shown in Fig. 9. All main dimensions appear to be in multiples of 58 centimetres (the 'Dira'). The section shows the decorative composition of the niches and door in the wall separating the shop from the store. There is a large pointed arch spanning the street entrance. The flat earth-roof construction is typical of Suakin.

Fig. 10, a comparative study of early and late window designs, throws a good deal of light on the effect of the window opening on the scale of the buildings. It is possible to classify the period of individual Suakin houses by their scale. The early ones are small in scale (this is not the same as being small in size); the later ones are large in scale, and coarse. I suggested in my previous article that this was due to a possible change-over on the part of the designers from the use of the 'dira' to the metre. I now think that this is unlikely, or if the 'dira' were then abandoned, a coincidence. The early (Turkish) houses have windows measuring almost exactly in terms of the metric system (e.g. 1.05 x 2.05), and the latest houses (the Egyptian phase, coarse in scale) have widths such as 1.35, and 1.20, and a height sometimes as great as 2.50.

The effect on scale can be seen by comparison between PLATES XVIII, XIX and XX. PLATE XVIII is a typical early Turkish house, with roshans and ventilation grilles in timber. The balcony on the top floor was probably added later, for the early houses always have roshans and rarely balconies, and the later houses vice versa. The later period is illustrated in PLATES XIX and XX. Neither of these houses has a roshan, the former has balconies, and windows 1.20 metres wide (Fig. 10 g), and the latter has evidences of balconies since removed, and windows 1.22 metres wide (Fig. 10 h).
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The scale of the early buildings (Plate XVIII) is helped by the fact that all openings are not the same size; instead of a uniform series of openings as occurs in the late phase (Plate XIX), the Turkish houses have a fascinating combination of large and small openings, subtle and free in arrangement. The fact that the largest window units are only approximately 1 m. by 2 m. makes additional openings necessary, and these are the smaller grilles, permanently open. The late Egyptian phase introduces adjustable jalousies, and is almost modern in comparison. Furthermore it lacks embellishment, except occasionally for the scalloped framing (fig. 18 c and fig. 10, d, e and f).

There is a transitional design between the Turkish arabesque window framing (Figs. 18 a and b, and 10 a, b and c) and the scalloped type described above, in the windows and roshans of the house of Omar Effendi Obeid. This house seems to link the two styles. In itself, it is coarser than the early Turkish houses. Whilst the design is conceived in the Turkish manner, the windows are larger (fig. 10 d), and the roshans are plain, except for scalloped ornament.

The decoration of Suakin houses seems to derive from both Turkey and India. The 16th–17th century Turkish wall tiles in the Municipal Museum, The Hague (fig. 14) are prototypes of the stalactite 'sharfa' work of the early roshans ('The Red Sea Style', fig. 40, KUSH I, p. 82).

The upper grilles in Khorsid's roshan (Plate XVII and fig. 17) are identical in design with the decoration of the back of a medieval Turkish chair in the Monastiraki Museum in Athens. Furthermore, the system of tenoned construction was adopted with larger pieces of timber to form grilled openings (fig. 16). In Khorsid's roshan the slats are approximately 1 cm. wide, and in the larger grilles 4.5 cm. wide. Khorsid's roshan contains similar grilles constructed of larger pieces of timber than that in fig. 17, but the pattern is the same.

The Indian influences have already been stated in the previous article. Fig. 13 shows two types of pierced grille composed of halved slats. The design is reminiscent of the pierced grilles in the Double Temple in Hullabid, Ceylon (A.D. 1224). Such pierced slabs are very distinctive of the Hindu style, and are also similar to Byzantine and Saracenic treatments. Trading connections are known to have existed between Suakin and Ceylon.

It seems probable that the square motifs in Suakin are of Indian origin. Such decoration occurs on the shutters to a mosque (fig. 11), in which the boards are pierced simply with square holes, and in fig. 12, square motifs in plaster decoration, and raised bosses in timber on the polygonal roshan. This roshan is the only one of its kind in Suakin (KUSH I, p. 73, fig. 7), and may well be Indian. The use of solid boarding pierced with square holes is used in the 'solid shish' of House No. 226 (fig. 15).

We have the problem of the age of the buildings. The oldest are obviously those of one storey (e.g. Khorsid, Plate XVI, and Beit al Basha), for they are dwarfed by the minarets of the two mosques. These, together with phase II must be pre-18th century, when Suakin declined; the decoration of these houses (Sitt Miriam's, and house block No. 220 to 226, and House No. 233, Shennawi Bey's, and many others) derives from the 13th, 16th and 17th century sources cited above. My previous classification included in phase III (the final phase) the 19th century Egyptian work (Plates XIX and XX), with balconies and no roshans, no arabesques, only scalloped ornament, and coarseness in scale.

I feel that a very large number of the buildings are of an age to come under the protection of the Antiquities Ordinance. It is difficult to expect the authorities to spend large sums of money on restoration, for such a project would be regarded only as
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'art for art's sake. But it will be a great loss to the Sudan if these treasures are allowed to disappear. An imaginative solution is needed to rejuvenate the island, such as the establishment of a vacation school or seminar as a branch of Khartoum University, using the old houses.

There is little wrong with them as structures. Any damage that is occurring is a result of lack of normal maintenance; external plaster is falling off, roofs are falling in. By far the largest amount of damage is being done by the owners themselves who are demolishing many of the best houses, and shipping the stone to make lime. In the process, timber roshans and grilles are crashing down into the streets, and being destroyed. The difficulty with which they are demolishing the houses is evidence of the great strength of the structures, which have been standing for hundreds of years. In spite of this, a considerable amount of the town is still standing; I expected to see more damage in the five years since my first visits than has actually occurred.

Noteworthy changes since 1950 are as follows: the complete repair of House No. 30/31 (Plate XIX), which is now in perfect condition, and shows what normal maintenance can achieve; the demolition (in progress) of House No. 86, with the consequent loss of the 'break-fronted' roshan illustrated in Fig. 28 of my previous article, and the demolition of part of the 'Turkish Terrace' (Fig. 12 in my previous article).

Disintegration will continue. It may be some years before all traces disappear. Unless preservation is initiated, the only remains eventually will be the written records.

D. H. MATTHEWS.
Obituary

ABDELRAHMAN ADAM (1924–1954)

With the death of Abdelrahman Adam, as a result of an accident, in Cambridge on 25 December, 1954, the Antiquities Service has lost one of its most promising officials and has suffered a serious blow at a time when political changes in the Sudan require the maximum number of trained workers.

Abdelrahman was thirty years old at the time of his death. He was born in Gedaref, the son of Yuzbashi Adam Mohammed, and was always very proud of the Beja blood he inherited from his father. Educated in the Gordon College, he received his diploma there in 1948 and in the same year was appointed as an Antiquities Officer. In 1951 he was sent to England to read for the Archaeology Tripos at Cambridge; he successfully passed the first part and was working hard and well for the second part at the time of his death.

During his few years with the Service, Abdelrahman had travelled widely in the Sudan, both with me and on his own. Apart from our usual inspection tours in the north, he had worked on Jebel Marra in Darfur, and was the first, and so far only, archaeologist to tour the southern provinces. He was a cheerful and energetic traveller under the often hard conditions that travels in the Sudan entail, and had a great enthusiasm for his subject. He carried out a camel journey in the Butana, with H. F. C. Smith, that has become legendary in the Service and published the results with Smith in Sudan Notes and Records, volume xxxi. He worked with me on excavations at Amara West and Soba, and, with Marshall, he carried out and published in Kush i, the excavation of a group of post Meroitic graves at Ushara.

His death has been a grave loss to the small group of scholars in his country, and in him I personally have lost a friend with whom I had worked and travelled in many different circumstances. I have many memories of Abdelrahman, which will remain with me after I have left his country—talking with him and O. G. S. Crawford to the Sheikh of Bunzuga on the Blue Nile and hearing the story of the still living tradition of Soba, driving across the dusty Gezira in high summer, and, strongest of all, the memory of the walk we took together along the river from Akasha to Saras in 1949, when we left our vehicle, our baggage, and our servants to go by the Batn el Hagar road, while we went with a bag of dates and a blanket each.

It will not be easy to fill the gap that he has left. P.L.S.

UGO MONNERET DE VILLARD (1881–1954)

This obituary of Ugo Monneret de Villard appeared in Oriente Moderno of December 1954. In view of the great contributions that Monneret de Villard made to Sudan Archaeology, I am glad to reprint it here with the kind permission of Professor Ettore Rossi, the editor of that journal.

UGO MONNERET DE VILLARD

(1881–1954)

Incontrai Ugo Monneret de Villard per la prima volta nell’aprile del 1925 al Cairo ove ero andato per il Congresso Internazionale di Geografia; si interessò dei miei studi e mi propose ricerche sui trattati di hisbah musulmani che, per la parte relativa alle corporazioni di mestiere e
ai mercati, avevano connessione con i suoi studi di storia dell’arte islamica. Successive mie occupazioni non mi consentirono di sviluppare una collaborazione dalla quale avrei ricavato grande profitto.

Il Monneret, nato a Milano il 16 gennaio 1881, vi aveva studiato ingegneria e aveva insegnato alcuni anni al Politecnico. Studioso di storia dell’arte milanese, sovratutto medioevale, fu portato ad estendere le sue ricerche all’arte cristiana dell’Oriente e compi a tale scopo viaggi tra il 1908 e la prima guerra europea. A questa sua preparazione si dovette l’incarico affidatogli nel 1921 dall’Ufficio delle Missioni Scientifiche in Levante per una missione archeologica in Egitto.

Sui primi otto anni della sua attività in Egitto il Monneret ha riferito in un articolo pubblicato in *Oriente Moderno*, che fa conoscere come egli riuscì, con scarsi mezzi e fra grandi difficoltà, ottenendo anche aiuti dal Governo egiziano e da istituzioni estere, a svolgere un lavoro di esplorazione archeologica e di studi definitivi i cui risultati sono contenuti in una serie abbondante di pubblicazioni:

- *La Chiesa di S. Barbara al Vecchio Cairo* (in collaborazione con Patriziolo), Firenze, 1922; ne esiste anche un’edizione inglese.


- *Deir el-Muharrarah*, Milano 1928.

- *La necropoli musulmana di Aswān*, Cairo, 1930. G. Wiet, nella prefazione a questo volume, definisce il Monneret ‘l’archeologhe le plus compétent, le plus documenté sur l’Égypte du moyen âge.’

Negli stessi anni il Monneret diede notizia di svariate ricerche sulla storia dell’arte cristiana in Egitto in articoli e note accademiche:

- *Oggetti egizi in una tomba germanica*, in *Aegyptus*, 1922, pp. 315-20.

- *Saggio di una bibliografia dell’arte cristiana in Egitto*, in *Bollettino del R. Istituto di Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte*, 1, Roma, 1922.


- *Un monumento romano di tipo egizio del Museo Archeologico di Milano*, in *Aegyptus*, 1921, pp. 281-84.

- *Sull’origine della doppia cupola persiana*, in *Architettura e arti decorative*, 1, 1921.


---
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L'arte di Samarra e il così detto fregio ʿṭūlīnīde, in Aegyptus, 1924, pp. 39-44.
Una pittura del Deyr el-Abyad, in Raccolta di scritti in onore di Giacomo Lumbroso, Milano, 1925, pp. 100-108.
Nota sulle chiese di al-Fustāt, Roma, 1929.
Note nubiane in Aegyptus, XII (1932)
Un santuario di Min-Pan in Nubia, in Aegyptus, XIII (1933).
Oreficeria barbara in Africa, in Memorie storiche foroiglesi, xxx (1934).
La storia e l'archeologia della Nubia cristiana occuparono per alcuni anni il Monneret in viaggi e scavi e nella preparazione di pubblicazioni:
La Nubia Medioevoale, Cairo, 1935, a cura del Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte (descrizione archeologica dei monumenti).
La Nubia Romana, Roma, Istituto per l'Oriente, 1941.
Un tipo di chiesa abissina, in Africa Italiana, VI (1935).
Iscrizione merotica di Kawa, in Aegyptus, XVII (1937).
Nota sulle più antiche miniature abissine, in Orientalia, VIII (1939).
Una iscrizione marwānide su stoffa nel sec. XI nella basilica di S. Ambrogio a Milano, in Oriente Moderno, XX (1940), pp. 504-6.
Le fortezze della Nubia, in Miscellanea Gregoriana, Città del Vaticano, 1941.
Gli studi sull'archeologia cristiana di Egitto, in Orientalia Christiana Periodica, VII (1941).
Un codice arabo-spaugnolo con miniature, in Bibliofilia, XLIII (1941).
Il culto del sole a Meroe, in Rass. Studi Etiopi, II (1942).
La coronazione della Vergine in Abissinia, in Bibliofilia, XLIV (1942).
Un avorio dell’Asia Centrale scoperto nei pressi di Roma, Roma, 1942.
Su una possibile origine delle danze liturgiche nella Chiesa abissina, in Oriente Moderno, XXII (1942), pp. 389-91.
Perché la Chiesa abissina dipendeva dal Patriarca di Alessandria, in Oriente Moderno, XXIII (1943), pp. 308-11.
Antiochia e Milano nel VI secolo, in Orientalia Christiana Periodica, 1946, pp. 374-80.
Miniature veneto-cretesi in un codice etiopic, in Bibliofilia, XLVII (1945).
La Madonna di S. Maria Maggiore e l’illustrazione dei Miracoli di Maria in Abissinia, in Annali Lateranensi, XI (1947).
OBITUARY

Aksum e i Quattro Re del Mondo, in Annali Lateranensi, xvii (1948), pp. 125-80.
La fiera di Batnai e la traslazione di S. Tommaso a Edessa, in Rend. dell'Acc. Naz. dei Lincei,
serie vili, vol. vii, fasc. 3-4, marzo-aprile 1951, pp. 77-104.
The Temple of the Imperial Cult at Luxor, in Archaeologia, xcvi (1953), pp. 85-105.
Il 'tāq' di Irnu 'l-Qais, in Rendiconti dell'Acc. Naz. dei Lincei, serie viii, vol. viii, fasc. 5-6,
Nelle ultime pubblicazioni del M. si alternano studi storici e studi di storia dell'arte orientale.
Lo studio dell'Islam in Europa nel XII e nel XIII secolo, Città del Vaticano, 1944 (Studi e Testi, n. 110); libro pieno di suggerimenti e di indicazioni bibliografiche e d'archivio per ricerche originali.
Le pitture musulmane al soffitto della Cappella Palatina in Palermo, Roma, Libreria dello Stato, 1950; opera monumentale nella quale per la prima volta sono fatte conoscere e interpretate criticamente centinaia di pitture del soffitto della Capella del Palazzo Reale di Palermo, eseguite probabilmente da artisti dell'Africa Settentrionale e dell'Egitto sotto il re Ruggero tra il 1132 e il 1143.
Le leggende orientali sui Magi Evangelici, Città del Vaticano, 1952 (Studi e Testi, n. 163), dottissimo e profondo studio che utilizza fonti arabe, siriane, iraniche, turche, armene, etiopiche, esamina le versioni della leggenda in Oriente e la sintesi europea nell'opera del carmelitano Giovanni da Hillsheim nel secolo xiv.
L'arte iranica, Milano, 1954.
Il Monneret univa al fine intuitivo e al gusto artistico conoscenze storiche e erudizione bibliografica formidabili. Già in Egitto aveva predisposto un programma di 'Repertorio dell'arte cristiana in Egitto'; negli anni seguenti attese a preparare una (inedita) bibliografia sull'arte islamica; negli ultimi mesi, prima del male che gli ha interrotto l'operosa attività, lavorava attorno a un catalogo degli oggetti orientali esistenti presso musei, istituti e privati in Italia.4 Era socio dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, membro dell'Istituto Egiziano, corrispondente straniero dell'Istituto di Francia.
È morto il 5 novembre 1954 a Roma, lasciando un vuoto nei nostri studi e il rimpianto di chi ha ammirato la sua dottrina a apprezzato le qualità del suo animo adombrate da un carattere fiero e sdegnoso.

ETTORE ROSSI.
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