To the reclamation and preservation of the peoples, cultures, and histories of ancient and medieval Nubia and to the illumination of its present.
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Editor's Foreword

There is an unfortunate tendency to rank ancient civilizations as a function of the abundance and impressiveness of their remains. This is understandable, since there is a direct appeal to the eye and vicarious visits can be arranged. But the shortage of remains does not in any way detract from the glory or greatness of a bygone civilization. This applies directly to Ancient Nubia, little of which has been recovered and, sadly, may never be recovered as it is now hidden under a vast lake. This is particularly regrettable since Nubia is a link among the ancient civilizations in a part of the world where it had long been assumed that little could be found, an assumption that is finally being discarded. This is indeed a great civilization in Black Africa, often subject to Ancient Egypt, but occasionally ruling it. And it was succeeded by various states and entities in later periods that are also of lasting interest.

The Historical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval Nubia is a welcome contribution to our knowledge of that part of the world, all the more significant in that our knowledge is still so sketchy. It begins with prehistoric times, emphasizes the dynastic period, continues on to the Kushitic and Meroitic eras, and concludes with a millennium of Christian Nubia. This long progression is first traced in the chronology. It is then described more amply in the introduction. It is the dictionary section that goes into greater detail on the more notable polities, the more eminent rulers, the numerous conflicts and battles, and salient aspects of the societies, economies, and cultures. For those who want to learn more, and they will not be lacking, the bibliography presents portions of the existing literature and points readers to more specialized sources.

This volume was written by Richard A. Lobban Jr., professor of anthropology, who also served as the director of the Program of African and Afro-American Studies at Rhode Island College. He has long been interested in Nubia since his doctoral field research on the Nubians in
1970–1972. His interest began with the modern Mahas Nubians but now embraces ancient and Medieval Nubia as well. His work includes numerous papers, lectures, classes, and exhibits at the Brooklyn Museum and Boston Museum of Fine Arts. Dr. Lobban studied at the University of Khartoum and was a founder and the first president of the Sudan Studies Association, where he still serves as executive director. He is also a coauthor of the second and third editions of the Historical Dictionary of the Sudan that previously covered Nubia, but should now be read in conjunction with the Historical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval Nubia to perceive the full sweep of history in this part of the historically rich Nile Valley.

Jon Woronoff
Series Editor
I would like to record my appreciation to John Voll for producing the first edition of the *Historical Dictionary of the Sudan* in 1978 and to Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, who joined the second edition in 1992. However, with scholarship on Sudan growing rapidly, the material has become more specialized, and a logical division has emerged between those working on Sudanese antiquity and “modern” issues relating to its Islamic period. This gave the motivation for separating the original books into two. Thus, the third edition of the *Historical Dictionary of the Sudan* (2003) will be continued with myself, Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, and now joined by Robert Kramer. This is focused on the Islamic times, while the present book covers the Prehistoric period, through antiquity and until the end of the medieval Christian kingdoms.

Rhode Island College, my home institution, has regularly expressed its confidence in me by sabbatical leaves, curricular flexibility, and research grants. Without this assistance over three decades, it would have been impossible to consider writing this book on a huge country with a long, complex history and very diverse cultures. It was at Rhode Island College’s Program of African and Afro-American Studies and my home Department of Anthropology that I began regular classroom instruction using ancient and modern Nubian materials and concepts. Here and at Tufts University I met some of my best students, who have coauthored or authored a number of the entries in this present work. I am very grateful to the following colleagues and former and present students: Frederick Collins, Valerie de Liedekerke, Kharyssa Rhodes, Paul Khalil Saucier, Melissa Talbot, Steffan Wenig, and Pawel Wolf, whose signed entries are included here.

I am also honored to serve as vice president of the Rhode Island Black Heritage Society, which has given me the opportunity to present some of these ideas, as well as the Narragansett Society of the Archaeological
Institute of America, which has elected me as president, where I could lecture on ancient Nubia and discuss it with members and officers Martha Joukowsky, Bonnie Olchowski, Jill Baker, Ann Thorndike, and Alex Thompson. The Friends of the Egyptology Society at Brown University has also been supportive, particularly Leonard and Barbara Lesko, Lanny Bell, and students Mariam Ayad and Frank Caizzi. Brown University’s Learning Community also gave me the chance to organize a condensed form of the course on ancient Nubia that I regularly teach at Rhode Island College. Let me also record my appreciation to the Sudan Studies Association for allowing me to serve in various ways and to present papers on ancient Nubian topics of abiding interest.

The Nubian Institutes—organized by Dr. Ronald Bailey and hosted by the Museum of Fine Arts and its curator at the time, Dr. Timothy Kendall, and the Museum of the National Center for African-American Artists directed by Dr. Barry Gaither—played important supportive roles in the background of this research and writing. Participation at the Meroitic Studies Conference in London and the Nubian Studies Conferences in Boston and Rome were also of great value to bring my own research up to date.

Let me also include my sincere appreciation to Osama ‘Abdel Wathiq, Hosni ‘Abdel Rahim, and many other members of his staff at the Nubia Museum in Aswan; Osama al-Nour at the Sudan National Museum, in better days, in Khartoum; and ‘Ali Hakem at the University of Khartoum, also in better times. I also wish to thank my many Mahas Nubian friends on Tuti Island, especially Mohammed Osman Agabash, Mohammed El-Hadi Shukralla, Mutusim ‘Abd el-Wahab, Sid Ahmed Mohammed Ali, and the late Asma ‘Abd el-Rahim, where I first whetted my intellectual appetite on Nubian studies more than thirty years ago while doing my Ph.D. in African anthropology at Northwestern University. Working closely under the late Dr. Ibrahim Abu Lughod, the former associate director of African Studies, was also critical at a time when studying Sudan was often discouraged.

In Aswan, I have learned so much from Shabaan ‘Abd el-Baset ‘Ali, Saleem ‘Abd el-Muta’al, Marcus Jaeger, and Gerard Lauche. I must also record a deep appreciation for my secret role models William Y. Adams and Nettie Adams, who have set the pace, the direction, and the heights in Nubian studies for many generations. The most recent contributor to this work has been Eugenio Fantusati at the
University of Rome ("La Sapienza"), who has graciously and tirelessly reviewed the entire manuscript seeking errors and points of criticism. Finally, last on this list but always first to hear my ideas and interpretation, is my anthropologist colleague, wife, and fellow Sudanist Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban. With our decades of conversations, she is the first point of testing ideas and the last stop in the many reality checks for producing a work like this.

To all these people and institutions, I am most grateful indeed, but lamentably I cannot hold them responsible for any errors in fact or interpretation.
By not including the Islamic period in this dictionary, I have focused on ancient and medieval Nubia. Now, after successive rises in dams at Aswan in the twentieth century, more of ancient Nubia has been either lost forever or recovered in desperate urgency. Clearly, the rushed salvage work was a great impetus for the increased interest Nubia in the 1960s. Happily, the latest expression of this interest is the recent opening of the new Nubian Museum in Aswan (Egypt’s most recent museum) and the preservation of Nubian antiquities in Khartoum as well as numerous museums around the world, especially the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, the Metropolitan Museum in New York, the British Museum in London, and the Louvre in Paris, all of which I have visited or consulted for this work.

However, the Nubian artifacts were usually displayed in conjunction with Egyptological exhibits until recently. At the Egyptian National Museum in Cairo, some important Nubian artifacts (e.g., the famed Piankhy stela) are rarely visited by tourist groups and have only the slightest identification. The outside front of the same museum omits references to the 25th Dynasty, when Nubians ruled Egypt.

The Boston Museum of Fine Arts, with the vast Nubian collections of George Reisner tucked quietly in the basement, finally heard this message by the 1990s. Add to this that some body tissues of King Taharka apparently reside at Harvard’s Peabody Museum. The time was at hand to rediscover Nubia. Reisner’s paradigm that Nubia was only a pale reflection of the majesty of Egypt was shaken by civil rights in America and the African liberation from colonialism. The residual proprietary issues of the ethics of basing a large museum collection on objects collected under colonial military occupation are still not addressed and remain unresolved.

In America, the period of the civil rights movement and the ongoing struggle against racism confronted the legacy of American slavery and
the wrongly but widely held view that Africa had little written history and certainly less great history. College-level Western civilization textbooks rarely mention Nubia at all, and by conceptually “moving” Egypt off the African continent and knowing little about Nubia, these racist mythologies were sustained amidst contrary archaeological and textual evidence. However, Africa was steadily centered as primordial in the origin of our species, and no amount of racism could jar this away. In Africa, the 1960s was a time of national liberation movements and the final defeat of European colonial and military occupation. The missing piece of “great and ancient” African written history finally came into view with the mounting evidence about Nubia in particular. In the process, “neutral” scholarly knowledge became politicized.

Despite positive views of “Ethiopia” (their term for Nubia) from Herodotus and Eratosthenes to Ibn Battuta and Jean François Champollion, Nubia was placed in the shadows of intellectual darkness. We now know that this was not the case for Anténor Firmin, the Haitian pioneer anthropologist who, in 1885, correctly saw the great role of the ancient Nile valley Africa in world history from “Memphis to Meroë.” But being Black, Haitian, pro-Africa, and francophone, his nineteenth-century work was lost to the anglophone, pro-colonial, and Negro-phobic intellectual community. Firmin’s book De l’Égalité des Races Humaines appeared in its first English edition in 2000.

In 1978, the Brooklyn Museum advanced this new era in the United States with its famous *Africa in Antiquity Exhibition* and its two volumes that are still consulted today. This marvelous exhibit put ancient, medieval, and modern Nubia front and center in a truly pioneering fashion. As a participant in the lecture series and ethnographic contributor to the exhibition, I easily recall how inspirational this was at that time and has remained so since. At last, the Nubian story was liberated from the intellectual and practical shackles that had confined it for so many centuries.

The George Reisner excavations were conducted following England’s bloody conquest of Sudan in which 10,000 to 12,000 Sudanese lost their lives in one morning massacre at Omdurman by English cannons, gunboats, and Gatling guns. The colonial military occupation that followed allowed the archaeological work to proceed while developing the natural and agricultural resources of Nubia/Sudan for Britain. Even Riesner’s colleague Dows Dunham noted in his “Recollections of an
Egyptologist” that Sudanese slaves were used as excavators at Jebel Barkal in 1918–1920, decades after slaves were emancipated in the United States. Statements that the work was approved and coordinated by the government of Sudan overlook the fact that the administration was British and Egyptian and not Sudanese at all. But the passion and intellect of A. J. Arkell, Peter Shinnie, and William Y. Adams managed to keep many important pieces of Nubian history in Khartoum, and with Nubian archaeology only in its infancy, much remained protected and unexcavated under the sands.

Politics, prejudice, and archaeology do not make very comfortable bedfellows, but such pioneer African American and pan-African scholars of African history as Anténor Firmin, W. E. B. DuBois, William Leo Hansberry, Joseph Harris, Frank Snowden, and Cheikh Anta Diop often found their works or themselves marginalized or openly excluded from the important public exhibitions and forums about ancient Nubia until recent decades. Hansberry, for one [(quoted by Joseph E. Harris (ed.) in Pillars in Ethiopian History, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1981))], was actively discouraged from Nubian archaeology by Dows Dunham, saying that the presence of an “American Negro” would “seriously affect the prestige of the other members and the respect which the native employees would have for them” (p. 13).

Trained in art history, Timothy Kendall, curator of the Museum of Fine Arts at the time, saw the importance of the Nubian collection then stored in the basement of the museum. A Boston “Nubian salvage project” began with pieces of history being raised from the lower strata of the basement to a handsome permanent exhibition on Nubia that has now been visited by thousands. He even found a lost part of Nubian King Aspelta’s nose in the basement. The museum guide to Nubia, by Joyce Haynes, is a fine introduction to this Nubian exhibition and to Nubian history. One day, the massive tomb of Aspelta may also be raised for public view from its subterranean resting place. Meanwhile, Timothy Kendall and Barry Gaither have mounted a full-scale replica of the tomb at the much smaller Museum of the National Center of African-American Artists in Boston. A new website on ancient Nubia has been pioneered by Ronald Bailey. We truly are in a new age.

In recent years, Egypt and Nubia have also attracted great interest because of the arrival of the controversial book Black Athena by Martin Bernal. Among other things, Bernal has sought to explore the relationship
between the Classical Greco-Roman world and Africa. His allegations of prejudice and bias in this scholarship certainly provoked some classical scholars who tended to separate Egypt from Africa and who generally ignored Nubia altogether. Even the great Nubianist George Reisner saw Nubia mainly as a poor reflection of Egypt. The ideas of DeGobineau and Hooton about the fall of civilizations attributed to “miscegenation” were still current in these times. The definitional debate about Egypt’s role, relationship, and identification with Africa may never be resolved, but the identity of Nubia as the oldest unequivocal African land potentially moves it into the spotlight.

Afrocentric scholars note, for example, that in the 25th Dynasty, Nubians could be said to “rule the [ancient] world” and thereby stimulate discussion about the role of Africans in these times, when at least three have their names in the Bible. Moreover, a significant period of independent, ancient Nubian history was contemporary with the Greek and Roman occupation of Egypt, so it figures importantly in the polarized debate. Today, some argue that “multiculturalism” should empower the “voices” of those who were not heard through the silence of racial supremacy. Thus, Nubian studies can be seen through many different lenses.

This new edition has transformed the former reference works (1979, 1992) from which it descends in this series. Substantial revisions, expansions, interpretations, and additions have been made, and material has been deleted that relates to the period after 1504 and the arrival of Islam to the central Sudan. Expanded entries on many new topics are included, as are new maps, charts, and tables. The revised bibliography contains major new sections on the proliferation of literature on ancient Nubia as well as a more comprehensive collection of earlier published works. I have made an effort to include works published on Nubia until 2000 through computer searches of the steadily growing number of websites.

The revised chronology has been substantially expanded to include new sections on early humanity and prehistory, the A-Horizon, the C-Horizon, Kerma, relations with Dynastic Egypt, the 25th Dynasty, the Napatan and Meroitic periods of Kush, post-Meroitic times, and finally the long epoch of medieval Christian kingdoms in Nubia. Biographies of the 25th Dynasty kings and discussion of the decipherment of Meroitic are also included.
The selection of topics is a difficult matter for a variety of reasons. First, I have sought to include the main leaders, observers, officials, places, and events that have defined the historical experience of ancient Nubia from prehistoric times to the end of Christianity. Naturally, disagreements may exist about this, but the problem becomes more challenging when some important figures and events have few written records, and some minor figures and events are well chronicled. Such are the usual problems of historiography, and when in doubt about interpretation or perspective, I have sought to ascertain a Nubian point of view when possible to avoid or minimize Egyptocentrism and Eurocentrism.

Studying Egypt through Nubian eyes would certainly be as problematic as studying Nubia through Egyptian eyes. Yet these peoples are neighbors, brothers and sisters, rivals, and allies. The “Golden Age” of New Kingdom Egypt represented colonial occupation of Nubia in which Nubians were usually reported to be “vile” tributaries needing regular punitive raids. Then the “Golden Age” of 25th Dynasty Nubians represented their political domination and religious salvation of Egypt. The chaotic “Intermediate periods” for Egypt were times of relative liberation for Nubians. But measured by numbers of dynasties or dynastic years in Egypt, disunity was almost as common as their achievement of a unitary state. The “evil” Hyksos enemies of Egypt in the 17th Dynasty were the allies of Nubians at Kerma. In Predynastic times, Nubian peoples, judging from some archaeological evidence, extended north of Aswan into Upper Egypt, where the first Egyptian state was created at Hierakonpolis. What shall be deduced from that? Was the founder of the Middle Kingdom of Nubian origins? Does it matter? Is being an Egyptian a matter of race, ethnicity, or nationality? Are Nubians so mixed with Nilotics and Egyptian peoples that the idea of Nubian homogeneity is an illusion? What a shame that modern social debates are even conducted through a “skin-colored” history in the first place.

Are the people depicted on New Kingdom walls, typically called “Nubian slaves,” really Nubian in the modern geographical or anthropological sense of the word, or are they from the more southern Nuba Mountains instead? Today, Nubia straddles both Egypt and Sudan, and tens of thousands of Nubians live in both nations, but no international body notes a modern nation of the ancient land of Nubia. Clearly, Egypto–Nubian relationships are complex and raise many questions.
When Nubian judgments differ, I have tried to present multiple and sometimes contradictory views. I have pursued Nubian and Sudanese studies mainly from my discipline of anthropology and its subfield of archaeology. We often see society from the grassroots upward, while some historians may see society from a top-down view based on primary texts and “great men,” a stance that may overlook the role of women, minorities, and nonliterate and marginal peoples. Archaeologists are naturally focused on the material remains of extinct societies. Ultimately, all researchers are limited by their access and analysis of available data, be they anthropologists, archaeologists, or art historians. We all wish we knew more.

In short, I have devised the *Historical Dictionary of the Ancient and Medieval Nubia* in an effort to make it a more comprehensive reference and research tool, especially for undergraduate students and generalist researchers. On the other hand, specialists in this field should find the entries rapidly accessible for their own teaching or scholarship, and, as necessary, the extensive bibliography can take them back to the primary sources consulted for more detailed literature review as they may require. A variety of audiences will find something here. Those studying the Islamic period can refer to the third edition of the *Historical Dictionary of the Sudan*. 
Spelling and Alphabetical Conventions

Problems exist with spelling conventions in non-Western languages that are often reported phonetically in a still greater diversity of languages. These approximations may replicate the sounds heard by one observer but not another. “Official” transliteration orthography for hieroglyphics or Arabic is one way out, but these precise forms may appear uncomfortable and awkward. In addition, common forms exist that are not proper transliterations. As a consequence, for this general book of reference, I have elected as a guide the simpler and more common forms when a choice was possible. Frequently, I have given the alternative spellings. Especially in the case of Meroitic terms that are largely untranslated, this is a challenging issue. Egyptian hieroglyphics are notably short on vowels, and this makes rendering in English awkward. Meroitic demotic (cursive) suffers similarly, thus the long-standing practice of inserting vowels following no particular logic or pattern.

In many cases in Nubian antiquity, scholars have no idea of what people called themselves. Often the only clue is from foreigners, such as Egyptians, Greeks, or Romans, with their own inherent biases in Nubian nomenclature. Shifting toponyms for the same places over this long period of time are no less problematic. Thus, this work is much confounded by the many nonliterate ancient Nubian societies whose languages are unwritten, untranslated, unknown, or neither ancient Egyptian, Greek, Latin, Arabic, nor European. When available, each entry also provides variant forms of the names. This may offend some linguists, epigraphers, and philologists, but every effort was made to make the book more “user friendly” and intelligible to the generalist audience for whom it is mainly intended.

For later terms of Arabic origin, I have largely followed the standard transliteration guide for Arabic of the International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies, but forms are in established usage that are not “proper”
transliterations. An excellent example of this much debated problem is the variety of ways in which persons spell their own names. Shall a Sudanese person be informed that his or her name is spelled “incorrectly”? For example, should it be ‘Abdel Wahhab Muhammad, ‘Abd al-Wahhab Mohamed, ‘Abdelwahhab Mohammed, or Abdelwahhab Mohamet? Then, in this confusion, how does one alphabetize? Should this example be alphabetized under “A,” “al,” “W,” or “M”? To “solve” this problem, this book is guided by most common usage and spelling and by the individual’s spelling of his or her name when widely known. The embedded article “al-” or “el-” is not used for alphabetization but the first letter after it. Similarly I have decided to use the term “Sudan” rather than “the Sudan.” Recalling that the term “Nubia” overlaps with “Kush” and that modern Sudan was called “Ethiopia” and “Nubia” or “Turkish Nubia” from the nineteenth century to the early part of the twentieth will offer many chances for confusion.

Cross-references in the dictionary are indicated by the insertion of “q.v.” and “qq.v.” These will guide the reader from a possibly confusing name they are searching for to our version in its alphabetical location in the book. Although all dictionaries are in alphabetical order, we have also provided a separate short index to survey the entries.

ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCE</td>
<td>before the common era (i.e., before Christ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>before present (for approximate dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBR</td>
<td>crude birth rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDR</td>
<td>crude death rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>common era (i.e., AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDR</td>
<td>infant death rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Sudan Studies Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSUK</td>
<td>Sudan Studies Society of the United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Main Sites in Ancient Nubia
2. Orientation Map of the Cataracts on the Nile and Detailed Sections
3. Map A: Aswan Area and First Cataract
4. Map B: Lower Nubia, or Wawat (First and Second Cataracts)
5. Map C: Third Cataract Area
6. Map D: The Nile at the Fourth Cataract Area
Map E: The Nile in the Meroë Area between Fifth and Sixth Cataracts
Chronology

Note: Early dates are very approximate and vary by location.

3,000,000–1,500,000 BP  *Australopithecus africanus* and *Homo habilis* type of fossils found in neighboring Ethiopia, Eritrea, Kenya, and Chad. Thus, it is most likely that they ranged in the Sudanese savanna in late Pliocene or early Pleistocene periods.

750,000 BP  *Homo erectus* established in Africa and Asia in later Pleistocene.

250,000–100,000 BP  Lower Paleolithic (Chellean tradition), especially at Khor Abu Anga (near Omdurman); bifacial handaxes, few flake tools.

100,000–50,000 BP  *Homo sapiens neandertalensis* (late Pleistocene Acheulian tradition) established in Africa.

50,000 BP  *Homo sapiens sapiens* (“Bushman”) in the Nile valley.

50,000–30,000 BP  Middle Paleolithic, Mousterian industries, denticulate tools, flaking techniques.

30,000–10,000 BP  Sahara still has extensive grasslands.

20,000 BP  Some semisedentary populations established on Nile and nomadic groups in adjoining savanna.

30,000–9,000 BP  Upper Paleolithic era in Sudan: Levallois tradition gradually transforms to Mesolithic. Advanced hunting and collecting of Stillbay culture represented by the Singa skull from the Blue Nile. This is the oldest hominid fossil presently known for Sudan.
8000 BP Very late Upper Paleolithic; Sebilian III tool types. Domestic cattle in Nile valley.

7000–4500 BCE Mesolithic to early Neolithic Period, gradual expansion of microliths, arrowheads, harpoon heads, and pebble tools for these hunting and fishing peoples. Perhaps there is some increase of settled population sites in the “Khartoum Mesolithic.” Contemporary Abkan, Qadan, Kulb, and Dakka sites are known in Lower Nubia, with rock drawings of wild animals, also at the Shaqadud site in Butana. All have traditions of decorated but unpolished “wavy-line” pottery. This is one of the oldest pottery types in Africa and can be linked to Saharan populations as far as the Fayum and Tibesti plateau. Wetter climate and much higher Nile floods.

4500–3500 BCE Early to Middle Neolithic, as in Kadero, Kadada, and Esh-Shaheinab sites, pastoralism; domestication of the pygmy goat, some riverine agriculture, shell beads, groovers, flakes, borers, oared boats; elaboration of the “wavy-line” pottery with impressed dots and zigzags. Bone for hooks and harpoons. Black and red polished bowls. Improved hunting of megafauna. Ancestors of Beja peoples established in Red Sea hills.

3250 BCE Late Neolithic. “Classic” A-Horizon, Butn al-Hajr, and Afye sites, contemporary with Badarian and Nagadan peoples in Predynastic Egypt. Characteristic black and red polished “eggshell” and ovoid pottery sometimes with a ripple finish, sometimes painted. Cultural and economic contact with Predynastic Egypt, especially in Lower Nubia.

DYNASTIC TIMES IN NUBIA AND EGYPT

3100 BCE Unification of Upper and Lower Egypt by Pharaoh Menes (Narmer?) and the dynastic order of the Old Kingdom. Conquest inscription of Pharaoh Djer at Sheikh Suliman in Nubia. Egyptian occupation and raiding against the Ta-Seti in Sudanese Nubia; border fort at Buhen. Hieroglyphics and huge pyramids introduced.

2700 BCE Senefru (4th Dynasty) seizes 200,000 cattle and 7,000 slaves in raids on Nubia, thus beginning a period of hostile Egypto-Nubian relations.

2700–2100 BCE Period of supposed B-Group in Nubia, which is likely a decadent A-Group. Old Kingdom and First Intermediate trade expeditions to Wawat, Irtet, Setjiu, and Yam in Nubia.

2500 BCE Atbai pottery tradition in Gash/Kassala area.

2500–2100 BCE Rise of C-Horizon and relative decline of Egyptian influence in Sudan during Egypt’s First Intermediate period. Characteristic shiny black pottery with geometric designs. Fame for cattle rearing. Early small states in Nubia, such as Setiu, Medjay, Irtet, and Yam/Irem (early Kerma). C-Horizon sites at Amada, Aniba, and Debeiri.

RISE OF KERMA

2250–2050 BCE Rise of Kerma before First Intermediate period in Egypt (7th–10th Dynasties).

2050–1795 BCE Reunification of Egypt by Pharaoh Mentuhotep II; start of the Middle Kingdom (11th–12th Dynasties); major forts and temples at Faras, Aksha, Semna, and Buhen. Resumption of Egyptian attacks against Nubia.

1900–1575 BCE Further expansion of Kerma culture during Egypt’s Middle Kingdom; beaker pottery with red polish; huge tumulus burials for Kerma kings with sacrificial burials; massive mud-brick defuffa buildings.

1887–1850 BCE Pharaoh Sesostris III has extensive raiding, trading, and fort network in Nubia.

1786–1567 BCE Second Intermediate period in Egypt (13th–17th Dynasties), including the Hyksos (Asian Semites) who invade Lower Egypt; horses, horse-drawn war chariots, and bronze swords introduced; return of Nubian autonomy; Hyksos seek Nubian allies against Egyptian Kamose’s effort to reunify the Nile. Lower Egyptian royalty flee to Nubia. End of the “First Empire” state of Kush.
COLONIZATION OF NUBIA BY NEW KINGDOM EGYPTIANS

1570–1090 BCE  Kerma is destroyed by Egyptian New Kingdom pharaohs who rule northern Sudan reaching the Fourth Cataract; numerous forts, temples, and towns built; *shaduf* (*keeyay*) water-bucket irrigation technology introduced; the “viceroys of Kush” becomes an established position that governs Lower Nubia (Wawat) and Upper Nubia (Kush).

1570–1546 BCE  Reign of Ahmose I in Egypt; Nubian campaigns and the appointment of an Egyptian as the “vicereys of Kush.”

1546–1526 BCE  Reign of Amenhotep I; Thuwre appointed viceroy of Wawat and Kush.

1530 BCE  War against Kush by Pharaoh Tuthmosis I; goal to seize gold, livestock, and slave soldiers.

1515–1484 BCE  Reign of Queen Hatshepsut, who builds temples in Nubia and conducts one raid.

1490–1436 BCE  Pharaoh Tuthmosis III has repeated military expeditions against Nubia past the Third Cataract; major temple erected at Semna. Principle goals: slaves, gold, cattle, and ivory.

1410 BCE  Joshua at the battle of Jericho

1403–1365 BCE  Reign of Amenhotep III, builder of temple at Solb.

1375 BCE  Nubian revolt against Amenhotep III.

1361–1352 BCE  Reign of Tutankhamen; Huy appointed viceroy of Kush; Huy responsible for gold production and tribute from Wawat and Kush.

1298–1232 BCE  Reign of Ramses II; manorial occupation of northern Sudan up to the Fourth Cataract. Temples at Abu Simbel, Amara West, and Aksha. Setau appointed viceroy of Kush.

1287 BCE  Nubian revolt against Egypt.

1069–715 BCE  Third Intermediate period in Egypt (21st–24th Dynasties); rival dynasties in Egypt Tanite (21st Dynasty, 1069–945 BCE) established in delta, later replaced by another dynasty at Bubastis. Herihor serves as viceroy of Kush under Ramses XI. As the 20th Dynasty
closes, Herihor (ca. 1060 BCE) becomes High Priest of Amun and his son (?) Piankhy becomes viceroy of Nubia.

1000–960 BCE Reign of King David of Israel.

1000–750 BCE Period of Phoenician trading prosperity.

ca. 970 BCE Salvage of royal Egyptian mummies to secret cache at Deir al Bahri.

960–931 BCE Reign of King Solomon of Israel.

KINGDOM OF KUSH EMERGES AT NAPATA

cia. 950 BCE Kushites under Aserkhamen (?) start attacks on Egypt in attempt to expand northward.

945–715 BCE Reign of the 22nd Dynasty; delta rivalries.

ca. 850 BCE Napatan kings and queens begin burials at Kurru.

825–730 BCE Age of Euboean (Greek) regional expansion and colonization.

818–715 BCE Reign of the 23rd Dynasty; delta rivalries.

ca. 800 BCE Kush expands northward with a weak, divided Egypt, Piankhy claims Thebes as province of Kush. Projected as a man of honor, a horse fancier, and a “deliverer” from disunity, he responds to the pleas from delta princes to reunify the Nile and defeat Osorkon IV of the 22nd Dynasty.

790–760 BCE Reign of Kushite Pharaoh Alara, probable founder of the 25th Dynasty, starting the “Late period” in Egypt and the reunification of the Nile valley.

765 BCE Piankhy completes conquest of Egypt.

KUSHITE RULE OF ALL OF EGYPT AS THE 25TH DYNASTY

760–656 BCE Reunification of Egypt under the Kushitic or “Ethiopian” or Nubian 25th Dynasty.
760–747 BCE Reign of Kushite Pharaoh Kashta, who drove Osorkon IV (22nd Dynasty) back into the Egyptian delta; Kashta was buried at Kurru, not Thebes.

750–700 BCE Phoenician alphabet arrives in Greece; expansion of regional writing systems.

747–716 BCE Reign of Pharaoh Piankhy, son of Kashta. Piankhy controls all of Egypt and uses siege tactics against the Assyrians.

ca. 730 BCE Piankhy fights Tefnakht (24th Dynasty) in the delta and halts Tefnakht’s drive to the south.

ca. 730 BCE Piankhy erects conquest stela at Jebel Barkal.

744–612 BCE Height of Assyrian power.

716 BCE Death of Piankhy; he is buried at Kurru.

716–701 BCE Reign of Pharaoh Shabaka (younger brother of Piankhy); Shabaka is noted in the Old Testament (Genesis 10:7). It was also noted that Isaiah, king of Israel, gave gifts to Shabaka, who had supported these Palestinians at Al-Taku in their fight against the Assyrians under Sennacherib. In order to divert the Assyrians, Shabaka stimulated revolts in the Levant. Later, in 701, when expecting battle with Sennacherib in the delta, he is saved when the Assyrians withdraw because of a plague epidemic among their troops. Shabaka ruled mainly from Thebes and is buried at Kurru.

701–690 BCE Reign of Pharaoh Shabataka (Shebitqu). Shabataka is also noted in the Old Testament (Genesis 10:7); he is buried at Kurru.

690–664 BCE Pharaoh Taharka (younger brother of Shabataka). As crown prince, Taharka joined forces of Hezekiah of Judaea (Israel) in their joint struggle against the Assyrians, then led by Sennacherib (704–681 BC). Ruling from Memphis and Thebes, he continually fought to protect the Nile valley from the Assyrians, led by Esarhaddon (680–669), the son and successor of Sennacherib. Taharka also sought the restoration of pharaonic authority, religion, and architecture; grandson of Kashta.

ca. 690 BCE Coronation of Taharka at Memphis; Taharka adds to the temple at Jebel Barkal.

680–669 BCE Camels introduced to Egypt by the Assyrian king Esarhaddon. Later, camels became critical in trans-Saharan trade. In or-
order to distract Esarhaddon away from the Nile, Taharka stimulated revolts at Sidon and Tyre in Phoenicia. These revolts were crushed and provoked Esarhaddon to strike at Taharka at Tanis and Memphis.

671 BCE  Esarhaddon speeds across Sinai with his camel cavalry and meets the Nubian and Egyptian forces of Taharka in the eastern delta; Taharka is defeated and withdraws from Tanis and retreats to his Memphis citadel.

670 BCE  Taharka retakes the delta from the Assyrians.

669 BCE  Assyrians under Esarhaddon siege and sack Memphis; son of Taharka captured and taken to Assyria; Taharka resumes tactical support of Phoenicians.

668 BCE  Esarhaddon plans return conquest but dies en route back to Egypt. Ashurbanipal (668–627 BCE), son of Esarhaddon, resumes revenge campaign and badly defeats Taharka in the delta and sacks Memphis.

667 BCE  Taharka withdraws from Egypt to Napata; delta princes call for Taharka to return to fight the Assyrians, but he does not respond.

664 BCE  Taharka dies and is buried at Kurru pyramid field. Rise of the 26th Dynasty in Egypt (664–525 BCE).

664–653 BCE  Reign of Pharaoh Tanutamun (Tanwetamani), nephew of Taharka.

664 BCE  Tanutamun briefly regains control of Memphis and the entire Nile valley but with weak support from the delta princes under Assyrian pressure; with rival claims to rule Lower Egypt by Psammetichos I (664–610 BCE), he withdraws to Thebes.

661 BCE  Tanutamun defeated in Memphis and driven from Thebes, which is sacked by Ashurbanipal.

656–590 BCE  Kushite withdrawal back to Sudan with the continued survival of the worship of Amun at Jebel Barkal/Napata.

653 BCE  Death of Tanutamun, the last Nubian king of Egypt to be buried at Kurru.

653–643 BCE  Reign of Atlanersa.

643–623 BCE  Reign of Senkamanisken (father of Aspelta and Anlamanii); buried at Nuri.
625 BCE  Naucratis established in delta for Greek traders.

623–593 BCE  Reign of Anlamani; campaigns against the Blemmyes in the Eastern Desert; Anlamani was crowned at Kawa and was buried at Nuri.

593–568 BCE  Reign of Aspelta, who plans attack against Necho II in Egypt; Aspelta is buried at Nuri.

591 BCE  Aspelta defeated in attempt to reclaim Egypt from the Saite 26th Dynasty; the border of Kush established at Second Cataract.

590 BCE  Psammetichos II (595–589, 26th Dynasty) invades Nubia to Third Cataract and fights at the northern plain of Dongola, seizing 4,200 captives. He also hacked out inscriptions to pharaohs of the 25th Dynasty, and his soldiers placed inscriptions at Abu Simbel. He may have sacked Napata and probably stimulated the gradual transfer of Kush’s capital from Napata to Meroë.

**KINGDOM OF KUSH AT NAPATA**

590 BCE–350 CE  Rise and gradual decline of Kush at Meroë; famed for notable iron-production technology; kings of Kush still proclaimed as “Lords of Two Lands” but only in words, not fact.

588 BCE  Judaean revolt against Babylon.

586 BCE  Babylonian repression against Judaea.

581 BCE  Exile of Jews from Jerusalem.

570–526 BCE  Amasis rules Egypt.

568–555 BCE  Reign of King Aramatelqo.

**PERSIANS ENTER NILE VALLEY**

539 BCE  Jews return to Jerusalem.

530 BCE  Death of Cyrus.

ca. 529–521 BCE  Reign of the Persian king Cambyses in Egypt.
525–398 BCE  Persian 27th Dynasty.
524 BCE  Cambyses campaigns in Nubia but is driven out.
487–485 BCE  Revolt in Upper Egypt.
486 BCE  Death of Darius; Xerxes comes to power.
462–454 BCE  Revolt in Egypt against the Persians; Romans give support to Egyptians.
430 BCE  Herodotus reaches Aswan.
429 BCE  Death of Pericles.
404–369 BCE  Reign of the Kushite king Harsiyotef, who fought the Blemmyes in the east; buried at Nuri.
360–342 BCE  Reign of last Egyptian pharaoh, Nectanebo II, of the 30th Dynasty (380–343 BCE).
342–333 BCE  Second Persian conquest of Egypt; Nectanebo II (31st Dynasty) flees to Nubia, the last native Egyptian to rule Egypt for more than 2,000 years; Nubia continues as an independent nation.
335–315 BCE  Reign of the Kushite king Nastasen, who fought against the Blemmyes and was fearful of Persian and Greek attacks; he is among the last Kushites to rule from Napata.

GREEKS ENTER NILE VALLEY

332 BCE  Siege and defeat of Tyre and Gaza by Alexander the Great of Macedonia; rout of Persians; conquest of Egypt and expeditions sent to Nubia; Greek language and culture introduced (an influence to create an alphabetic Meroitic language?).
331 BCE  Foundation of Alexandria.
323 BCE  Death of Alexander the Great.
305–284 BCE  Ptolemy I rules from Alexandria; famous library established.
283 BCE  Construction of the famed lighthouse of Pharos in Alexandria.

280–274 BCE  Ptolemy II raids Lower Nubia for captives and livestock, and has hunting or trading expeditions for elephants in Meroë. Greek descriptions of “Ethiopia” increase.

274 BCE  Ptolemy II wages first war against the Seleucids under Antiochus I.

KUSH MOVES FROM NAPATA TO MEREO

270 BCE  Standard date for the end of the Napatan period of Kush, but the state continues at Meroë.

264–241 BCE  First Punic War between Rome and Carthage.

260 BCE  First Kushite king, Ergamenes (Arkamani II), to be buried at Meroë (Bejrawiya cemetery); Ergamanes studied the Greek language; expansion of cattle and elephant hunting at Musawwarat es-Sufra in Butana plain; expansion of iron production.

260–253 BCE  Second Syrian War between Ptolemy II and Antiochus II.

253 BCE  Antiochus II married Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy II.

250 BCE  Translation of Jewish Bible into Greek as part of the popular regional literacy movement.

246–222 BCE  Reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes; has expedition in Nubia led by Eudoxus and wages war against Seleucus II in Third Syrian War (246–241).

222–205 BCE  Reign of Ptolemy IV Epiphanes; has good relations with Meroë, with which he traded for elephants.

219–217 BCE  Fourth Syrian War between Ptolemy IV and Antiochus III. Egypt is saved by intervention of Egyptian troops and Meroitic elephants at the battle of Raphia.

221–204 BCE  Ptolemy IV builds in the Dodekaschoenos.
218–201 BCE  Second Punic War.

204–185 BCE  Meroites regain control of Lower Nubia and foment revolts in Upper Egypt.

ca. 204–180 BCE  Reign of Ptolemy V; inscription of Rosetta Stone.

203–200 BCE  Philip and Antiochus plot against Egypt.

200 BCE  Greek geographer Eratosthenes describes Nubia.

196 BCE  Foundation of library at Pergamum.

181–145 BCE  Reign of Ptolemy VI; reactivates Nubian gold mines and regains control of the Dodekaschoenos to resume temple construction or additional projects.

170–168 BCE  War between Ptolemy VI and Antiochus IV of Syria.

166–164 BCE  Jewish (Maccabean) revolt against Antiochus IV, who desecrates the temple at Jerusalem and forces Hellenization. The Jewish celebration of Hanukkah commemorates the miracle of this time, which made oil in a lamp burn for eight days.

164–163 BCE  Flight of Ptolemy VI from Egypt.

150 BCE  Kandake Shanakdakheto has first clearly dated inscription in Meroitic cursive.

149–146 BCE  Third (and last) Punic War; Rome sacks Carthage.

147 BCE  Macedonia falls under the Roman Empire, and the northern Mediterranean power shifts.

145 BCE  Death of Ptolemy VI; Aristarchus and other intellectuals of the library at Alexandria flee with the rise of Ptolemy VIII.

145–130 BCE  Reign of Ptolemy VIII, Physcon.

ca. 100 BCE  Saqia (eskalay) waterwheel introduced; long conquest inscription recorded on stela of Qore Tanyidamani.

80–51 BCE  Reign of Ptolemy XII, “the Piper.”

73–71 BCE  Spartacus leads slave revolt against Rome.

63 BCE  Caesar Augustus (Octavian) born.
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55–54 BCE  Julius Caesar invades Britain.

ca. 50 BCE  Diodorus terms Nubia as the home of Egyptians and of civilization itself. Reigns of Kandakes Amanirenas and Amanishakheto.

48 BCE  Pompey flees to Egypt, where he is assassinated; Alexandrian War; Julius Caesar seeks rule of Egypt.

ROMANS ENTER NILE VALLEY

51–30 BCE  Reign of Cleopatra VII and Ptolemy XV, initially as coregents, then she rules alone.

44 BCE  Assassination of Julius Caesar on the Ides (fifteenth) of March.

44–21 BCE  Period of activity of the Roman geographer/historian Strabo.

42 BCE  Battle of Philippi; Mark Anthony defeats Brutus and Cassius.

37–36 BCE  Anthony in Egypt with Cleopatra VII.

31 BCE  Octavian is victorious at the battle of Actium; Antony is defeated.

30–28 BCE  Suicides of Cleopatra VII and Antony; Roman conquest of Egypt under Octavian/Augustus.

28 BCE  Cornelius Gallus, Roman prefect, meets Meroitic envoys at Philae temple to have peace negotiations for Lower Nubia.

27 BCE–14 CE  Reign of Roman Caesar Augustus/Octavian.

27 BCE  Strabo visits Aswan.

24 BCE  Meroites raid Elephantine and Philae at Aswan. Probable time that the bronze head of Augustus was seized; this sculpture of Augustus was found at Meroë as likely booty.

23 BCE  Augustus counterattacks with his forces led by Petronius, seizing Qasr Ibrim and likely invading Nubia to Napata.

ca. 22–21 BCE  Meroites counterattack at Qasr Ibrim but are driven back.
Negotiations at Samos Island conclude with peace treaty between Romans and Meroites. Meroitic tribute is suspended, and a permanent ambassadorial position is established between Meroë and Roman Egypt. Romans withdraw to Maharraka, which establishes Roman control only for the Dodekaschoenos.

0–20 CE Reigns of Meroitic Qore Natakamani and Kandake Amanitore.

CHRISTIANITY ENTERS NILE VALLEY

33 CE Death of Christ.
37–41 CE Reign of Gaius (Caligula).
37 CE First (?) Christian enters Nubia/Meroë (Acts of the Apostles 8:27). This eunuch was a high-ranking servant of a “Candace Queen of the Ethiopians.”
40 CE Apostle Mark comes to Alexandria.
54–68 CE Reign of Nero; sends “explorers” to Nubia in 61 CE, planning campaign in 64 CE, but this is not carried out.
64 CE Expansion of Christian persecution.
66–73 CE First Jewish rebellion against Romans in Palestine.
67 CE Nero frees Greece from Roman rule; Josephus the historian deserts the Judaean revolt and joins the Romans.
70 CE Writer Pliny describes Nubia; Romans capture Jerusalem with Nubian mercenary cavalry.
73 CE Fall of Masada; Romans complete conquest of Palestine.
79 CE Death of Pliny the Elder.
100–111 CE Period of activity of Pliny the Younger.
100–300 CE Post-Meroitic occupation of Qasr Ibrim.
115–117 CE Jewish revolt.
117–138 CE Reign of Roman Emperor Hadrian.
132–135 CE Bar Kochba revolt of the Jews; dispersal of the Jews.
180 CE Church of Pantaenus founded in Alexandria.
199–200 CE Septimius Severus allows a senate in Alexandria.
247–264 CE Patriarch Dionysius seeks Egyptian converts.
ca. 260–300 Major conversion of Egyptians to Coptic Christianity; some spread to Nubia.
268–297 CE Another period of Blemmyes (Beja) attacks on Nubia.
270–275 CE Roman Emperor Aurelian loots Alexandria to strengthen Roman rule there.
284–304 CE Reign of Diocletian.
297 CE Withdrawal of Romans from Lower Nubia to Aswan; persecution of Christians.
300 CE Christian population of Egypt reaches one million; by this time or before, destruction of the library at Alexandria and the loss of 650,000 papyrus scrolls of ancient science, math, literature, and religion.
312 CE Emperor Constantine accepts Christianity for the Roman church as a result of his victory at Milvian Bridge in the name of Christianity; rise of Donatist church in Numidia (endorsed martyrdom as a creed of this schismatic group).
313–322 CE First Christian basilica built in Rome.
325 CE Council of Nicaea rules over “oneness” of God and Christ.
ca. 340 CE Axumite King Ezana establishes Christianity in Ethiopia and destroys the remnants of the Kushitic state at Meroë.
350–550 CE X-Group, Ballana (Lower Nubia), and Tanqasi (Upper Nubia) cultural horizons showing a new syncretic blend of pharaonic, Kushitic, and Christian characteristics; no textual records, but huge grave tumulae suggest small states with clear social stratification; era of Blemmyes strength; the development of the Christian kingdoms of Nobatia, Mukurra, and Alwa and their respective churches and settlements.
391 CE  Christianity becomes state religion for Egypt; “pagan” temples defaced; Christian Egypt becomes part of the eastern Byzantine Empire.

436 CE  Blemmyes attack Egyptian Nile and even Kharga Oasis.

451 CE  Effort begins to spread Monophysite Christianity from Egypt, while Egypt is isolated as a result of the Council of Chalcedon (at Constantinople). Effort to resolve differences between Bishop Dioscoros of Alexandria and pope in Rome. The council determined that Jesus was a single person with two natures; the bishop was exiled. Eastern Orthodox insisted that Jesus was of one nature: Monophysite. Schism lasts until today.

452 CE  Romans under general Maximinus attack Blemmyes and Nobatia (northern Nubia) to release Roman hostages; Christian missionaries arrive in Nubia.

453 CE  Treaty of Philae guarantees right to worship Isis.

476 CE  End of the western Roman Empire.

ca. 500 CE  Blemmyes still worship Isis at Philae.

515 CE  Romans subsidize Blemmye and Nobatian chiefs in exchange for peace.

524 CE  Byzantium and Axumite alliance; Blemmyes and Nobatian mercenaries in Axumite attacks on Yemen.

525 CE  Isis temple at Philae is officially closed by Narseth, serving as prefect of Egypt for Justinian.

527–565 CE  Justinian rules the eastern Roman Empire of Byzantium and seeks to reconquer Italy and North Africa.

ca. 537 CE  Nubian King Silko drives out Blemmyes from Nobatia and implies at Kalabsha temple that he is the first Christian king of Nubia; Isis cult at Philae suppressed by Justinian, who officially closes it to “pagan” worship.

543–569 CE  First Monophysite Christian kingdoms in Nubia; missionary Julian given permission by Empress Theodora in Constantinople to evangelize among Nubians.
543 CE  Faras established as capital of Christian Nobatia.

ca. 560 CE  Missionary Longinus at Nobatia and Alwa.

ca. 569 CE  Dongola established as capital of Mukurra after its conversion to Christianity.

579–580 CE  Longinus converts Alwa to Monophysite Christianity; Soba is the established capital.

ISLAM ENTERS EGYPT

632 CE  Death of the Prophet Mohammed.

636 CE  Arab conquest of Syria.

639–640 CE  Arab Muslim conquest of Egypt led by 'Amr ibn al 'As for Khalifa 'Omar; this begins the first Muslim contacts with Lower Nubians, who are forced to pay tribute in slaves and livestock and promise of no aggression against Egypt.

641–642 CE  Islamic armies of 'Amr ibn al 'As reach the plain north of Dongola but fail to capture it.

646 CE  Egyptians attack Nubia.

652 CE  A baqt treaty established between Nubia and Egypt under 'Abdallah ibn Sa'ad ibn Abi Sahr. Nubia would provide 360 slaves each year and promise no attacks; Egypt would provide 1,300 kanyr of wine. Old Dongola is captured for a period; conflicts noted between Makuria and Nobatia.

661–750 CE  Umayyad dynasty in Egypt; some Nubians serve as mercenaries in the Islamic armies.

697–707 CE  Merger of Nobatia and Mukurra under King Merkurius.

720 CE  A baqt is recorded between Egyptians and Beja.

740s CE  Cyriacus, king of Dongola, lays siege to Umayyad capital at Fustat (Cairo).

750–870 CE  Abbasid dynasty in Egypt.
758 CE  Abbasids complain of no baqt payments from Nubia; the Blemmyes attack Upper Egypt.

819–822 CE  Dongola king and Beja refuse to pay baqt tribute and mount attacks on Egypt.

835 CE  George I (816–920) crowned king of Dongola.

836 CE  George I travels to Baghdad and Cairo.

868–884 CE  ‘Amr Ahmed ibn Tulun rules Egypt; large numbers of Nubians in Tulunid army.

920 CE  Reign of Dongola King Zakaria begins.

950 CE  Some Muslims reported at Soba.

951, 956, 962 CE  More Nubian raids into Upper Egypt.

969–1171 CE  Fatimid rule in Egypt; attack on Nubia by al-Umari.

969 CE  King George II reigns and attacks Egypt.

970 CE  Formation of Al-Azhar University in Cairo.

ca. 1000 CE  Nilotic cattle pastoralists expand into southern Sudan.

ca. 1050 CE  Up to 50,000 Nubians serve in Fatimid army.

1171–1250 CE  Ayyubid dynasty in Egypt.

1172 CE  Saladin (Ayyubids) forces Nubians under King George IV back to Upper Egypt.

1140s CE  Christian kingdom of Dotawo (Daw) noted in Nubia.

1163 CE  Crusaders attack Ayyubids and seek alliance with Nubian Christians.

1172 CE  Nubian–Crusader alliance against Ayyubids; clashes in Cairo and delta towns; Turanshah attacks Nubia.

ca. 1200 CE  Rise of the Daju dynasty in Darfur; northward movement of Dinka and Nuer populations into Bahr al-Ghazal and Upper Nile.

1204 CE  Nubian and Crusader leaders meet in Constantinople.

1235 CE  Last priest sent to Nubia from Alexandria.
1250–1382 CE Bahri Mamluk Dynasty in Egypt.

**ISLAM PENETRATES NUBIA**

1260–1277 CE Forces of Mamluke Sultan Al-Zahir Baybars attack Nubia.

1264 CE Nubians again pay baqt, now to Mamlukes.

1268 CE Dongola King Dawud pays baqt to Mamlukes.

1275 CE King Dawud raids Aswan.

1275–1365 CE Period of warfare between Mamlukes and Nubians.

1276 CE Mamluke Egyptians sack Dongola; forced conversion to Islam; King Dawud captured.

1289 CE Last Mamluke military campaign against Dongola.

1317 CE Defeat of the last Christian king in Nubia and the first Muslim king 'Abdullah Barshambu on the throne in Dongola; baqt reestablished; first mosque built at Dongola.

1372 CE Bishop of Faras consecrated by patriarch in Alexandria.

1382–1517 CE Circassian (Burji) Mamluke dynasty in Egypt.

1400s CE Probable time of the replacement of the Daju by the Tunjur dynasty in Darfur; Luo migrations from southern Sudan lead to creation of Shilluk groups.

1453 CE Fall of the eastern Roman Empire.

1504 CE Islam reaches southern Nubia with the fall of Soba, capital of the last Christian kingdom of Alwa; rise of the Islamic Funj sultanate at Sennar and the Fur sultanate in western Sudan.

See *Historical Dictionary of the Sudan* (3rd ed.) for subsequent Islamic chronology to the present.
Introduction

Ancient Nubia no longer exists as a political entity. Its land has disappeared between the borders of Egypt and modern Sudan. Lower (northern) Nubia is now incorporated into Egypt, while Upper (southern) Nubia is within northern Sudan. Its long history has been obscured by many changes in reference names and territorial boundaries. Yet Nubian languages and Nubian consciousness are very much alive. Nubia has had names for itself and names attributed to it by foreigners. At times, Egypt has controlled Nubia; at other times, Nubia has controlled Egypt; and at still other times, the two have been military rivals and have even coexisted peacefully with policies of détente. Thus, ancient Nubia straddles significant conceptual, cultural, historical, and political frontiers.

Historically, Nubia has been on the border between Egypt and sub-Saharan Africa, so it has served metaphorically as a filter, barrier, and pathway between these ancient and modern regions. It also served as a trade and transportation route between the ancient peoples of the Red Sea coasts and the peoples across the Sahel and savanna into West Africa. Occupying this strategic position on the world’s greatest river, the Nile, and connecting several climatic regions, some suggest that ancient Nubia was a bridge for transmitting ideas, technology, and human and natural resources passing from the ancient Near East into and out of Africa.

For those interested in Sudanese history since the end of Christian Nubia, you may consult the companion volume Historical Dictionary of the Sudan (3rd ed., by Lobban, Fluehr-Lobban, and Kramer), which covers Nubia and the rest of Sudan since the time of Islam.
GEOGRAPHY

The name “Nubia” is the simplest term to define the region that lies between Aswan in modern Egypt at the First Cataract (rapids) on the Nile River and the confluence of the White and Blue Nile just above the Sixth Cataract. One must also include the banks of the Nile and the adjacent land territories with which they interacted and controlled. It is also useful to separate Lower Nubia (the First to the Second Cataract) from Upper Nubia (Second to Fourth cataracts) to southern Nubia (Fourth to Sixth Cataracts). Unless otherwise specified, these are the geographical boundaries for this present work. However, Nubia and its component parts had a number of other references. Among the earliest is the term Ta-Setiu (q.v.) or the ancient Egyptian general reference to Nubia being a “land of the bowpeople.” Another ancient Egyptian reference is to the Ta-Nehesi, which seems to reflect the name of an ethnic group of Nubia that may linger on in the modern name of the Mahas Nubians.

Some sections of Nubia also have more specific nomenclature. Wawat (q.v.) is the ancient Egyptian name for essentially at least the northern part of Lower Nubia. Irtet (q.v.) rested adjacent to Wawat but went to an indeterminate distance farther south. Greeks and Romans used the term of the Dodekashoenos to describe the region of Lower Nubia that they sometimes controlled. Arab terminology provides the reference to the Butn al-Hajr (Belly of Stones) for the section of the Nile from the Second to the Third Cataract. Above the Third Cataract was the ancient Nubian state now known as Kerma (q.v.) for the small village of that name in the vicinity. It is most likely that this was the state known to ancient Egyptians as Yam or Irem (qq.v.). Many other places are recorded on New Kingdom monuments indicating the conquests of specific lands or peoples of Nubia, but these are generally not any longer meaningful.

“Kush” is still another term that gives reference to ancient Nubia. It certainly appeared by the Egyptian Middle Kingdom, and the viceroy of Kush was an important dynastic title throughout the New Kingdom. “Kush” appears to be a broad term roughly inclusive of Nubia, but it too shifts in its territory from time to time, and it is a term that some Nubians use for themselves. Indeed, the word used here, “Nubia,” appears to be derived from the ancient Egyptian word for gold, or nb, as this was a much valued product from the land of Nubia, or the “land of gold.”
However, Greeks referred to Nubia as “Ethiopia,” including sometimes parts of “Libya Interior.” This phenotypic reference referred to the “burnt faces” of the Nubians. Greco-Roman references were also made to their contemporary civilization on the Nile known as Meroë. At its height, Meroë included the entirety of Nubia from the First to Sixth Cataracts; at the time of its collapse, it was concentrated primarily in the “Island of Meroë,” or the savanna lands of the Butana steppe lying to the east of the Nile from the Fifth to the Sixth Cataract. To abide by a standard convention, the word spelled as “Meroë” defines these ancient peoples and places, while “Merowe” (ancient Sanam) is the term for the modern Sudanese town just downstream from the Fourth Cataract and Jebel Barkal.

“Christian Nubia” refers to the three kingdoms of Nobatia, Mukurra, and Alwa that cover this region, and “Nubia” was the reference to the region throughout medieval times until the end of the nineteenth century. At this time, the name “the Sudan” came into use, from the Arabic expression Bilad as-Sudan, meaning “the Land of the Blacks,” essentially an Arabic translation of the Greek “Ethiopia.” In medieval Muslim literature, it was applied generally to Africa south of the Sahara. The term “the Sudan” has been used in a sweeping way to refer to the broad belt of plains and savanna land stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the Red Sea and lying between the Sahara and the forest areas. In English and Arabic, the term is also used specifically to refer to the territory south of Egypt that formed the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan (1899–1955) and the contemporary independent Republic of the Sudan. It was first used in this sense during the late nineteenth century and was applied to the African territories ruled by Muhammad ’Ali, the Ottoman governor of Egypt, and his successors, but earlier in the nineteenth century, the region was either “Nubia” or “Turkish Nubia.” Even George Reisner, at the start of the twentieth century, referred to Nubia as “Ethiopia,” and he clearly did not have in mind the modern nation of Ethiopia.

The modern Republic of Sudan has an area of 2,503,890 square kilometers (966,757 square miles). It measures about 2,040 kilometers (1,270 miles) north to south and about 1,625 kilometers (980 miles) from east to west. It shares borders with Egypt to the north and, going clockwise, with Eritrea and Ethiopia to the east; Kenya, Uganda, Zaire, and the Central African Republic to the south; Chad to the west; and Libya to the northwest. It has an oceanic frontier on the Red Sea. After
the Berlin Congress in 1884–1885, Britain, France, and Italy drew the modern boundaries of Sudan that substantially exceed the largest boundaries of ancient Nubia. These nations were the imperial powers of the region in the nineteenth century, following the partition of Africa in Berlin in 1884–1885 in which no Africans were invited to carve up the continent, its resources, and its peoples. After almost forty years of postindependence civil war in Sudan, it is clear that the artificial nature of the nation is tearing it apart more than forcing it together.

Thus, it is apparent that ancient Nubia varied in nomenclature and size over time, but its effective control was only about one-third to half of the territory represented by modern Sudan. Ancient Nubia was a land rather different from its desert and oasis climate of today. Until the end of Mesolithic times, about 4500 BCE, it was much wetter, and the adjoining grasslands were broadly extensive. For reasons of human interaction with the environment (perhaps regional extinctions of some megafauna), the climate steadily and perhaps rapidly became much drier than it is now. The climate of Nubia for the past five millennia has been desert, and rainfall is rare. Sometimes there is no rain for several years. Farther south, there is a semiarid belt in the central plains that extended far northward in ancient times. Farther south, the seasonal rainfall increases to sustain grasses, woodland savanna, and scrub and heavy forests of acacia trees.

The Nile (and its tributary rivers) is the single most dominant feature of the physical landscape. The river system cuts across the climatic and vegetation belts, providing water for irrigation, a major means of transportation, and the locus for most of the settled agricultural life and economy of the country. The Nile is formed by the confluence of two great rivers, the Blue and White Niles, at the Mogren in Khartoum. The Blue Nile rises from Lake Tana (Dambea) in the Ethiopian highlands and contributes most of the floodwaters since the White Nile loses a great percentage of its water by evaporation in the Sudd swamps. The only major tributary north of Khartoum is the seasonal Atbara River.

Different regions of ancient Nubia and its hinterland can be identified. One can see the dominant topological features as follows: 1) the Upper Nile drainage system, 2) the great eroded region of the Red Sea mountains, 3) the vast central plains with occasional sharp hills, 4) the volcanic uplands in Darfur, and 5) the southern and southeastern highlands of the Nuba Hills. Generally, Nubia is built on a sandstone foun-
dation with areas of volcanic and granite infusion along with other hard stones with important human use in construction and sculpture. Emeralds and gold are also found in the deserts of Nubia.

Economic classification can be refined within four subregions: 1) the Nile valley in the north and central parts, where most people farm with the aid of irrigation; 2) the western Sudan, an area of mixed nomadism and peasant agriculture; 3) the eastern Sudan, primarily an area of nomadism but with some irrigated agricultural areas; and 4) the southern region, with a wide variety of pastoral and complex agricultural societies.

Nubian people have maintained a cultural distinctiveness since ancient times. Lower Nubia has been termed the “corridor to Africa,” and it experienced repeated population fluctuations, as it was the Nubian meeting place of ancient Egyptians as well as other foreigners, such as Assyrians, Greeks, Romans, and Arabs. In Upper Nubia, one finds the ancient kingdom of Kush or Napata. Farther south in the former grasslands was the kingdom of Meroë. It was bounded on three sides by the Nile and Atbara Rivers and was known as “the Island of Meroë.” Farther up the river valley, the area between the Blue and White Niles came to be called the “Gezira,” or “the island.” Finally, the southern third of the country in the twentieth century came to be spoken of as a separate region, “the South.” This region includes the three provinces of Equatoria, Bahr al-Ghazal, and Upper Nile. Some circumstantial evidence exists that the ancient states of Nubia were in contact with those regions for procuring slaves and natural resources. But it may also have been that the territories of those Nilotic peoples extended much farther north in antiquity. The ancient Egyptian depiction of captives from the south is usually rendered as “Nubian slaves,” but these people are very similar (in hair style, use of feathers and earrings, and physiognomy) to those people of the Nuba Mountains who steadily retreated over the centuries to southern Kordofan as a refuge from slave hunters and imperialists.

From the First to the Second Cataract on the Nile, Egyptian Nubia has three essential sections. The first is the river itself, the Kenuz Nubian of Aswan and lands southward, and the Halfawi Nubian peoples who occupied the region closer to the border with the Sudan. This section of Lower Nubia also has an intrusive Arab group called the Al-Aleqat. The second is the Red Sea Hills region to the east of the Nubian Nile, occupied today
by Bisharin people who are the modern descendant of the Blemmyes, Medjay, and Pan-Grave (qq.v.) stocks. The third is the generally uninhabited region to the west of the Nubian Nile that provided some oases, stone quarries, and important oases trade routes.

**LANGUAGE, POPULATION, AND “RACE”**

Linguistically, the peoples of modern Nubia speak five dialects of a related language stock that descends from the Eastern Sudanic linguistic family. From north to south, they are the Kenuz, Fadicha (Matoki), Sukkot, Mahas, and Danagla (q.v.). This places the Nubian languages in a relationship with Nilotic peoples such as the Dinka and Nuer and the people of the Nuba Mountains of southern Kordofan. However, these other languages are not intelligible to Nubians of the northern Sudan or southern Egypt. Eastern Sudanic languages are not related to Arabic or ancient Egyptian except through loanwords. Moreover, the linguistic connections between modern Nubian dialects and Old Nubian and Meroitic are still under scholarly investigation.

In ancient times, the populations and migrations of Sudan may only be guessed with reference to known settlement sites and their associated cemeteries. The oldest population statistic for Nubia relates to the conquest by Pharaoh Senefru (q.v.), who claimed that he captured 7,000 Nubians on a raid in that region. Was he honest in this claim? How far did he go into Nubia? Were others slain? Certainly many other questions arise that leave this early statistic tantalizingly incomplete. The scholars of Nubia have generated a great deal of speculation on this subject.

Then as now, the main population centers were at the successive capital towns or cities at Kerma, Napata/Sanam, Merœ or Faras, Dongola, and Alwa in Christian times. Numerous regional trade centers and villages were contemporary. A particularly challenging issue in ancient demography is not only what is known but also how to interpret what is not known, especially in terms of the ethnic composition of the settlements.

The capital towns were probably not much more than some tens of thousands at their maximum, but annual festival and periodic marketing times did perhaps inflate these numbers. Since the several ancient Nubian states did not apparently exercise control above of the confluence of the Niles, it would not be fair to include the population of Nilotes
who lived south of that point. In short, the ancient population was mainly northern and riverine except for the oasis routes. It is hard to imagine that the entire population of the biggest ancient Nubian polity was greater than a half a million and likely much less. This speculation is based also on the ratio of existing modern populations of Egypt and Sudan that typically favor Egypt by about three to one. But this modern ratio relies on very heavy use of irrigation in Egypt and much less for Sudan. In ancient times, the lack of extensive irrigation and no comparable extensive delta region in Nubia must have supported an even smaller population size there.

Nubia has long been on a major route of north–south migration along the Nile and west–east migration across the Sahel by migrants and herders. High infant death rates were probably the case in antiquity as well. Endemic parasitic diseases, limited medical options, and low life expectancy must have been the ancient case, at least for those who survived childbirth and infancy. Thus, in ancient times, population shifts from famine, disease, migration, warfare, and climate shift were likely important factors. This is suggested by cycles of population and depopulation of Lower Nubia during the A-Group and C-Group of the shifts in royal cities. No population statistics or censuses conducted during the ancient periods of Nubian history are known to exist.

The ethnic composition of Sudan today is very roughly one-third “Arab,” one-third “southerners,” and one-third “others” (such as Nubians, Fur, and Nuba). But those who may be projected as northern and riverine Arabs today are, in fact, largely descendant from ancient Nubians who have been “Arabized.” Within these groupings, considerable ethnic heterogeneity exists, and the population numbers are disputed. “Pure” Nubian peoples in Sudan today who still speak Nubian dialects are just a small minority of the riverine far north from Dongola to Wadi Halfa, and in Egypt from the border to Aswan, overlooking the great number of relocated Nubians and migrants to Egyptian and Sudanese cities.

So the question of the “race” of Nubians can be much debated. For one thing, the definition of the “race” concept itself has little agreement. Generally, it is a social construct with phenotypic features that are assumed to have genetic foundations or some combination of these variables. To complicate this matter more, much confusion exists in the literature between race, ethnicity and culture, and language. Although
anthropologists take pains to separate these factors, public, political, and nonscientific discourse often lumps them together in a confusing manner. Still, one may consider Nubians as “Negro” Africans, but this facile description belies the huge admixture into Nubia from southern Nilotic and Noba or Nuba peoples through the five millennia of relations north to south. These involve voluntary migration, forced relocation, military conscription, rape, and concubines amidst the ancient slave trade in the region, not to mention numerous Egyptian and foreign admixture undertaken in legitimate marriage, colonialism, and conquest. Those seeking the “pure Nubian” have a very difficult task ahead.

Migrants from various other regions in Africa are also known to have spread into Nubia at times and to have withdrawn at others. Such would include ancient admixtures from the Libyans to the west and the Medjay to the east. Even the ancient Egyptian stereotypes about the Ta-Setiu or Ta-Nehesi depict Nubians in various forms of dress, skin color, status, and ethnic origin.

Modern Nubians can vary from rather light to rather dark in complexion, from tall to short in stature, and from having straight to tightly curled hair. This modern diversity has certainly been present for an extremely long period of time. Therefore, one can construct a sort of “Creole” population for Nubians, that is, neither Egyptian nor Nilotic but somehow both. Amazingly, the cultural sense of being Nubian and of speaking Nubian dialects has persisted amidst these many centuries and amidst this great mixture along the Nile. Thus, the study of ancient Nubian ethnogenesis and Nubian cultural and linguistic survival is very much a continuing story.

ANCIENT HISTORY

The modern study of ancient Nubia has flowed from the building of dams in Egypt that necessitated major archaeological efforts to study sites before they were flooded. Although accounts of famed eighteenth- and nineteenth-century travelers to Nubia have been made, the first major salvage survey was begun in 1907 and directed by George Reisner. This work made it possible to construct an outline of Nubian cultural history. Reisner used a simple terminological scheme that is still commonly used, naming the various cultures with a letter so that the earliest one, related to predynastic and early dynastic Egypt, is called the A-Group, dating to about 3100 to 2600 BCE. But Nubian history goes back far earlier.
It is now firmly established that the origin of the hominids in various local forms of *Homo africanus* or *Australopithecines* is in Africa. Sites in Kenya, the Omo River valley of Ethiopia, the Afar region of Eritrea, and now even Chad show examples of human fossils dating to three to four million years ago. Since these four nations border Sudan, one cannot imagine that *Homo africanus* had overlooked Sudan, and it is probably a matter of time before human fossils of this time are found there as well. The reason that they are so far missing is more likely that the geomorphology of Sudan is not as conducive to fossilization or for deeply cut valleys where such remains might normally appear.

Judging from stone tool typology, human (*Homo erectus* and *Homo sapiens neandertalensis*) occupation of Sudan can be confirmed for the early Stone Age or Paleolithic sites that suggest dates as early as 250,000 BCE. The most thoroughly studied sequences of very ancient tool industries and settlement sites in Sudan are in Nubia. There, around Wadi Halfa and now covered by Lake Nasser, for example, a series of cultures has been found with dates of perhaps 50,000 years ago. Both local social evolution and the immigration of new peoples are postulated as sources for gradual changes in Sudanese Paleolithic cultures. The earliest known human remains in Sudan/Nubia seem to be a fossil from Singa on the Blue Nile that is not well dated but may be a late Paleolithic “Bushmanoid” or Stillbay (q.v.) type.

The Khartoum Mesolithic (q.v.) is a well-established tradition from 8000 to 4000 BCE that reveals a widespread semisedented lifeway built on riverine hunting and fishing with some gathering of useful plant products. Mats and nets are known archaeologically, but the most diagnostic part of this ancient assemblage is the wavy-line pots that are very widely distributed through much of the wetter Sahara. Some believe that the oldest pottery in Africa (or even the world) may be in the Khartoum Mesolithic tradition.

The techniques of plant and animal domestication began to appear in the Sudan by 4000 to 3000 BCE at Shaheinab or Khartoum Neolithic sites in central Sudan. Neolithic groups in Sudan may have had relations with a wide range of cultures in northern and northeastern Africa. The closest affinities were with inhabitants of predynastic Egypt. The Lower Nubian contemporaries have been termed the A-Group. They were independent of, but strongly influenced by, emerging dynastic Egyptian civilization.
Around 2500 BCE, the Egyptians conquered some of Lower Nubia and either displaced or dominated the local C-Group people, but when Egypt entered a subsequent period of disorganization, around 2160 BCE, Nubia flourished. The C-Group and its cultures reemerged, still influenced by Egypt but with their own distinctive traits. Further south at Kerma, Nubians rested securely in their own state, which was temporarily allied by the Hyksos enemies of Egypt who had taken over the northern third of Egypt. This era came to an end when the revived New Kingdom Egyptians conquered and established firm control over much of Nubia around 1500 BCE. The Egyptian viceroy of the Nubian province of Kush, as the area was called, held firm sway, and the New Kingdom began its five centuries of colonial rule over Nubia.

As the Egyptian empire weakened, especially after 1100 BCE, a Nubian state again emerged with vigor and even became a refuge area for Egyptians fleeing civil war and foreign conquest. By 950 BCE, the Sudanese city of Napata had become the site of the major temple for the Nubian worship of Amun, the god of the most important priesthood, and a distinctive Egyptian–Kushite culture evolved. Napata became the capital of Kush, and its kings even conquered Egypt for a time, forming the 25th Dynasty in the late eighth century BCE.

When the Assyrians conquered Egypt around 664 BCE, the Kushites were driven back but maintained their independent Nubian state. The attacks on Napata by Psamtik II, who invaded from Egypt in 591 BCE, caused the capital to be temporarily moved south, but when the enemy withdrew, government continued to function there for another three centuries before the capital was moved to Meroë still farther southeast.

Meroë was a vibrant state influenced by Hellenistic and Roman as well as ancient Egyptian ideas. However, it developed its own cultural traits and was a gateway and marketplace for ideas, writing, resources, and technologies into and from Africa. Meroë began to meet pressures from growing states around it, especially Axum in Ethiopia, and Meroë came to an end around 340 CE.

**MEDIEVAL HISTORY**

Much less is known about Sudanese history in the period of disorganization following the collapse of Meroë. This is the time of the X-Group
(Ballana or Tangasi) culture, which was a post-Meroitic mixture of Roman, Kushite, and new elements. Out of the confusion, three states emerged: Nobatia, Mukuria, and Alwa. Their rulers converted to Christianity between 543 and 580 CE, and Nobatia and Mukuria merged into the kingdom of Dongola by at least 700 CE.

The best-known aspect of the history of these states is their relationship with Egypt, which became one of the early Islamic conquests in North Africa in 640 CE. Battles, treaties, (the baqt) attacks, and counterattacks occurred, with the long-term trend in favor of the Muslims. Tradition holds that the first Muslim became king of Dongola in 1315 and that Soba, the capital of the last Christian Nubian kingdom of Alwa, fell to the Funj sultans in 1504. Gradually, Arab Muslim merchants and teachers settled into Sudan, where they married and became Afro-Arab Sudanese. Thus, at the end of the medieval period, the spread of Islam and the Arabic language in Sudan was more a gradual transition and conversion than a result of conquest.

**ISLAMIC TIMES**

Islamic times are covered much more fully in the *Historical Dictionary of the Sudan* (3rd ed.), but some description is still appropriate here since Christian Nubians interacted with Muslims for 600 years. The three centuries between the traditional date for the fall of Alwa and the Turco-Egyptian conquest of the Sudan in 1820–1821 are of great importance in Sudanese history. The movement of people and establishment of new institutions confirmed both the Islamization and Arabization of much of northern Sudan or former Nubia.

At this time, the major movement of Nilotic peoples into the south was also completed, and the Azande kingdoms were firmly established. Now other regional sultanates in Darfur and Kordofan were emerging within the area of modern Sudan, and ancient Nubia was terminated as a sovereign region. In Darfur, the Daju gained control over part of the area before 1200 and were followed by Tunjur. They were succeeded in turn by the Keira dynasty, which created a sultanate controlling most of Darfur from the mid-seventeenth century until 1916.

Islam was firmly established in northern Sudan during the Funj and Keira periods. Traveling merchants and teachers opened the region to
the rest of the Islamic world. Local schools were created, and the great Islamic brotherhoods, or *turaq*, gained a firm foothold. Holy men and their families came to wield important influence in all areas of life. Nubians, especially Nubian Mahas in central Sudan, were much involved in the spread of Islam as religious sages and teachers. In this way, the basic Sudanese Islamic pattern was focused on individuals in a personalized socioreligious order. Now the religious brotherhoods joined the primary ethnic group—kin and family—as the bases for social identity.

Postmedieval experience created the foundations for modern Sudanese society. The major states of both north and south had provided more than simply a localized ethnic identity. In Nubia, the Islamization of society was confirmed and its Arabization far advanced. Yet Nubian culture and language persisted. Even when it was time for the Sudanese to resist and overthrow the hated Turco-Egyptians, it was a Nubian boatman, the prophet Mohammed Ahmed al-Mahdi, who was the leader of this successful movement. Even in postcolonial times, the military government of Gaafar Nimieri brought Nubians back to the centers of power, since he was himself of some Nubian descent, as were some members of his Revolutionary Command Council.

Much recent information has come from the archaeological study in Nubia before the waters of Lake Nasser and Lake Nubia flooded the area. But elsewhere in Sudan, many important sites remain to be studied. The vigorous activities of the Sudan Department of Antiquities, the International Society for Nubian Studies, the Meroitic Studies Association, and the Sudan Archaeological Research Society and other scholars in Germany, Italy, Spain, and elsewhere mean that new information is constantly being made available. Recovering and writing the history of ancient Nubia is well under way but still has a long road ahead.
1. Cartouche of Mentuhotep II from his Khnum Temple at Elephantine.
   Photo: Richard Lobban.

2. Detail of Nubian Archer-Soldiers serving Middle Kingdom Egyptians.
   Photo: Richard Lobban.
3. Nubian goddess
Anket noted at
Khnum Temple at
Elephantine.
Photo: Richard Lobban.

4. Prisoner from Kush
(as inscribed) on a
statue of Ramses II at
the Luxor Temple.
Photo: Richard Lobban.
6. Column in King Taharka’s kiosk in the forecourt at Karnak Temple.
Photo: Petrihive, late 19th century, No. 1121, Richard Lobban Collection.

7. King Taharka protected by Ram God Amun, from Jebel Barkal. At British Museum.
Photo: Richard Lobban.
8. Memphis besieged and Nubian captured by Assyrians. Detail of Ninevah wall tablet.
Photo: Richard Lobban.

Photo: Richard Lobban
   Photo: Richard Lobban.

11. Philae Temple at new location on Agilka Island.
    Photo: Richard Lobban.
12. Dakka Temple at original location in Lower Nubia.
  Photo: J.P. Sebah, Richard Lobban Collection.

13. King Arkamani (Ergamenes) offering incense at the Dakka Temple.
  Photo: Richard Lobban.
14. Temple 300 at Musawwarat es-Sufra.
   Photo: Pawel Wolf.

15. Central Terrace at Musawwarat es-Sufra.
   Photo: Pawel Wolf.
16. Overall site plan of Musawwarat es-Sufra.

Photo: Pawel Wolf.
17. Kalabsha Temple at original location in Lower Nubia.
Photo: Antonio Beato, ca. 1880's. Richard Lobban Collection.

18. Detail of Meroitic proclamation of King Kharamadoye at the Kalabsha Temple.
Photo: Richard Lobban.

Photo: Richard Lobban.

20. First Cataract image.

Photo: Richard Lobban.
ABABDA. The Ababda are a nomadic people with some sedentary sections in Upper Egypt and northern Sudan. They are also linked to the Qireijab coastal fishermen of western Arabia. The Ababda, Bishareen, and Hadendowa are parts of the wider grouping of Beja who are widely considered the modern descendants of the ancient Pan-Grave or Blemmyes (qq.v.) people. In ancient times, the Abada ancestors often served as mercenary forces for the Egyptians and were thus sometimes rivals to the riverine Nubians.

At that time, they may have spoken their own Cushitic language, but they have been multilingual for much of their history as they lived between powerful neighbors. Today they are Arabic-speaking, but traditionally they were important as the guardians of the land border and caravan routes from Korosko to Abu Hamad from pharaonic times to their service as irregulars in the Anglo-Egyptian army in the nineteenth century.

ABDALLAH IBN SA’AD IBN SARH. Ibn Sarh, the Muslim ruler of Upper Egypt, formalized the *baqt* treaty relationship with kings of Christian Nubia all the way to Alwa (q.v.). The *baqt* may be an Arabized version of the Latin *pactum*, or treaty. This protective agreement was a rather unequal peace treaty established in 652 CE after the second battle of Dongola (q.v.). Travelers in either respective land would be guaranteed safety but not residence, and neither party should attack either land. It further provided that runaway slaves from Egypt should be returned along with any rebels against the Egyptian government, that religious freedom should be
protected for Muslims in the Dongola mosque, and that 360 healthy male and female slaves should be presented to the Egyptian authorities in Aswan each year.

**ABDALLAH NIRQI.** Abdallah Nirqi was the site for a small Nubian church on the west side of the Nile near Abu Simbel (q.v.). It functioned within the Christian kingdom of Nobatia under the administration of Faras (q.v.). After the fifth-century spread of Christianity (q.v.) into Nubia, numerous churches, chapels, and some monasteries were constructed almost to the end of Christianity, in the fourteenth century, in Lower Nubia (q.v.). The buildings are now mostly lost, but some architectural elements, frescoes, gravestones, pottery, and textiles have been preserved in the Nubian salvage campaign.

Its frescoes were preserved, to a certain degree, by the endless accumulation of windblown sand that protected the interior while threatening it structurally. Indeed, some churches of Lower Nubia were buried as the sands built up. Some of the frescoes from the tenth-century church of Abdullah Nirqi are on display in the Aswan Nubian Museum, and others are in Rooms 17 and 22b at the Cairo Coptic Museum. In one fresco fragment, a polychrome image of the nativity scene depicts a recumbent Virgin Mary, with Jesus, Joseph, three wise men on their horses, and two shepherds. Generally, the church painting followed the prevailing Byzantine iconography and style but with local interpretation and skills.

**ABKA, ABKAN.** Abka is a Neolithic site in Lower Nubia (q.v.) that gives its name to an archaeological horizon. It represents an early case of a Nubian pottery tradition that may be just prior to the A-Group (q.v.). Abkan peoples may descend from the Mesolithic Qadan (qq.v.) tradition (12,000–9000 BCE) since they share similar stone tool technology in the same region. Commonly, both had grinding stones for processing wild grains and flaked microlithic boring and grooving tools. While the Qadan peoples did not have a pottery tradition, the burnished or slightly rippled pottery of the Abkan people is stylistically distinguished from the contemporary Khartoum Mesolithic (q.v.) with its wavy-line patterns. The smooth finishes for Abkan pottery suggests that they were forerunners of the A-Group tradition.
The site at Abka is also known for the numerous petroglyphs of regional wild fauna, including what appear to be giraffes, ibexes, ostriches, and gazelles. The Scandinavian Expedition to Sudanese Nubia closely studied these petroglyphs. Circumstantial evidence exists that links the makers of these petroglyphs to the Abkan pottery tradition. Typical of these times are eggshell, bone, and oyster shell beads.

**ABU. See ELEPHANTINE.**

**ABU HODA, ABAHUDA.** The Abu Hoda chapel was formerly located directly opposite from Abu Simbel (q.v.). It is a rock-cut shrine constructed at the end of the 18th Dynasty by Horemhab to honor the gods Thoth, Amun-Re, and Horus in four different Nubian forms. In Christian times, this New Kingdom chapel was reused as a church in which the south wall featured a scene of St. George and the Dragon (Horus versus Seth) and of Christ (Osiris) on the ceiling. In the Nubian salvage project, this was removed to Abu Simbel, directly across the river, to be reerected.

**ABU SIMBEL, IBU SIMPEL.** This temple complex is the most spectacular of all antiquities in Lower Nubia (q.v.). Despite its grandeur, this ancient monument had been virtually forgotten by the Western world until it was rediscovered in the early nineteenth century—during the 1813 travels of John L. Burckhardt (q.v.), which generated his posthumous publication *Travels in Nubia in 1819*; in the preliminary excavations by G. B. Belzoni (q.v.) in 1817; and in the travels of David Roberts (q.v.) in 1838 and the publication of his lithographs in 1847 and 1848. Extensive wind-blown sand buried the original entrance and thereby added to the preservation of some original colors and features.

In front of this temple are four colossal figures of seated Ramses II (q.v.) that are much celebrated. This complex includes the huge rock-cut temple to Re-Horakhty and the smaller Hathor temple of Ibsherik for Nefertari. These were built entirely for Ramses II and his favored wife Nefertari, who probably commemorated the temples shortly before her death. At the adjacent Nefertari temple to a cow-headed Hathor are six additional standing colossal figures of Ramses II.
Although these are the grandest of the Nubian monuments of Ramses II, they are among his other works at Beit al-Wali, Gerf Hussein, Wadi Es-Sebua, Ed-Derr, and Aksha (q.v.). The inscriptions of the Great Temple provide a significant record of the claims of Ramses II for his victory at the battle of Qadesh. This complex also has the marriage stela of Ramses II with the daughter of a Hittite king, as well as the peace treaty between these rival ancient nations. To the south and adjacent to the huge temple is a small chapel to Thoth and other steleae celebrating ranking officials of Ramses II.

Also notable at this temple are the eight Osiride forms of Ramses II standing in the first interior hall. Perhaps more significant is that the pharaoh is depicted as seated with the three gods Amun-Re, Re-Horakhty, and Ptah, as Ramses II projected himself as an equal among the deities. A well-preserved inscription at the entrance shows the god Hapi unifying the Nile. Other gods depicted at Abu Simbel include Ptah, Amun, Hathor, Maat, Thoth, Atum, Montu, Isis, Mut, and Min and the Nubian goddess Anqet.

From a Nubian point of view, this temple may not easily be celebrated since it represents a high point of Egyptian colonial domination of Nubia. Numerous depictions of bound captives from the south have been made along the bottom registers of the seated southern colossal figures. No later Meroitic inscriptions are found at Abu Simbel.

At Abu Simbel, one may also find numerous graffiti of the famous and passersby. Notable on the most ruined colossus are the inscriptions of soldiers of Psamtik II (q.v.) of the 26th Dynasty as they penetrated deep into Nubia around 591 BCE.

As remarkable as the ancient construction was, the prodigious modern task of dismantling these vast rock-cut temples into huge stone blocks was begun in January 1966. The engineering approach was to cut into the mountain itself to isolate the original structure carved in virgin Nubian sandstone. Then the newly fashioned pieces could be moved to higher ground and the mountain into which they were carved wholly reconstructed. This was largely completed by September 1968 and finally completed in 1972. The new location has managed to preserve the careful orientation of the temple to the twice-annual penetration of the sun’s rays to the inner sanctum. The frieze of baboons at the very top first detects the sun’s rays.
ABUSIR. Rocky outcroppings at Abusir in the vicinity of Wadi Halfa show numerous Middle Kingdom inscriptions from the 11th and 12th Dynasties. New Kingdom occupation is suggested by the lonely “guard houses” just beyond the summit. The face of Abusir Rock is also covered with nineteenth-century inscriptions, especially of British soldiers on their way to defeat the Dervishes of Sudan. Note that this Nubian site of Abusir is not that of the pyramids of Abusir (of the 5th Dynasty) between Memphis and Giza, nor is it the Ptolemaic temple of Abusir on Egypt’s Mediterranean coast.

ACHEULIAN. See PALEOLITHIC.

ACTIUM. This famed naval engagement in 31 BCE redefined the balance of ancient world forces with the defeat and subsequent deaths of Anthony and Cleopatra VII (q.v.) by Octavian (Caesar Augustus) (q.v.). This terminated all Ptolemaic bids to hold power in Egypt or make alliances with Rome. The Roman era in Egypt had begun. The ancient center of world power based in Egypt decisively shifted to the northern Mediterranean and from Athens to Rome. Almost immediately, Nubians in Aswan (q.v.) were in a military confrontation with Romans that led to negotiations for the settlement of border issues. See also ROMAN INFLUENCES IN NUBIA.

ADDADA. See REHREH.

ADDHO. See JEBEL ADDHO.

ADIJKHALAMANI, AZAKHERAMON, ADKERAMON. This Meroitic king ruled from the late third century BCE to the first decades of the second century (ca. 207–200 to ca. 190–180 BCE). He is known from the Amun temple at Dabod (q.v.) with Ptolemy IV (q.v.) and from a stela at the Isis temple at Philae (q.v.), to which Ptolemy VII added his name. Both of these sites are in the most northern parts of Lower Nubia (q.v.), suggesting that he controlled an extensive territory. He likely ruled during the time of the Theban revolt, when he presented himself as the “Image of Re,” “Lord of Two Lands,” and the “Beloved Son of Isis and Osiris.” Most likely, these images were selected to legitimize his aspirations to recover the Egyptian crown.
from the Ptolemies. His royal nomenclature may be compared to that of Arkamani II at Philae and Dakka (qq.v.) or to Amasis (the Usurper) in the 26th Dynasty. Although the Dabod temple appears to have been started by Ptolemy IV, some considerable construction also took place by Adikhalamani, since he ruled Meroë and Lower Nubia during the Theban revolt, giving him access to Philae, which earlier and later was under Ptolemaic control. The Amun temple at Dabod was restored to Ptolemaic control by the time of Ptolemy VI (q.v.).

Adikhalamani ruled following the reigns of Arnekhamani and Arkhamani II (qq.v.), and it is likely that Adikhalamani or Tabirqo was buried in the Bejrawiya north pyramid 9, but it is not clear whether this is the same or a different person.

**ADINDAN.** Adindan is located on the eastern bank of the Nile about midway between Abu Simbel (q.v.) and Wadi Halfa or almost on the Egypto-Sudanese border. Keith Seele and Bruce Williams of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago excavated cemeteries T, K, U, and J of Adindan that contain funerary goods and skeletal remains of the C-Group, Pan-Grave, and Kerma (qq.v.) cultural typologies. The largest number of graves is certainly for the C-Group, and this settlement must have been smaller than the C-Group population at Aniba (q.v.). It appears that the C-Group moved back north into Lower Nubia when the Hyksos had broken the political unity of the Egyptian Nile and freed the Nubian population from Middle Kingdom Egyptians. On the other hand, material traces of the C-Group disappear once the New Kingdom is well under way. Perhaps the repetitive triangular shapes incised on C-Group pottery and painted on A-Group (q.v.) pottery suggest a thematic relationship, but the style is different.

The excavation of Adindan took place from 1960 to 1964 as a part of the UNESCO Nubian salvage project. Several intact C-Group grave circles were found, but many had already been plundered. Some C-Group graves had an unusual shaft configuration. Most corpses were buried on their right sides and were slightly flexed. Some had cattle skulls and animal remains (cattle, goats, gazelles, and a few sheep) in the burial. Cattle were clearly very important as a source of food, leather, social status, wealth, and exchange. Distinctive C-Group pottery was typically left outside the burial mound.
or stone cylinder. The shape of C-Group black-topped, incised ware can vary considerably by intended use for collection, cooking, and storage of liquids or solids. Pottery with cattle motifs was a strongly consistent style of the period at this site.

Traces of their other, rather simple material culture included leather sandals, leather clothing, caps and belts, ostrich feather fans, ostrich eggs, beaded necklaces (of many materials), rings, anklets and bracelets, snail and cowrie shell belt girdles, shell cosmetic palettes, and slotted hair clips. Some Middle Kingdom Egyptian pottery jars were excavated. These likely arrived at a time of friendly interaction between these two populations. A few figurines (mostly female) were also found.

Kerma-related graves were rectangular with a provision for bed burials. These graves were also distinguished by typical black-topped, white-banded, red Kerma beakers. Painted animal skulls, broad-bottomed pottery, and distinctive use of shell bracelet ornamentation demonstrated some limited Pan-Grave occupation. These two other contemporary cultural groups may be easily distinguished from the C-Group, but certainly some interaction took place between the three.

ADULIS. One of the largest urban centers on the Red Sea coast, Adulis was an important trading port during the Greco-Roman period (332 BCE–395 CE) of ancient Egyptian history. Located on the northeastern coast of modern Ethiopia, classical historical sources report that Ptolemy II (q.v.) founded Philadelphus, the modern archaeological site of Adulis, in the middle of the third century BCE. By 75 CE, Pliny considered Adulis one of the most important Roman ports of call on the Red Sea. The center of maritime trade between the Mediterranean and interior Africa, Adulis supplied the Roman Empire with ebony, slaves, hippopotamus hides, rhinoceros horn, tortoiseshell, gold, and spices. According to Pliny (q.v.), important export commodities were ivory and live elephants (q.v.), which were hunted and captured in the nearby forests for importation to Rome for use in entertainment or war.

Because of the relative ease with which Adulis could be approached by sea, the port had a tremendous competitive advantage over Meroë (q.v.), which was environmentally circumscribed by the
desert and Nile cataracts. As a result, Axum (q.v.), which was only an eight-day journey from Adulis, was able to surpass Meroë as the favored trading partner of the Roman Empire. Some scholars believe that this development dealt an economic blow from which Meroë was never able to recover and that eventually led to the fall of the Meroitic Kingdom. Adulis reached its peak of prosperity between the fifth and sixth centuries CE, when it became the leading port between the Byzantine Empire and India. [by k. rhodes]

AESOP (d. 564 BCE?). The sixth-century BCE storyteller was of captured slave origins and was sold from Phrygia to a merchant in the island of Samos. His status and name appears to be a corruption of “Aethiop” (or “burnt-faced people,” i.e., Nubian). This suggests that he may well have been of Nubian origin and was traded to Samos. Roughly contemporary with this period were the Assyrian-backed satrap kings of Egypt, such as Psamtik I (664–610 BCE), Necho II (610–595 BCE), and Psamtik II (595–589), of the 26th Dynasty who immediately followed in time and militarily clashed with the Nubians, easily taking prisoners of war (i.e., slave captives).

Although Aesop’s life is not well known, his biographers J. E. Keller and L. Keating describe him as having a large mouth and black eyes and as being “ugly.” Such contemporary terminology would be
consistent for someone of non-European (i.e., Nubian) origins. He also was reported as a stutterer, which could easily be a reference to an accent, and the Berber, or “Barabra” (Nubians), were so called by their “unknown stuttering” in many classical texts. One of his tales is about an Ethiopian (a Nubian slave); another is about an Ethiopian slave girl. Moreover, the circumstantial evidence in this case is strengthened by the fact that his largely moralist folktales are parallel to Nubian folklore. Exogenous animals (e.g., scarabs, jackals, foxes, monkeys, apes, elephants, crocodiles, scorpions, lions, camels, poisonous asps, and huge snakes) illustrate many of his tales. Such animals did not physically exist in contemporary Greece but were common in Nubia. Other animals often mentioned by Aesop (e.g., crows, frogs, kites, horses, dogs, bees, flies, ants, pigeons, mice, storks, rabbits, sheep, and goats) were found in Greece but were also widely known in Nubia.

The Nile is mentioned in his tale *The Murderer*, and some reports indicate that Aesop may have gone to Egypt on a trip. The tale *Eunuch and the Sacrificer* also reverberates with slavery in the Nile. Some of his tales were said to be of “Libyan origin,” a common classical reference for Africa. Modern Nubian folklore is rich in animal themes, and a common theme in African folklore in general is based on the trickster characters and cunning exploits that are common in Aesop’s fables. Thus, the specific confirmation of Aesop as a Nubian is deficient, but a convincing case can be made by circumstantial evidence.

**AFYEH, AFYEH, AFIA.** This site is some 30 kilometers upstream from Korosko. Indian salvage excavators discovered remains of both A-Group and C-Group (qq.v.) habitation at Afyeh. The importance of Afyeh is that it is one of the largest A-Group town sites. For the most part, A-Group and Predynastic Egyptians built more temporary structures, but at Afyeh some rectangular drystone masonry structures exist as well. The largest has six rooms, and several have prepared floors. All these features are indicative of a permanent settlement and intensive agriculture (q.v.).

**AGATHARCHIDES.** This Greek writer is commonly known as Agatharchides of Cnidus. He was a historian and geographer of the second century BCE, but is not considered accurate. His sixty original
works have been lost, but Diodorus and Strabo (qq.v.) refer to them. Agatharchides’ writings gave detailed accounts of how Egyptians extracted gold (q.v.) from the quartz rock. He revealed that the gold mining operations also used Nubian convict labor. The Ptolemies’ oppressive treatment of these forced gold miners was recorded in his horrific reports of heartless and murderous treatment. His records also tell how control of the gold mining regions of Lower Nubia, such as the Wadi Allaqi (qq.v.), were significant in financing Ptolemaic foreign policy in the Mediterranean basin in the third century.

Agatharchides had the idea that “Ethiopians” were the first regional inhabitants of the earth and were the first to have religion. Egyptian civilization also descended from Nubia, according to his work. It was also Agatharchides who wrote about the election of Meroitic kings by a group of priests, which seems to have taken place at the time of Arkamani (q.v.).

Agatharchides also reported on the “elephant-port” established by Ptolemy III (q.v.) on the Red Sea. This was named Ptolemais Theron (“Ptolemais of the Wild Beast”), near modern Suakin, from where elephants (q.v.) were exported to Berenike farther north on the Egyptian Red Sea coast. During these times, the Red Sea trade in elephants was maintained at a high level. [by P. Saucier and RL]

AGILKA, AGILKIA ISLAND. Agilka Island is the modern site of the relocated temples at Philae (q.v.). The top of this island was removed, and the site was hugely reconfigured with bulldozers to reproduce the orientation of nearby Philae, which is now underwater. Thus, Agilka is a product of archaeological imagination, but the result is so effective that it has essentially assumed the identity of ancient Philae.

AGRICULTURE. The history of agriculture in Nubia (q.v.) and along the Nile is a vast topic. Agriculture involved the imported grains that included emmer wheat for making beer and barley for making bread. In Nubia, millet was especially important and may have had local domestication. Root crops were not as important in the Nile valley as they were in sub-Saharan Africa, and bananas did not enter until far later. Animal husbandry included the earliest domestication of sheep, goats, pigs, and cattle (q.v.). They arrived within the Neolithic horizons of the Nubian A-Group (q.v.) and its Predynastic Egyptian coun-
terparts. Horses probably did not arrive in numbers until the time of the Hyksos (q.v.), and camels likely entered the region in Assyrian times or before. Debates over dating and the extent of agriculture will continue as scholars try to determine the precise times this innovation took place. This transformation likely took place somewhat later in Nubia than in Egypt since the extensive Nubian savanna did not create the impacted habitat as early as in Egypt. Dates in the vicinity of 7000 to 6000 BCE are reasonable estimates, but further investigation is needed, and far earlier evidence of agriculture may be forthcoming.

Agriculture in ancient Nubia was first organized around floodplain, or *gerf*, cultivation. Some canalizing of water diverted or dammed between the banks and close islands was likely at early times to extend the growing season. The introduction of the water-lifting beam, the *keeyay* (in Nubian; *shaduf* in modern Arabic) in the New Kingdom, and the endless loop of water jars with a wooden geared system, the *essikalay* (in Nubian; *sakia* in modern Arabic), during Greco-Roman times, or perhaps before, allowed intensive agriculture to expand considerably at these times.

**A-GROUP, A-HORIZON.** The A-Group is the arbitrary name given by Reisner (q.v.) to a preliterate, agricultural Lower Nubian culture contemporary with Predynastic and Early Dynastic Egypt (e.g., Badarian and Naqadan), from about 3800 BCE to about 2700 BCE. They were cattle herders, hunters, fisherfolk, gatherers, and farmers. The material culture and sociopolitical organization of the two societies is similar except for stylistic differences in their respective pottery styles. Archaeologists now divide the A-Group into Early, Classic, and Terminal phases. These last phases showed more political centralization than the Early phase. At their height, they lived in small villages with some social ranking, as judged by burial goods. They may account for the now discarded B-Group, a reference that George Reisner (q.v.) first proposed.

The origins of the A-Group are unclear, but recent work on the A-Group by Sabrina Rampersad suggests that earlier roots may be found regionally within the Abkan and Khor Bahan (qq.v.) traditions; to the south in earlier Khartoum Mesolithic Kadero and Kadada (qq.v.) traditions; and/or perhaps to the west through Wadi Howar and Wadi Milk as judged by common themes in ceramic and pastoral traditions.
Most authorities see a rather abrupt end to A-Group culture, with Archaic and Old Kingdom Egyptian invasion and expulsion of A-Group peoples and subsequent replacement by other cultural horizons. Others interpret the record as one of continuity and the gradual development of new elements leading to C-Group (q.v.) peoples.

Their material culture is known almost entirely from excavations of almost 100 cemetery sites. Very few town sites are known. As a result of the Nubian survey of the 1960s, Lower Nubia (q.v.) has at least fifty-eight A-Group cemeteries on the western bank of the Nile and thirty-five on the eastern bank. No grave site is known away from the Nile. Burials were usually in a flex position.

Especially in the Terminal A-Group, contain sites ovoid and eggshell-thin painted and burnished red and black pottery that are hallmarks of this period. By the Terminal periods, the pottery craft was highly developed. Also known are tools, slate, or stone cosmetic or paint palettes. Some utilitarian pottery and copper weapons are considered an Egyptian export to Nubia. Modest bead jewelry, amulets, and bone and ivory bracelets are also found among the grave goods. Clothing of the A-Group is unknown, but it is likely that some use was made of leather as it was in subsequent periods. Trade items exported from Nubia to Egypt likely included a standard inventory of exotic animal skins, ivory, and ebony for carving and inlays as well as resinous incense, all of which were highly valued in Egypt. It is apparent that Nile valley trade was active between A-Group Nubians and Predynastic Egyptians at least until the disruptions or expulsions by the Old Kingdom intervention, after which Egyptian gold and diorite miners arrived in Lower Nubia and traces of the A-Group vanish.

The pottery female figurines made by A-Group people are of interest. These suggest body markings such as scarification. Without any clear contextual proof, it is widely believed that these figurines had a fertility function. Also of special interest is that the known grave goods of the later times of the A-Group are not equally distributed for members of this society. Judging from the size, content, and position within a cemetery field, it is clear that status differentiation had taken place at such places as Sayala and Qustul. Their local strength came to represent a military threat to expanding Egypt. A well-known graffiti (now at the Sudan National Museum) attributed to Egyptian King Djer contains an image of defeated Nubians and
their chief hung on the bow of an Egyptian vessel. Pharaoh Senefru also reported raids into Nubia that may be considered against A-Group peoples. One can presume that these were among the last days of A-Group chieftains. During Old Kingdom dynasties, Lower Nubia was occupied by massive mud-brick forts stationed at strategic points. In the First Intermediate period during Pepi II, some renewed trade in the region or farther upstream at Kerma (q.v.) was reported, such as the expedition undertaken by the Aswani official Harkuf.

A debate among political anthropologists and archaeologists has revolved around the degree of ranking or centralization in political power at this time. At the least, regional centralization was in place. Perhaps this was on the model of a lineage-based chieftanship with an advisory council. Evidence of state insignia of a double crown and royal throne on an incense burner found at Qustul was taken by Bruce Williams to suggest that Nile valley state formation began in this region. The lack of precise dating, the lack of other monumental structures or evidence, and the easy explanation of an exogenous origin of this object presently compel acceptance of the theory that A-Group and Predynastic Egyptians were serious rivals along the Nile. However, it seems that the experience of Narmer at Hierankopolis preceeded major state formation in Nubia. Indeed, this was the most likely explanation for the later dispersal of the A-Group.

Settlement sites for the A-Group are poorly known. The organic materials from which their homes were made were perishable, and the sites were often disturbed and reoccupied over the subsequent five millennia. Moreover, the successive floodings of Lake Nasser have now obscured all riverine sites in Lower Nubia.

AHA, HOR-AHA, KING. Egyptian King Aha of the 1st Dynasty (Archaic/Early Dynastic period) may have initiated a campaign in Lower Nubia (q.v.) as a part of the early unification of the Nile River. This is based on a possible interpretation of an ebony label found at Abydos. However, the main Egyptian aggression in Lower Nubia began after the start of the Old Kingdom.

AHMOSE I, AMOSE I (1570–1546 BCE). Around 1573 BCE, King Kamose (q.v.), brother of Ahmose I, began the mission to restore Egyptian unity and expel the Hyksos (q.v.) and carry out war against
Lower Nubia (q.v.). Nubians at Kerma (q.v.) and the Hyksos (q.v.) at Avaris in the Nile delta had been allied in their efforts to restrict Egyptian power to the Upper Egypt. The objectives of Kamose were not fully achieved, but Ahmose I continued both missions and drove the Hyksos out of Egypt, succeeding in the restoration of the political unification of the Egyptian Nile. Thus, Ahmose I was the founder of the 18th Dynasty and was thereby the founder of the Egyptian New Kingdom (q.v.). The first political task for Ahmose was to complete the expulsion of the Hyksos and terminate the Second Intermediate period. Some of these Hyksos fled to Nubia, as they had been allied with Nubians in their joint opposition to the restoration of Egyptian dominance, as noted in the Kamose stela (q.v.).

According to Ernest Budge (q.v.), Ahmose’s attack against Lower Nubia was followed by a Nubian counterattack ranging from Semna to Philae (qq.v). According to the text written by an Ahmose (son of Ibana), who apparently participated with the military forces of Ahmose I, another counterraid into Nubia as far as Khent-hen-nefer resulted in the defeat of the last (Kerma?) King Tetaan. These events are described in a tomb inscription that tells of his return to Egypt with a modest number of war captives, slaves, amputated “tally hands,” and gold. Ahmose left an inscribed doorjamb at the refurbished Buhen (q.v.) fort and perhaps at Sai (q.v.) Island. This was the start of many such raids and attacks on Nubia by successive New Kingdom pharaohs such as Amenhotep I and Amenhotep III, Tuthmosis I and Tuthmosis III, Tutankhamen, Hatshepsut, Seti I, Ramses II, and Ramses III. These punitive military measures evidently were required to put down revolts and secure a flow of tribute through the offices of the King’s Son of Kush (or the viceroy of Nubia), who was, in the case of Ahmose I, his viceroy Sa-Taiyt.

AHMOSE (son of Ibana). See AHMOSE I.

AHMOSE-NEFERTARI (1570–1535). This queen was the daughter of Kamose (q.v.), an early founder of the 18th Dynasty in the New Kingdom and brother to Ahmose I (q.v.). She subsequently married her uncle Ahmose I and thus continued this powerful dynasty in Egypt by close intermarriage. Ahmose-Nefertari is depicted with a black-colored skin, suggesting that she may have been of Nubian ori-
gin. If this was the case, then either Kamose or his wife likewise had Nubian roots. Later, the skilled artisans of Deir al Medina depicted Ahmose-Nefertari as a deity. Being of royal birth, Ahmose-Nefertari became the royal mother of Amenhotep I (q.v.).

**AHS.** According to Ernest Budge (q.v.), the minor god Ahs is considered of Nubian origin, but this deity is rarely depicted.

**AKASHA.** Akasha is located amidst the Dal Cataract about forty kilometers downstream of the Third Cataract in the Butn al Hajr region. Akasha and Kulb are on the eastern bank of the Nile. At Ukma on the western bank are sites of small Christian churches. Akasha is the site of small monastic communities that may have existed during the Classic Christian period (9th–12th centuries CE). For such communities, Akasha was a holy place also housing the only known hot spring in Nubia. Along with Meinarti (q.v.), Akasha served as a customs post that demarcated the Lower Nubia (q.v.) free trade zone. It should not be confused with Aksha (q.v.). [by P. Saucier]

**AKHENATON, IKHNATON, AMENHOTEP IV.** (1350–1334 BCE). This 18th Dynasty pharaoh came from a line of pharaohs named Amenhotep (qq.v.) and was the son of Amenhotep II (q.v.) and his wife Tiye. He could have easily ruled from Thebes as did the others, but he is best known for his “heresy” against the Amun cult and his introduction of Aton worship at his new capital of Amarna. His unique portraiture, the Amarna art style, the worship of the singular Aton cult, his exquisitely lovely wife Nefertiti, palace intrigues, and the mysteries that surround his death and succession certainly make him one of the more remarkable kings of ancient Egypt.

An odd and unexplained iconography gives Akhenaton a link to Nubia. On occasion, Akhenaton was depicted wearing a skullcap and the double-cobra uraeus that later became a common symbol for Kushites in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) and thereafter.

The confusion sown in Egypt by Akhenaton’s religious experimentation may have come as some temporary relief to Kushites and Asians still reeling from the heavy hand of earlier 18th Dynasty pharaohs. In Nubia under Akhenaton, only the walled colonial town of Sesibi (q.v.) and three temples at that location were built, but this
may have been before his sixth year, when he converted to the Aton cult. Likewise, it may be that his father started the town that became known as Gem-Aton (later Kawa [q.v.]), opposite modern Dongola (q.v.) and a few miles above Kerma (q.v.). Once his reign was over, most traces of his administration were carefully eliminated or recycled into other structures. One could imagine that the temple of Tutankhamen built at Kawa may have been fashioned from blocks originally used in the construction there by his ancestor Akhenaton. Finally, this dynasty collapsed in confusion, perhaps because of the murder of Tutankhamen and military rule by Horemhab. However, with the start of the 19th Dynasty, Nubia was still under Egyptian colonial rule.

AKHRATAN, AKHRATANYI. This Napatan king ruled from about 353 to 340 BCE (alternatively 350–335 BCE) or just after Nectanebo I (q.v.) or just before the arrival of Alexander the Great (q.v.) in Egypt. He was one of the last to be buried in the royal Nuri cemetery before royal burials briefly reverted to Jebel Barkal pyramids. Thereafter, the capital was moved to Meroë (q.v.) itself in about 270 BCE. Akhratan is assumed to be a son of Harsiyotef (q.v.) since he has a similar throne name. Akhratan’s Horus name is similar to that of Ramses II (q.v.). A black granite statue at the Amun temple in Napata (Jebel Barkal) and a sandstone masonry pyramid are the only existing pieces of architecture that are attributed to Akhratan. This is sculpted in the style of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). [by P. Saucier with R. Lobban]

AKIN. Akin was a Meroitic province that had relative political and economic autonomy within the Meroitic Kingdom. Since the first century BCE, a peshito, or governor, ruled the region of Akin. Culturally differentiated Akin had a small, urbanized area that was important to the kingdom of Meroë (q.v.). First, Akin served as Meroë’s front line of defense against Roman Egypt. Second, Akin’s arable land allowed for an agricultural surplus, thus having grain wealth for a basic form of “currency” to pay employees and dependents of the state. Third, the region was in a strategic position for profitable external and internal trade networks. The region imported from Roman Egypt wines, oils, and bronze vessels while exporting from Upper Nubia
and Meroë, to Roman Egypt products such as wood, ivory, and cotton. It also possessed a riverine trading route to protect it from attacks by desert peoples, especially the Blemmyes (q.v.). In economic terms, the merchants of Akin served as middlemen in Egyptian and Upper Nubian trade networks.

The word “Akin” is also associated with the three main classes of Meroitic officials of the north: “Prince (pesto) of Akin,” mercenary Blemmyes (pelmes), and “Royal Crown-Prince” (pqr). Each title appears to have been a hereditary and traditional title giving status to local ruling families. [by P. Saucier]

AKINIDAD. Akinidad was a Meroitic military leader (pesto) and king ruling in the first decade BCE, probably between 18 and 12 BCE, after Queen Amanirenas (q.v.) and before Queen Amanishakhete. Akinidad was one of several second- and first-century leaders to leave inscriptions in the temples of Dakka, Meroë, and Napata (qq.v.). The most famed and important inscription for Akinidad is the stela (now in the British Museum, No. 1650) from Hamadab, near Meroë, that was inscribed with a very long historical text in Meroitic. The first line shows a long row of eleven bound prisoners. Midway are numerical references that may indicate the numbers and origins of these captives, and the end of the closing line appears to be a date for the inscription. Presumably, Akinidad and Queen Amanirenas offer an account that is believed to be about a military action against the Roman forces in Aswan led by Petronius (q.v.), who was serving Caesar Augustus (q.v.). Three cartouches have also been revealed on the corridor walls of the “Sun Temple” in the name of Akinidad. [R. Lobban with P. Saucier]

AKSHA, AKSHEH (TEH-KHET DISTRICT). Aksha was located between Faras and Buhen, all being on the western bank of the Nile. Sometimes Aksha is noted as Serra West, across from Serra East. Aksha should not be confused with Akasha (q.v.). The research of Bruce Williams at Serra East has found occupation from A- and C-Groups (qq.v.), Pan-Grave (q.v.), and a New Kingdom fortress and rock-cut tombs as well as in X-Group (Ballana) times (q.v.).

Not surprisingly, Aksha contains some evidence, raised by Jean Vercoutter, of an Egyptian cemetery that dates back to the Archaic or
1st Dynasty occupation at this site. However, it is known mainly for serving as a New Kingdom town in the Ibshek region. It was the site of a small freestanding sandstone temple, first built by Seti I, which was completed by his son Ramses II (q.v.), who deified himself as the “The living Lord of Nubia,” thus justifying his list of southern (Nubian) conquests on this temple. This was built in much the same spirit of imperial conquest as the construction of Amenhotep III at Sulb or Tutankhamen at Faras (q.q.v.).

Being in poor condition, only the western wall of the temple was removed in 1963 and relocated in 1968 to the northern side of the garden at the Sudan National Museum in Khartoum. The remaining inscriptions show lists of northern (Asian) and southern (Nubian) lands he had conquered. Specific lands are noted in the standard form of bound prisoners over the cartouches identifying their places of origin.

AKUYTA. Akuyta was a small chiefdom in southern Nubia following the disappearance of the small states of Aushek and Webetsepet, which were associated with seminomadic peoples of the region. [by P. Sauvier]

AL-. “Al-” is the definite article in Arabic. To find a word beginning with “al-,” look under the word following it. For example, to find “al-Mahdi” (“the Mahdi”), look under “Mahdi.” This is the convention of Arabic-origin words in this book. Some other texts use an “el-” form, and others use “nunated” letters that transform “al-” or “el-” to “ar-,” “ash-,” or “en-.”

ALARA. This Nubian king may be the first named king of a dynasty that would later emerge as the 25th Dynasty. He likely was born in Sanam (q.v.). Alara is buried at Kurru (q.v.) in a line of about a dozen royal burials that suggest regional state formation in the Nubian “Dark Ages” that preceded Alara by at least one or two centuries. Their names have not been recovered. They ruled Nubia after the former withdrawal of the Egyptian military forces of the New Kingdom (q.v.) and its viceroy of Nubia (King’s Sons of Kush). Although the location of the earlier mound graves with bed burials at Kurru are known, they lack inscriptions, so none of Alara’s predecessors is
known by name or by commonly agreed sequence. The burial type is reminiscent of Kerma (q.v.) and certainly not like Egyptian burials. Some sparse evidence exists of ongoing links with Egypt.

Most likely, Alara reigned from Kurru or Napata (q.v.) in Upper Nubia in the early or mid-eighth century BCE. The full extent of Alara's domain is not determined with accuracy, but a case could be made that he recovered some territory of Lower Nubia, but probably did not control Thebes. However, Egyptian authority was much withered at this time in the Third Intermediate period. Deep rivalries in Egypt between the delta—at Memphis, Heracleopolis, Thebes, and Hermopolis—meant that the way was paved for Nubians to be heralded as saviors of peace and religious conservatism. On Alara's death, his brother Kashta (q.v.) continued the path for Napatan authority to enter Egypt. Under Kashta's son Piankhy (q.v.), continuous Nubian rule was established over Egypt in the eighth and seventh centuries BCE as the 25th Dynasty.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT (r. 332–323 BCE). This Macedonian was the builder of the great empire centered at Alexandria, named in his honor. He attacked coastal Asia Minor in 334 BCE and, by 333 BCE, forced a retreat of the forces of Darius at the battle of Issus. Cyprus was taken over by the Greeks, and Sidon in Phoenicia also capitulated as Alexander's forces advanced to Damascus. After a seven-month siege of Tyre, it too fell, and by 332 BCE, he had captured Darius and completed his defeat of the Achaemenid (Persian) Empire. The Persians had threatened Greece and dominated the eastern Mediterranean previously. In this context of whirlwind military expansion, the cities of Judaea and Egypt easily accepted his arrival. He arrived in Egypt in 331 and promptly visited the Amun temple at Siwa. Almost as promptly, he left Egypt, never to return until his body was returned after his death. His tomb in Alexandria remains one of the great archaeological quests.

His lasting major achievement in Egypt was the foundation of the city of Alexandria, designed by Dinocrates on a grid pattern. Over the next three centuries, relations between the Greeks in Egypt and Nubia ranged from cordial and commercial to hostile and military. Greek merchants traded cloth, glass, and bronze ware with Nubians for ivory, elephants, slaves, ebony, feathers, gold, incense, and other
goods from “Ethiopia,” or “the land of the people with the burnt faces.” Because Jews (q.v.) had been accommodating to him, he allowed Jews to settle in Alexandria and elsewhere in Egypt.

In fact, Alexander did not stay long in Egypt after his pilgrimage to the Amun temple of Siwa, as he ventured onto the shores of the Caspian Sea and, from 327 to 326, was engaged in a far-flung campaign in India. It was on his return that he died in 323 BCE, after which weak rule ensued in Egypt by his half brother and son, who soon saw the loss of some of the Alexandrian conquests, such as Babylonia and, by the Seleucids, Persia. Judaea remained for a longer period of time under Ptolemaic rule, and the long and complex process of the Hellenization of Jews was begun. Such it was until the Lagid Ptolemies (qq.v.) began a more institutionalized administration. Hellenic influences in Egypt emerging in the wake of Alexander were to have a deep influence in Meroë (q.v.) in architecture, foreign relations, the changing control of Lower Nubia (q.v.), the sciences, mathematics, Euclidian geometry, and language.

ALWA, ALOA, ALODIA. The kingdom of Alwa first emerged in central Sudan sometime after the fall of Meroë (q.v.). Its capital was at Soba near modern Khartoum that was first built from bricks salvaged from Soba. In about 580 CE, the rulers of Alwa were converted to Monophysite (q.v.) Christianity by Longinus (q.v.). Alwa survived as a Christian state far longer than the northern Christian kingdoms in Nubia. According to tradition, Soba finally fell to the Funj (q.v.) in 1504, although the kingdom was certainly weakened before then. See also CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA; DONGOLA; MUKURIA; NOBATIA.

AMADA, AMADEH. Amada is located in Lower Nubia (q.v.) between Qasr Ibrim and Korosko (qq.v.). Early excavations by the University of Chicago, the University of Pennsylvania, and later German salvage excavations revealed C-Group (q.v.) occupation and remains, the New Kingdom (q.v.) temple, and regional evidence dated to Meroitic, X-Group, and Christian (qq.v.) times. The C-Group settlement at Amada shows a complex building, including numerous storage rooms, silos, and residential structures. The relative size and differentiation of this building suggest that a ranked society was extant.
Today, Amada is most noted for the excellent temple dedicated to Amun-Re and Re-Horakhty built entirely in the New Kingdom. Pharaohs Tuthmosis III and Amenhotep II (q.v.) built the inner sections and a hypostyle hall or four-columned forecourt was added by Tuthmosis III and Tuthmosis IV (qq.v.) in celebration of the latter’s second jubilee festival. Inscriptions noting the defeat of Libyans and Asians by Amenhotep II and Merneptah are recorded at this temple. Hekanakht, the viceroy of Kush under Amenhotep II, is depicted personally executing seven chiefs of the Takhesy (Tehkhet?) district and following the ancient example from King Djer (q.v.). He displayed their inverted bodies as he sailed back to Egypt proper. Commemorative mention is made of the Egyptian mercenary commander of the Nubian archers, Epyoy, and a pyramidion of Viceroy Mesuy, who served Merneptah.

Akhenaton (q.v.) and his Aton cult left their traces here in their effort to remove the role of Amun, but restorations attributed to Seti I and Ramses II sought to correct this mutilation. A substantial amount of the original colors may still be seen in Amada temple, and rich details of the ritual aspects of temple construction and dedication may be seen in the small chambers to the left and right of the inner sanctuary dedicated to Amenhotep II. In Christian times, this temple was plastered and repainted for religious purposes. But when the temple was visited in the early twentieth century, almost sixty centimeters of rubbish and fill had entered the main temple space, giving access to the upper walls for graffiti of camels and livestock by local nomadic peoples.

Being sited below the flood level of Lake Nasser, the temple was dismantled with difficulty between 1964 and 1975. It was moved to a new site, about three kilometers upstream and sixty-five meters higher, in association with the Temple of Ed-Derr built by Ramses II and the tomb of Penniut from Aniba (qq.v.). In an effort to avoid having to deconstruct the Amada temple, workers moved the temple on a set of three railway tracks laid to support its great weight (some 900 tons) across the sand from the barge that carried it from its original site to its present location. There, it was lowered by hydraulic jacks to make a prominent monument of this new archaeological center.

A handsome ceramic child’s coffin from New Kingdom (q.v.) times is known from Amada and is in the Museum of Fine Arts collection in Boston. It carries standard funerary features of protective Anubis figures, Osiris, and the four “sons of Horus” symbolizing the canopic jars.
AMANIKHABAILE. See BASA.

AMANIKHATASHANI, QUEEN (62–85 CE). This Meroitic queen is known from her Bejrawiya north pyramid 18. An interesting feature is that she was buried with as many as three wooden bows, suggesting her military and regnal role.

AMANIMALOL. See ANLAMANI; ASPELTA.

AMANINATAKILEBTE (538–519 BCE). This Napatan king is poorly known, but a lovely silver mirror handle was found at Nuri (q.v.) with his name and is now in the collection of the Museum of Fine Arts (No. 21.338) in Boston. It shows a solar disk with deities protecting the four directions, with Amun-Re guarding the east and west and Re-Horakhty protecting the north and south. This king is also known for a sandstone heart scarab (No. 20.645) that presumably was part of his original mumification and burial at Nuri.

AMANINETEYERIKE (431–405 BCE). This Napatan king is noted in inscriptions at the temple of Kawa (q.v.), where he tells of his military conquests, his coronation, and restoration of the temple. Importantly, the inscription gives the first written mention of Meroë (q.v.) as a contemporary town of the Napatan Kingdom. Archaeological and inscriptional evidence at Meroë shows that it certainly existed much earlier. Amanineteyerike may have actually lived at Meroë, but was buried in pyramid 12 at Nuri (q.v.).

AMANIRENAS, QUEEN (20s BCE?). This Meroitic queen is best known from her Hamadab stela that is jointly attributed to her and to her son, Prince Akinidad (q.v.). She was likely the wife of King Teriteqas. This historically important document may relate to her attack at the Roman garrisons at Aswan (q.v.) in the 20s BCE, shortly after the arrival of the Romans in Egypt. If this is correct, then she may have been the famed “one-eyed queen” of Meroë and the one who brought back the bronze head of Augustus to that capital town. This also suggests that Teriteqas had already died.

Inscriptions for Amanirenas are found at Temple T at Kawa and at Dakka, where Petronius defeated the queen in his counterattack. The
case be made instead that this attack was undertaken by Meroitic kandake (q.v.) Amanishkheto (q.v.). That this basic question rests without firm resolution is one of the serious problems in Meroitic historiography.

AMANISHKHETE, AMANISHAKTO, AMANISHAKHETO, AMANISHAKETE (41–12 BCE?). This regnant queen of Meroë (q.v.) was on the throne during or just after the transition of Ptolemaic to Roman rule in Egypt. Thus, it might have been her forces that attacked the Roman garrison at Aswan and returned to Meroë with the bronze head of Augustus (q.v.) (according to Shinnie 1996:116). With Meroitic chronology weak and Meroitic texts not deciphered, it may be that she (or was it Queen Amanirenas? [according to Adams 1977:312; Welsby 1996:21]) was the kandake (q.v.) in power, noted by Strabo (q.v.) when the treaty of Samos was concluded and the Roman-Nubian border was set initially at Maharraka. She was possibly the Nubian head of state in the failed Meroitic counterattack as Qasr Ibrim (q.v.).

There is reason to believe that her 670-square-meter royal palace was located at Naqa (q.v.) and that it offered living quarters, multi-columned halls, a maze of corridors, and storerooms for her treasures. As with modern Sudanese residences, it appears that additional living (or sleeping?) space was provided by a stairway to the second story or roof level. Steffen Wenig recently reported two new stela for Amanishaketo from Naqa.

One of the remarkable features of this queen was her very impressive burial cache, in her Bejrawiya north pyramid 6, of lovely gold jewelry, glass objects, bronze work, silver, and semiprecious stones along with four Hellenistic-style flutes. It is not clear whether these objects were made locally under Greek influence or were high-status trade items. It appears that this cache was also uniquely conceived as a tomb for her ba spirit. She also showed great reverence to the goddess Isis.

While most Meroitic pyramids were solid, and only covered tombs, hers was unusual in that some treasures were buried in the superstructure. After treasures were discovered in her pyramid in 1834 by the Italian adventurer Giuseppe Ferlini (q.v.), needless destruction of many other Meroitic pyramids was instigated in a quest for valuables that were never found.
AMANISLO (ca. 275–260 BCE). This Meroitic king was the second to be buried at Bejrawiya after the relocation of the capital from Napata to Meroë (q.v.). Before departing from Napata, Amanislo, it is believed, was responsible for removing a pair of red granite couchant lion statues from Sulb to Napata. In Sulb, they had been first installed by Amenhotep III (q.v.) and may have been reused by Amanislo. These lions now reside in the British Museum, where they are sometimes referred to as the “Prudhoe lions.” Amanislo still attended important ceremonial functions there, such as his coronation, and he probably constructed or renewed a palace at Napata as well. His predecessor, Arkamani I (q.v.), had earlier introduced the practice of royal burials to the new southern capital at Meroë, and it was there that Amanislo was buried in the Bejrawiya south pyramid 5. It is Amanislo who is rendered as “Amonasro” in Verdi’s opera Aida.

AMANITENMENIDE. This Meroitic king lived in about 50 CE, and inscriptions are attributed to him at the funerary chapel attached to pyramid 17 in the northern burial field at Meroë (q.v).

AMANITORE, AMANITERE, AMANITARE (12 BCE–12 CE). This Meroitic queen was coregent with her husband Natakamani. They resided at the royal capital Meroë (q.v.) and made additions or improvements to the Amun temple there. A more prominent image of these coregents appears on the Apedemek (Lion) Temple at Naqa (q.v.), along with their son Arikhankharer. There, both are shown smiting enemies. Another nearby temple to Amun was built during their joint reign. Also in the Butana are found two additional temples attributed to these rulers. Short bilingual inscriptions on a small bark stand, now in Berlin, were written in Egyptian hieroglyphs and Meroitic and played an important role in the pioneering transliteration of Meroitic by F. Ll. Griffith (q.v.). Far to the north at Amara (q.v.), another temple was also attributed to these joint rulers. At Jebel Barkal (q.v.), they may have had a palace for religious services there. Judging from the extent of the constructions, it may be said that these two Meroitic rulers represented the Meroitic “Golden Age” of empire, before Axum (q.v.) would erode their trade to the east and Roman dominance of Egypt would curb Meroitic trade to the north. Amanitore was buried in the Bejrawiya north pyramid 1.
AMARA EAST. Amara East is located just downstream of Sai Island (q.v.) near the Third Cataract in the Nile. This town site was occupied in Meroitic times and had a small temple attributed to Amanitare and Natakamani (qq.v.) that was styled in a manner similar to the Naqa (q.v.) Temple. This temple has the northernmost example of the use of Meroitic hieroglyphs (q.v.).

AMARA WEST, PEDEME, PEZEME (in Meroitic). The site of Amara West is directly across from Amara East (q.v.) and just downstream from Sai Island (q.v). The western site has remains of a small Amun temple of Ramses II (q.v.) and a trace of his Ramses-Town enclosure wall. During Ramses II’s long reign, Amara West was the seat of his several viceroys of Nubia (see appendix). This was a more forward location for the imperial viceroys than at their seats in Aniba or Quban (q.v.). On the town gate are notations of Ramses II’s regional plunder and raiding of Nubia in the 19th Dynasty.

AMASIS (570–526 BCE). This Saite pharaoh of the 26th Dynasty succeeded Apries (q.v.) after civil war broke out between them. Amasis was a veteran of Nubian military campaigns and was able to turn this combat experience to his favor by defeating Apries in combat, earning him the name “The Usurper.” Amasis had a remarkably long reign and was really the last effective king of the 26th Dynasty, which had replaced the Nubians in Thebes.

AMENEMHAT I, AMMENAMES (1991–1962 BCE). This founder of the 12th Dynasty in the Middle Kingdom (q.v.) conducted punitive wars against Wawat in Lower Nubia (qq.v.) and thus against the C-Group (q.v.) peoples who may have still been in that region, such as those known at Aniba and Adindan (qq.v.). Textual evidence notes that Amenemhat I “sent twenty ships to Elephantine and above” for this purpose, and his campaign against the C-Group is noted at Korosko (q.v.) as late as his twenty-ninth regnal year. With this conquest complete, further renewal of the Middle Kingdom forts of Lower Nubia was possible. In addition, it is possible that at this time Nubian “Bow-People” territory stretched much farther north, perhaps as far as Edfu in Upper Egypt. Seeking strategic mobility in the Egyptian empire, he built his capital south of Memphis.
and far north of Thebes. The relocation of political power in the Middle Kingdom is seen in the shifting of the functional capital from Thebes to Lisht.

Textual evidence suggests that Amenemhat I had a Ta-Seti or Nubian mother and may have been born in Elephantine (q.v.). He introduced the stabilizing position of a junior coregent so that power would flow more consistently within the dynasty; thus, his successor, Senusoret I (q.v.), was coregent from about 1980 BCE. It is likely that Senusoret I led important military expeditions against the Nubians in the twenty-ninth year of the reign of Amenemhat I. This brought Wawat under Egyptian control up to Korosko, located at the northern end of an important Eastern Desert route that also led to the gold mines of Wadi al Allaqi (q.v.).

It is believed that Amenemhat seized power in the 11th Dynasty from Mentuhotep IV, under whom he had served as vizier. Amenemhat I was buried in the revived pyramid style at his mud-brick pyramid that still stands at Lisht along the Nile near Fayum.

**AMENEMHAT II (1929–1895 BCE).** This long-lived Middle Kingdom (q.v.) pharaoh from the 12th Dynasty was the son of Senusoret (q.v.) and was recorded for backing a trading voyage to the Red Sea and to Punt (q.v.) in the twenty-eighth year of his reign. His burial in a mud-brick pyramid at Dashur (not Lisht, like Amenemhat I) provided marvelous jewelry for his queens, including a golden cowrie necklace or girdle similar to the real cowrie shell belts found for the C-Group at Adindan (qq.v.).

**AMENEMHAT III, AMMENEMES III (1842–1797 BCE).** This Egyptian pharaoh ruled at the height of Middle Kingdom domination of Lower Nubia (qq.v.). Although like others in the 12th Dynasty his ruled was centered in Lower and Middle Egypt, he is known especially for the famous “Labyrinth Palace” and his mud-brick pyramid at Hawara in the Fayum, adjacent to an ancient canal that brought water from the Nile into Fayum. He also constructed a pyramid at Dashur and was deified, like Senusoret.

**AMENEMOPE.** Amenemope is known from a stela at Shaat on Sai (q.v.) Island and from Amara West (q.v.).
AMENHOTEP I, AMENOPHIS I (ca. 1551–1524 BCE). Amenhotep I was the son of Ahmose I (q.v.), founder of the New Kingdom (q.v.). Amenhotep I was destined to extend the newly reborn empire into Nubia. He led at least one military expedition to Kush (q.v.) and one against the Libyans. Amenhotep I’s mother, Ahmose-Nefertari (q.v.), may have had Nubian origins.

This 18th Dynasty pharaoh of the New Kingdom continued the struggle to rebuild Egyptian unity and hegemony over Nubia. Amenhotep I continued the grand plans of Ahmose, but instead turned southward to give more attention to Nubia. After the end of the Middle Kingdom, the Nubians occupied or destroyed the Middle Kingdom fortresses of Sesostris and Amenemhet, and it was the goal of Amenhotep I to retake these edifices. Amenhotep’s army reached the vicinity of the Second Cataract, and he established a military-colonial governor at Nekhen (Hierakonpolis) to control all of Wawat (q.v.). This location hints at either a much more extensive Nubian territory or a rather timid Egyptian presence in Nubia, since Nekhen lies substantially downstream from modern Aswan, which today is considered the gateway to Nubia. Local Nubian chiefs initially had a presence as far north as Qasr Ibrim (q.v.), but Egyptians steadily replaced them. This was a high-ranking position designed to be directly responsible to the pharaoh and to ensure a steady flow of tribute and punitive measures against restive Nubians.

After the reign of Amenhotep I, the Egyptian rule over Wawat advanced much farther south, perhaps as far as Napata (q.v.). Amenhotep I introduced the title King’s Son of Kush (viceroy of Nubia), which was applied to Thuwre, who was among the first to hold this position. Amenhotep I was probably the first to have a rock-cut tomb in the Valley of the Kings at the western Theban necropolis. Although the locations of his tomb and funerary goods are not known, his mummy was recovered in the royal cache at Deir al-Bahri.

Amenhotep I (q.v.) had a critical role for the river commander Ahmose, son of Ibana (q.v.), in the Egyptian reconquest of Nubia. This commander was in charge of battling his way to the Third Cataract, meeting Nubian resistance as he went. His southernmost point was documented with a set of conquest stelae at Tombos (q.v.), which he valued for its strategic position and stone quarries. Returning from his victories, Ahmose sailed back to Egypt through the newly cleared channel at
Seheil Island (q.v.) and on to Thebes with the upside-down body of a Nubian chief hanging from the bow of his naval vessel.

AMENHOTEP II, AMENOPHIS II (ca. 1453/1450–1425/1419 BCE). This New Kingdom pharaoh used his personal and collective military might throughout the Egyptian Empire and into neighboring Palestine and even Syria. As an imperialist, he also sent his armies to Kush (q.v.) in the third year of his reign. Amenhotep II concluded construction of temples at Elephantine and Amada (qq.v.) that had been initiated by his famed warrior-king father Tuthmosis III (q.v.). At Amada, he noted his defeat of the Libyans and Asians. The viceroy of Kush under Amenhotep II was Usersatet/Weser-Satet. The plundered mummy of Amenhotep II was found in its sarcophagus in the Valley of the Kings.

Amenhotep II ruled briefly with his father as coregent and soon faced revolts in western Asia on his father’s death. These revolts were put down by the second year of his reign, but he then turned to Nubia to face the same problem in the third year. He appointed Usersatet as his viceroy of Nubia, and Usersatet carried out Amenhotep II’s construction projects in Nubia. These include the completion of a temple initiated by his father at Elephantine in Aswan (q.v.) and another at Amada in Lower Nubia (qq.v.). Those Asian princes who resisted were treated in the now familiar way of having them hung upside down on the bow of his vessels returning from Asia. Perhaps the pharaoh Amenhotep II himself struck the executioner’s blow on these resistant princes. Six of his victims were hung up on the walls of Theban temples and another so decorated the temple at Napata (q.v.) as a bloody warning to Nubians who might be inclined to revolt. Napata was thus maintained as a southern point of the New Kingdom in the region then termed Karoy. Amenhotep II set up a boundary stela at Napata (q.v.) to demarcate his territory. Amenhotep II was buried in the Valley of the Kings, and his mummy is still preserved in the Cairo Museum.

AMENHOTEP III, AMENOPHIS III (1386–1349 BCE/alt. 1417–1379 BCE). From his great grandfather, Tuthmosis III (q.v.), Amenhotep III inherited a huge empire. In Nubia, his rule extended to the province of Karoy/Karei (or the region of Napata [q.v.]). Fol-
lowing the standard New Kingdom colonial practice in Nubia, many of the pharaohs of this period sought their legitimacy in Egypt with reference to Amun, Re, and Ptah. However, in Nubia, colonial rule was often legitimated with the pharaoh shown worshiping Nubian deities (such as the Elephantine triad) or by having the pharaoh actually deified to ensure “proper” respect. Such was also the case for Amenhotep III.

In Nubia, Amenhotep III constructed the great temple at Soleb (q.v.), where this pharaoh was proclaimed the Lord of Nubia under the title Neb-Maat-Re. Aside from the still standing remains of this temple were the pink granite couchant lions that no doubt flanked the entrance to the temple. These stone lions had a fascinating subsequent journey through time after being removed from Soleb to Jebel Barkal (q.v.), perhaps at the time of the 25th Dynasty.

The Meroitic king Amanislo (q.v.) reinserted these lions in the third century CE. In about 1828, the British explorer Lord Prudhoe traveled to Egypt and Nubia and removed them from Jebel Barkal during the Turco-Egyptian military occupation of the Sudan. After his return, they were presented to the British Museum, where they rest today, although no published account of his travels seem to exist. The literature sometimes refers to these recumbent beasts as “the Prudhoe lions.”

The four decades of colonial rule by Amenhotep III appear to have been very prosperous and relatively peaceful in Nubia. One punitive expedition, in about 1381 BCE, is known from inscriptions at Aswan (q.v.) and Konosso. Perhaps another expedition was made to Nubia from Semna (q.v.). The lofty position of the King’s Son of Kush under Pharaoh Amenhotep III was initially occupied by a viceroy named Amenhotep and then by the viceroy’s son Merymose. In the fifth year of Amenhotep III’s rule, Viceroy Merymose sent a punitive expedition to Nubia using Nubian (Medjay?) troops from his Kubban fort in Wawat (q.v.). He reportedly crushed a revolt upstream of Qasr Ibrim (q.v.) at Ibhet. His victory stela proclaimed 740 Nubian prisoners and 312 enemy dead in a brief battle that was followed by extensive looting of Nubian resources and people.

From a Nubian point of view, if anything good might be said about the raid of Viceroy Merymose, it is that this was the last major military incursion in the 18th Dynasty. This was partly because his successor, Akhenaton, suspended the worship of Amun and became so
much diverted by the politics of his Aton cult that Egyptian colonial rule in Nubia was undermined. On the other hand, Egyptian rule was hardly suspended, judging from the Nubian tribute and images of subordination shown by Viceroy Huy, who served Pharaoh Tutankhamen (q.v.).

Amenhotep III is recorded as organizing a trading voyage to Punt (q.v.), probably from the Red Sea port of Quseir. No doubt, Nubian visitors to Thebes at the time of Amenhotep III were much impressed by his immense mortuary temple on the western bank of the Nile, the remains of which are now reduced to the so-called Colossi of Memnon at his Malkata palace. Many huge, magnificent sculptures and constructions at Karnak and Luxor and the grand Malkata palace of Amenhotep III were also produced partly from the great wealth extracted from Nubia. Amenhotep III’s intriguing wife Tiye (q.v.) had a temple built at Sedegna near Sulb (qq.v.). Because of his long life and relatively stable regime, Amenhotep III brought the 18th Dynasty to its height.

AMENHOTEP IV. See AKHENATON.

AMENIRDIS I, AMENARDIS, AMONORTAIS, AMENARTESU (740–700 BCE). This God’s Wife of Amun (GWA, or Divine Wife of Amun) at Thebes was in office from 740 to 700 BCE. She was the daughter of the Nubian king Kashta (q.v.), who was the forerunner to the 25th Dynasty in Napata. The established protocol was that the ruling pharaoh would have his daughter “adopted” into this ranking celibate position of Thebes by the former holder of the God’s Wife of Amun title. Thus, Amenirdis was the “adopted daughter” of Shepenwepet, daughter of the former pharaoh Osorkon III. Amenirdis I was also the sister of Piankhy and Shabaka. It may be that at one point, Amenirdis I and Piankhy were virtual coregents, at least in terms of the great powers that both wielded. Subsequently, Amenirdis I “adopted” Shepenwepet II, the daughter of Piankhy, as her “daughter” successor to the position of God’s Wife of Amun.

At the northern enclosure of Karnak (q.v.) near the Montu temple are several chapels to these Nubian God’s Wives of Amun. A door lintel inscribed to Amenirdis I and Shepenwepet II is in the Egyptian Museum (No. 39400, Room 30) and may have been from that chapel.
at Karnak. They were buried in their own funerary chapels at Medinet Habu, in the forecourt of the funerary temple of Ramses III. Fine freestanding alabaster sculptures of Amenirdis are also found in the Egyptian Museum (No. 930) and the British Museum (No. 46699). A scarab for Amenirdis I is at the Metropolitan Museum in New York. Clearly, this position of the God’s Wife of Amun carried considerable influence and prestige. It was important in legitimating the connections between the ruling dynasty and the Theban priesthood and its High Priest of Amun, who could also be a royal member, such as was the case in the 25th Dynasty, when Harkebi (q.v.), a grandson of Shabaka, occupied this office, and apparently Harkebi continued in a slightly reduced role even after the 26th Dynasty assumed power. [by M. Ayad and R. Lobban; see appendix, Kinship in the 25th Dynasty]

AMENIRDIS II. This Nubian princess was the sister of Taharka (q.v.). She had been “adopted” by Shepenwepet II, who herself had been “adopted” by Amenirdis I, following the pattern of dynastic succession for the significant position of the God’s Wife of Amun at Thebes. Despite the fact that Taharka was driven out of Thebes by military force, the position of God’s Wife of Amun still held by Amenirdis II carried powerful legitimacy, so one assumes that she was compelled to “adopt” Nitocris when Taharka and Tanutamun of the 25th Dynasty were replaced by Psamtik (q.v.) of the 26th Dynasty. Nitocris (q.v.) was the daughter of Psamtik. In this way, a parallel, more or less exclusive female dynasty served to thwart the claims of rivals to Theban authority, since the God’s Wife of Amun was a blood relative of the king. The position of the God’s Wife of Amun was something of a divine “mother superior,” and this officeholder was not formally allowed to marry a civilian, as she was viewed as being married to Amun. [by M. Ayad and R. Lobban]

AMERIS, AMMERIS, AMERES (715–696 BCE). Following the death of Piankhy in 716 BCE, the Nubians sought to upgrade their control of Egypt, now under their complete authority. Annoyed by the lack of loyalty of Bakenranef (q.v.) and the other Libyan princes in the western delta, the new pharaoh Shabaka determined a new course. He executed Bakenranef by burning him at the stake and then appointed Nubians to these top administrative positions.
According to Manetho (q.v.), such was the case of the Nubian Ameris, who served as the top administrator of the delta during all of Shabaka’s administration and at least seven years of the reign of Shabataka (q.v.). This policy proved effective for most of the rest of the 25th Dynasty, until Assyrian military pressure on Taharka and Assyrian political appointments of their satraps in the delta brought back disloyal Libyans into these positions to undermine Nubian control.

**AMUN, AMEN, AMON CULT**. The most significant of all Egyptian deities after the New Kingdom was the sun god Amun. Although technically the religion of ancient Egypt was polytheistic, this centralized theocratic state certainly held Amun as the highest god, especially by the New Kingdom. Amun is simultaneously conflated with Re or Ra as the composite sun god. Pharaohs were projected as direct offspring of the god Amun and his wife Mut. Amun rituals were important from the Middle Kingdom, but especially throughout the New Kingdom at Karnak, Luxor, the western bank of the Nile, and Jebel Barkal. Nubians carried on the Amun cult long after even into the late X-Group (q.v.) times. Many Egyptian rulers and common folk were given names derived from Amun.

After the New Kingdom, the High Priests of Amun were virtually the pharaohs of Upper Egypt and Nubia, and the position of the God’s Wife of Amun was used to associate the Nubian pharaohs of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) with this important Amun cult by having family members serve in this position. This political and religious manipulation harkens back to the time of Hatshepsut, who heard the voice of Amun allowing her to rule as a female.

Relative to Nubia, the god Amun is sometimes reckoned as the “Bull of Nubia,” that is, the patriarchal and progenitor “father of Nubia.” Amun was very commonly portrayed as a ram with forward-curving horns at both Napata and Thebes. At Jebel Barkal (q.v.), the god Amun in his ram form was considered to live within this holy mountain, and the original freestanding temple there was one of huge proportions. The famed rock-hewn temples at Abu Simbel in Lower Nubia and the temple at Wadi es-Sebua (qq.v.) were also built to honor Amun, among other deities. Amun’s usual consort was the goddess Mut. Aside from carrying the ankhu (life sign) and was (Theban power sign), Amun is usually portrayed wearing a double-plumed
crown. Amun was subsequently reconfigured as the god Zeus of the Greeks.

ANHUR, ANHURIS, ONHUR, ONOURIS, ONURIS. This Egyptian god was worshiped in Nubia. His Hellenized form is Onuris, a god of war and hunting. Some tales relate that Anhur encouraged Tefnut to return to Egypt from Nubia after her period of exile there. This deity of the sky has a parallel function with the Egyptian god Shu. Anhur can also serve as a warrior for the god Amun-Re, like the Egyptian god Montu. As a warrior, Anhur is especially vigilant against those intending harm to the state. Anhur usually is depicted in an anthropomorphic form and may be confused with Amun since they are distinguished mainly by having two plumes for Amun and four plumes for Anhur. This deity may also have creator roles. Anhur was worshiped in Nubia and in Greco-Roman Egypt at Abydos and elsewhere.

ANIBA, ANIBEH, MIAM. Nubian occupation of Aniba in Lower Nubia (q.v.) is dated to A-Group times, but C-Group cemeteries are also found there. The C-Group occupation of Aniba was contemporary with that of Adindan (q.v.), which has similar material culture for this period. Perhaps these were contemporary with Middle Kingdom Egyptian use of the site, then termed “Miam.” It served as a regional fortress during the reign of Senusoret I (q.v.) of the 12th Dynasty.

During the New Kingdom (especially the 18th Dynasty), Aniba was the regional capital of Wawat, or Lower Nubia. As such, it held administrative and residential functions as well as a modest fort and Temple to Horus, the protector of pharaohs. The major defensive forts against Nubians were located farther upstream at the Second Cataract. Hekanefer (q.v.), for example, was titled the “Prince of Miam.” With early and rather long, continuous occupation, Aniba was also the center of a cemetery for local inhabitants as well for those who held the important position of governor of Wawat. It was sometimes the seat for the viceroys of Nubia (q.v.).

These governors often were entitled to substantial rock-cut tombs. Virtually all were looted and in very poor condition at the time of the flooding of Lake Nasser. In one case, the tomb of Penniut (Penne, Peno), governor of Wawat under Ramses VI (1151–1143 BCE, 20th
Dynasty [q.v.]), was saved by entirely removing the hill in which it was cut. It was then transported forty kilometers downstream to the new locations for the Temples of Derr and Amada (qq.v.).

Inside the stone-cut tomb of Penniut, one may see a formulaic image from the Book of the Dead that depicts Thoth (the record keeper), Amemet (“the Devourer”), and Anubis (the bailiff jackal) and the Opening of the Mouth ceremony. Other scenes of the deceased Penniut and his wife show their reverence to national gods and to their pharaoh, Ramses VI. In particular, Penniut is depicted making a land donation to generate income to maintain a statue of Ramses VI (q.v.) at Derr. In turn, the king gave his viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) some silver vessels to be given to Penniut in appreciation for the land. Other tombs of the governors of Nubia are known, but this one was in the best condition, as all the others of Aniba are lost under the waters of Lake Nasser.

ANIMAL HUSBANDRY. See AGRICULTURE; CAMEL-HERDING ARABS; CATTLE-HERDING ARABS; DOMESTICATED FOWL; ELEPHANTS; OSTRICHES.

ANKHPAKHERED. This High Priest of Amun (q.v.) served at Thebes during the Nubian 25th Dynasty (q.v.), especially during the reign of Taharka (q.v.). He likely was of Egyptian origin, having descended from a line of Theban priests, unlike the High Priest of Amun, Harkebi (q.v.), who was of Nubian origin. The Nubian quest for continuity was much inclined to build on the former Egyptian traditions and personnel in order to achieve legitimacy. Thus, the positions of the High Priest of Amun and the God’s Wife of Amun (q.v.) showed remarkable continuity even at times of dynastic shift.

ANKHSHEPNUPET. This royal singer of the 25th Dynasty lived at the “Residence of Amun.” She is known from her tomb at the chapel in front of Medinat Habu that was built mainly for Ramses III (q.v.). At this tomb was found a lovely polychrome inner anthropoid coffin that was also associated with dummy canopic jars, a faience bead mummy cover, and 365 shawabtis (funerary helper statues). Her mummy is now located at the Metropolitan Museum in New York.
ANLAMANI. Anlamani and Aspelta were brothers and sons of Queen/Royal Mother Amanimalol. King Anlamani ruled from Napata after the decline of the 25th Dynasty, from about 623 to 593 BCE. Anlamani is thought to be the great grandson of Taharka (q.v.) and was the senior brother of Aspelta. He was depicted as “Lord of Two Lands,” even though his reign did not exceed Lower Nubia. Inscriptions by Anlamani commemorate a visit to the temple of Kawa (q.v.), where he celebrates the Festival of Amon and a military expedition against the Blemmyes (q.v.). Anlamani’s wife Mediken became the High Priestess under his brother Aspelta (q.v.). He was buried in the royal cemetery of Nuri in pyramid 6. [R. Lobban with P. Saucier]

ANQET, ANKT, ANQIT, ANUQET, ANUKET, ANUKIS. Anqet was the water goddess of the First Cataract. She was variously the cowife or daughter of Khnum and Satis. Her name means “to embrace”; that is, she embraced the fields during the annual flood. As with Satis, Anqet had her cult center at Seheil Island temple in Lower Nubia within the First Cataract. Today, this is just between the Low Dam at Aswan and Elephantine Island. With her husband/father Khnum and her daughter/cowife Satis, Anqet was part of the triad of deities for Elephantine and Philae. Anqet was iconographically depicted with a stiff and cropped red (parrot?) feather headdress.

Anqet was also the goddess of the gazelle hunt and of lust, and as such her cult center was considered to have obscene attributes. Sometimes she is identified with Nephthys. At Seheil are many invocations by Ramses and many others that show his respect for this Nubian goddess, who is also depicted as far south as the Abu Simbel temples.

ANUBIS, ANPU. This jackal-headed guard dog of the underworld, judgment day, and embalming was much featured in ancient Egypt and Nubia for mortuary rituals and Book of the Dead images. Anubis served as the “bailiff” for judgment day, and he protected the deceased thereafter. Anubis is commonly depicted on Meroitic hetep funerary tablets. He maintained popularity in all periods of the Egyptian occupation of Nubia but is not known in Kerma. Anubis is depicted in various Napatan and Meroitic iconographic and inscriptive evidence. In Christian times, he vanishes, but Christian iconography does have Cerebus, a guard dog of the underworld, who likely evolved from an Anubis prototype.
APEDEMEK, APEDEMAK, APETHEMEK. This famed lion-headed Nubian god was celebrated in Meroitic times, especially at the temples of Ben Naqa and Musawwarat es Sufra (q.v.). Apedemek was a principal Meroitic god after Amun (q.v.). Indications are that he was warlike or a god of war. Most obvious is that he can be shown with a bow and arrows (q.v.). Apedemek is sometimes shown with a woman consort and with a serpent body and lion head. Apedemek was not incorporated into the Egyptian pantheon, although overlooking gender one may see some parallels with the Egyptian leonine goddess Sekhmet, who was famed for her unpredictable violence and revenge. He seems to vanish in post-Meroitic times, although Greco-Roman and Axumite (q.v.) royalty was often associated with palace leopards.

APOPHIS, APEPY. See KAMOSE STELA; KERMA.

APRIES, WAHIBRE (589–570 BCE). Apries was the son of Psamtik II (q.v.) and was subsequently a Saite king of Egypt in the 26th Dynasty. He assisted the Palestinians and Judaeans in a revolt against the Babylonians under Nebuchadrezzar in 586 BCE. Apries was a contemporary of the Napatan kings, but his dynasty was critical in removing the Nubians from Theban power and pursuing them thereafter. While the 26th Dynasty had been a rival of the 25th, it continued a foreign policy that was remarkably similar even though the enemies had by then shifted from the Assyrians to the Babylonians. In Nubia, Apries managed to put down a revolt in the Aswan barracks. Apparently, his disaffected soldiers planned a mass exodus to Nubia, as evidently had been the case with Psamtik I. Seeking to blame him for his lack of control, Amasis (q.v.), a military man with experience in Nubia, challenged the leadership of Apries and finally killed him in a 26th Dynasty civil war battle in 570 BCE.

ARABIC, ARABS. The Sudanese Arabic language is closest in form and content to Egyptian Arabic. It is the main Sudanese language for communication among the majority of Sudanese. This language has been undergoing a process of development and Sudanization for over 1,000 years. Arabic, like other Afro-Asiatic/Hamito Semitic languages, is structurally and semantically related to ancient Egyptian
and other regional Semitic languages. The Arabs are, strictly speaking, pastoral nomads who speak this Afro-Asiatic (Semitic) language, have “Arabic” culture, and, after the seventh century, are largely followers of the Islamic religion.

Islam was rather slow in reaching Nubia while it sped from the Arabian Peninsula into Egypt, across North Africa, and, by separate routes, deep into western and eastern Europe, all within one or two centuries after the prophet Muhammad. However, the medieval Christian kingdoms in Nubia blocked the spread of Islam into central Sudan until the early sixteenth century. Today, the majority of Sudanese people who are projected to be cultural and linguistic Arabs are not nomadic and, in northern Sudan, are essentially Arabized Nubians.

In Sudan, one also finds nomadic variations by herding cattle rather than camels; many are fully sedentary or only seasonally migratory (transhumant). Africanization of Arabs expanding southward and Arabization of southern slaves brought northward occur in various degrees. Sudanese people such as the Daju, Fur, and Nubians who are heavily Arabized and Islamized still speak their own non-Afro-Asiatic languages, as do native Arabic speakers who are Christians and Jews. Thus, the broader definition of an Arab is a matter more of cultural self-awareness than of strict terminology. Perhaps one-third of the Sudanese are “Arabs” in the general sense that they claim descent through the Jaaliyin, Khazrag, or Juhayna Arab groups. See also CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA; RACE.

ARAMATELQO, ARAMTEQO, AMTALQO. This Napatan king was the successor to Aspelta (q.v.). Aramatelqo ruled from about 568 to 555 BCE and was buried in pyramid 9 in the royal cemetery at Nuri. His funerary chapel has scenes of people playing the popular board game of Senet. The “qo” or “ka” at the end of his name is a common suffix for royal figures in Nubia.

ARCHITECTURE. The architecture of ancient Nubia is a vast topic since the known forms cover 5,000 years of history and numerous independent and syncretic traditions. Ironically, the best-known aspect of these traditions is funerary architecture since that has been the best preserved. However, this distorts our modern consciousness to think
that ancient Nubians were somehow preoccupied with death. As states and empires evolved in Nubia, increasing attention was paid to monumental works, especially of a religious nature. Some royal palaces are known along with workshops that provide an awareness of the technologies used. The most poorly represented in the archaeological record are the domestic structures of the average people who were the majority at all times.

Surveying the architectural traditions, one can make tentative conclusions about the Paleolithic as seasonal and temporary campgrounds having fire circles and windbreaks along with some round domestic structures. Funerary traditions in burials for this period are poorly known for Nubia, the earliest human remains being associated with the Singa (q.v.) skull. For the Mesolithic period, the architecture likely changed little except for scale and more permanent locations with windbreaks, hearth sites, and matted houses that evolve into the Khartoum Neolithic.

The Neolithic period provides for substantial change from the earlier times since the known sites begin to have evidence for funerary architecture and domestic buildings as well as traces of religious structures. In the late Neolithic A-Group (q.v.) sites of both graves and houses in Nubia favor oval and circular structures with postholes, coming from a long African tradition of such shapes, although at Afyeh some use was made of stone and rectilinear shapes. Some shrines are either square or rectangular structures of posts and fiber mats, perhaps to protect or revere votive objects. This again comes from African spatial and artistic traditions.

For C-Group (q.v.) pastoralists, the architectural traditions in funerary application continue to be round, curved, and sometimes rather large (six-meter) domestic structures that appear to have been oriented around a central pole and off-center fire hearth. The use of building stone begins to be regularized in tent circles for these open pastoral villages. Other structures and funerary chapels attached to circular burials start to be rectangular, suggesting deeper influences coming from Egypt. In Lower Nubia, at Wadi es-Sebua (q.v.), a C-Group (q.v.) village shows clear evidence of limited-access fortification to protect the inhabitants and their food stores. The unplanned nature of this site is retained in the mud-brick foundations. The example from Amada shows substantially more planning, but certainly
the silos and curved walls link this complex dwelling to the former C-Group people of the region.

Although on a very different scale, the contemporary Kerma (q.v.) peoples continued the conservative round shapes for funerary arts, especially for the huge grave tumulæ for the important kings, but even here the evolution of rectangular, mud-brick funerary chapels appears as a result of contact with Egypt. On the other hand, the multicropped tumulæ or bed burials have virtually nothing to do with Egyptian funerary architecture. The huge defuffa (q.v.) associated with Kerma show influences from Egypt in terms of monumental mud-brick structures, but their arrangement is also unique for Nubia. The adjacent reception pavilion is clearly of African style, with a conical roof and a surrounding circular mud-and-wattle wall. Wall decorations at Kerma are reminiscent of those still found among the Dinka or Shilluk.

After the colonial conquest of Nubia by the New Kingdom (q.v.), the major temple architecture appears to be fully Egyptian, as are numerous cases of accepting funerary arts and design, including mummification and false doors, but Nubian traditions for burials and likely domestic structures still persist. In the Nubian “Dark Age” of the Late period, experimentation or perhaps “recovery” of Nubian-style royal burials appears to have taken place at Kurru (q.v.), and presumably most domestic structures are rectilinear and built of stone and mud brick; however, exogenous tuklæ, or roundhouses with arches, branches, and matting are interspersed, as they continue to be through much of the rest of the ancient history of Nubia. The “Golden Age” of Nubia, represented by the 25th Dynasty (q.v) and early Napatan times, is dominated by rectilinear domestic structures. Nubian bed burials continue to some extent along with mummification, but major figures have the unique Nubian style of a pyramid with steeper angles than those earlier pyramids in Egypt, burials, under the structure rather than inside, and funeral chapel annexes that do not penetrate the main structure. Some similarities can be noted with the pyramids found in the New Kingdom workers’ village of Deir al-Medina at Luxor. The state temples continue to be of Egyptian inspiration.

As the subsequent Meroitic civilization evolved, mummification seemed to decline, but the unique Meroitic pyramid structures continued, with only small stylistic or scale variations. Domestic build-
ing continued for Meroë with a rectilinear shape for the most part and expansive surrounding walls and internal functional differentiation. Some evidence of grid-based town planning is seen, but domestic buildings are in mud brick, with some use of stone for lintels and jambs often taken from earlier structures. Exogenous *tukls* are also part of the domestic architectural mix along with workshop and storage structures. In Lower Nubia, in Meroitic times, attention clearly was paid to defensive structures and walls, but in Upper Nubia, in the Meroitic heartland, this was not an important feature. Most towns generally were unplanned, but each household was rectilinear with internal subdivisions exiting to narrow streets. The variations in household size suggest important class stratification at this time. Some homes in congested areas had second or third stories.

As Nubian deities became more distinct, syncretic experimentation emerges in Meroitic temple arts with the portrayal of the deities of Apedemek, Sebiumeker and Arensnuphis, and Dedun (qq.v.) and in such unique configurations of a multicolumned central platform or acropolis seen at Musawarat es Sufra (q.v.) or at Jebel Adda. Only temples and pyramids were built of masonry, usually sandstone. Meroitic temples had flat, timbered roofs, as rainfall was a minor concern.

The two centuries or so of post-Meroitic architecture, especially at Ballana (q.v.), saw the restoration of large multiroomed tumulus bed burials for the royalty. These kings apparently reoccupied earlier temples with little architectural adjustments, such as at Kalabsha (q.v.), and domestic structures are not especially well known. In the case of Meinarti, excavated by William Adams, one can see domestic structures for some higher-status figures and their neighbors in their unplanned communities of roughly rectilinear, multiroomed structures with some public and private spaces differentiated as trading, storage, or religious areas. The building materials varied from mud bricks to stone and combinations of the two.

The last phase of architectural traditions for ancient and medieval Nubia is the feudal Christian period (q.v.), where creativity has been applied to essentially exogenous Byzantine church and chapel styles and ecclesiastical conventions. High-quality stonemasons used established geometric proportions and sophisticated notions of secular and sacred space, as seen in the elaboration of the central apse and its as-
sociated structures. Multivaulted ceilings of Nubian churches could span considerable distances. Residential areas were not as carefully planned as were the churches, but generally they were dominated by rectilinear multiroomed domestic structures that now had internal latrines. Fortifications, substantial storage rooms, external town walls, archer loopholes, and strategic elevated locations of Christian towns and houses are persistent themes, as relations with Islamic Egypt were in steady tension and deterioration. The height of the architecture of Christian Nubia is represented by the impressive defensive castles and the large basilicas, such as at Faras and Dongola. Mumification, bed burials, and pyramids are long gone by this time, and domestic structures are made of stone and mud brick, depending on local circumstances.

AREIKA. Areika is a Bronze Age Nubian settlement located in C-Group Lower Nubia (q.v.). Areika is small in physical size (only 0.28 hectares or almost three-quarters of an acre), but is important archaeologically since it is the only C-Group settlement site ever excavated. The settlement plan differs from other C-Group settlements. Areika features rectilinear mud-brick structures as opposed to the more common curvilinear structures built from stone masonry, wood, and matting. Areika appears to have been built under Egyptian supervision to control movement in the Lower Nubian valley. [by P. Saucier]

ARENSNUPHIS, IREY-HEMES-NEFER. “Arensnaphis” is the more common Greek transliteration of the Nubian and Egyptian god Irey-hemes-nefer (“good companion”). Often, Arensnuphis was represented in an anthropomorphic pair with the god Sebiumeker (q.v.). Both were placed to protect the entrance to a temple, such as at the Musawwarat es-Sufra (q.v.) enclosure in the Butana (q.v.) of the third century BCE, where this deity appears on the south wall of the Apedemek (q.v.) (Lion) Temple there. Other examples of Arensnuphis may be found at Philae, in a temple in his honor, and at a small kiosk in the Isis temple at Philae (q.v.). His distinctive headgear appears to be that of Anuris (q.v.), with four plumes rather than the two plumes of Amun. Arensnuphis’s headband had a single protective cobra, and his upturned false beard suggests ties to Osiris. As with Sebiumeker, he had a bead necklace but also earrings.
Arensnuphis and Mandulis (q.v.) were also worshiped at the Dendur (q.v.) temple, which was built at the time of Augustus (q.v.), who had poor relations with Meroë.

ARGIN. Argin is located on the western bank of the Nile exactly on the modern Sudano-Egyptian border just downstream of old Wadi Halfa. Argin was probably occupied in A-Group (q.v.) times or before, judging from some local petroglyphs. It was again occupied in C-Group (q.v.) times. Oval-shaped burials, with the common cattle heads and geometrically incised globular pottery jars typical of the C-Group, were found by Spanish excavators.

Argin was also occupied in Meroitic times (first century BCE to third century CE), and in X-Group or Ballana (qq.v.) times it was known from an extensive cemetery. During the UNESCO campaign to salvage Nubia, the Spanish, under Martin Artajo and Manuel Pellicer Catalan, excavated the Meroitic cemetery site of Nag Shayeg at Argin from 1960 to 1962. The 200 burials in varied styles of graves oriented east to west and numerous door lintels suggest that a rather large Meroitic and/or post-Meroitic town was present there. The grave goods included beads, jewelry, bronzeware, and turned Meroitic pottery. The Meroitic ceramics were often painted with flowered designs, geometric patterns, and animals such as frogs and crocodiles, and some use was made of the *ankh* symbol. Shapes include jugs, vases, spouted vessels, flat dishes, and bowls, and some with handles and lugs. In modern times, Sudanese Nubians at Argin made a notable effort to resist their relocation and resettlement required by the High Dam at Aswan, but the site is now deep underwater.

ARGO ISLAND. Argo Island lies just upstream of Kerma (q.v.), above the Third Cataract. It was probably the farthest southern penetration of Nubia during the 12th Dynasty of the Middle Kingdom. A statue of King, or Regional Prince, Sobekhotep of the 13th Dynasty in the Second Intermediate period was also found at Argo Island. Perhaps it was transported to Argo by the Kerma kings when Egypt lost control of Lower Nubia. After Egyptian reconquest in the New Kingdom, Pharaoh Tuthmosis I (q.v.) raised a stela to celebrate his Nubian military campaign. Argo is also the location of the Tabo Temple, built by
Taharka (q.v.) using New Kingdom stones. Meroitic occupation is also attested in the form of two granite colossi of Meroitic kings.

ARIANISM. The primary theological division between Christianity in Nubia (q.v.) and Egypt with that of the Byzantine church rests on the disagreements over the divine nature(s) of Christ. Some of the roots of this division are found among the adherents of the prominent Alexandrian priest Arius (ca. 250–336 ce), from whom Arianism gains its name. The argument of Arius was that Christ was a prophet who was higher than a normal human but that he was subordinate to a higher God, who lived before and after his son Christ. This highest God was inaccessible and ultimately unknowable and transcendental. In fact, it seems to be modeled on the position of the highest Egyptian god, Amun, who shared these features. This interpretation may also find its derivation from the slightly earlier teachings of Origen (q.v.; ca. 185–ca. 254), who formulated a lesser theological role for Christ in comparison to God. Arius believed that the Holy Spirit was not divine or was at least at a lower level of divinity than God. National and political rivalries only underscored the theological tensions between the Ptolemaic city of Alexandria and the city of Constantinople. Perhaps the support for women and Alexandrian dockworkers that was shown by Arius did not win friends within the increasingly patriarchal church.

At first, the divisions were moderately tolerated when the church was struggling to assert itself and hold together a fractionated Roman Empire. In 312 ce, Constantine became the first Roman emperor to accept Christianity as the religion of the Roman state with both Arians and Dyophysites among his advisers. However, this dispute was occasionally violent, as followers of Arius and Pope Athanasius (q.v.) of Alexandria clashed over points of dogma and the refusal to offer Communion and recognize marriages.

In other areas, such as Persia and central Asia, contemporary disputes with the Nestorians (who believed that Christ was human in birth but had divinity placed on him) only sowed more division within the ranks of nascent Christianity. By 318 to 320, Arius and his followers had become a major problem for Athanasius.

To “resolve” this contentious matter, the Council of Nicaea was convened in 325. Under political direction, the bishops determined
that Arianism was heretical to the orthodox Nicene Creed, and its various religious spokespersons were to be excommunicated and exiled. Thus, it was only a matter of time before the initial tolerance gave way to force and fiat. As the church theology and imperial state solidified and orthodox views became symbolic of political power, resistance was no longer accepted. This was particularly the case among the adherents of Arianism in northern Europe and Egypt. Once the orthodox Trinitarian view became more set, this apparently minor dispute became a major fissure, as the central Byzantine church held that Christ was, in fact, a form of God, with two natures, or Dyophysite aspects.

Some scholars believe that Arian theology lingered on in the Middle East until the seventh century to welcome the acceptance of the prophet Mohammed in 641 by Patriarch Cyrus of Alexandria. Cyrus considered that Muhammad was a human being, although he carried a divine message, as the Arians had believed about Christ. Certainly, the deep religious schisms within Mediterranean Christianity assisted the arrival of Islam in the region by failing to provide any unified opposition and expecting that Muslims would tolerate Christians.

Even when Arianism was finally marginalized in Byzantium, it reappeared and evolved to become the Monophysitism (q.v.) of Egypt. Thus, it has continued to be the theological foundation of the church of Egypt, Ethiopia, and Christian Nubia, which still has its own pope. This pope was separate not only from the Dyophysite church of Byzantium (and later Rome) but also from the Melkite church of the eastern Mediterranean. Even as late as the time of Emperor Theodosius I (381 CE), Arianism was still a factor of division in the Egyptian and Nubian churches. See also CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA.

ARIAKANKHARER. This Meroitic king ruled briefly after the second decade of the common era. He was the son of Amanitare (q.v.) and was buried in the northern royal cemetery in Bejrawiya pyramid 5.

ARKAMANI, ARQAMANI, ARKAMANI-QO, ‘RG’MN, ERGAMENES, ‘IRK-IMN, I, II. First, a note of clarification is required since the two Meroitic kings of this name are often confused or conflated because of variant forms of the hieroglyphic, Greek, and Meroitic spellings of this name. The existing evidence is slight, and
thus partly to blame, but convincing analysis of the limited available epigraphic evidence supports that there were two kings of similar names. Following the conventional understanding of László Török and Steffen Wenig, Arka(k)amani I ruled from 270–260 BCE during the reign of Ptolemy II (r. 285–246 BCE, q.v.), while Arkamani II ruled from 218–200 BCE, thus during the reign of Ptolemy IV (r. 222–205 BCE, q.v.). The two kings could be distinguished as Arkamani I and II.

The case can be made that Arkamani I could also be called Arkakamani on the basis of one instance that has the extra ‘k’ and also judging from his unique ‘Sa-Re’ name. However the comment by Agatharchides (q.v.) referred to him as Ergamenes and this name has been hard to pry away in existing literature. The comment by Agatharchides also says that the king was a contemporary with Ptolemy II, and this supports the argument made by Török that there must be two Ergamenes. The parallel use by Arkamani I of the royal titulary (‘the Heart of Re rejoices’) of King Amasis (q.v.) of Dynasty XXVI gives further circumstantial evidence for the unique identity of Arkamani I (Arkakamani), as his inscriptions are among the last using Egyptian hieroglyphics at Meroë. Apparently both Amasis and Arkakamani violently overthrew their domestic opponents. According to Herodotus (q.v.), Arkamani was subject to a decision of regicide by the royal priests who wielded this power. Not being prepared to accept this fate, Arkamani arranged to have the priests murdered instead. Arkamani I was the first king to be buried at Meroë, presumably after he overthrew the Amun priests probably located at Napata (q.v.)—thus his move to relocate the capital and perhaps the start of a new dynasty. After the transfer of the capital from Napata to Meroë the Nubian state remained otherwise intact. He is also known in the works of Diodorus Siculus. Arkamani I was said to be conversant in Greek, in that he studied in the royal court of Meroë.

Meanwhile, Arkamani II (218–200 BCE) is missing the extra ‘k’ in his name, and he has various additional titularies that are not parallel to Arkamani I. Possibly Arkamani II is the same as Prince Arki known from Musawwarat es-Sufra. Arkamani II should be credited for some of the construction at the recycled temple at Dakka (q.v.) and inscriptions at the temples of Debod, at Philae in the Arensnuphis temple started by Ptolemy IV, and at Kalabsha (qq.v.). These projects probably took place
during the period of the Theban revolt (207–186 BCE), and they attest to
the large territorial extent of his administration and to the temporary
withdrawal of Ptolemaic control of the Dodekaschoenos (q.v.). While
both kings are buried at Meroë, it seems that Arkakamani I is associated
with Bejrawiya South 6 pyramid and Arkamani II should be associated
with Bejrawiya North 7 pyramid and chapel.

ARMINNA (WEST), ADOMN (in Meroitic). Armina West was a late
Meroitic (q.v) and early X-Group (q.v.) settlement not far from Abu
Simbel (q.v.) in Lower Nubia (q.v.). It was excavated jointly by a
Yale University and University of Pennsylvania expedition in the
early 1960s during the Nubian salvage campaign. The Meroitic re-
 mains include ba statues (q.v.) and Meroitic-inscribed offering
tablets. Mud-brick graves and pyramids, pottery, small stelae, and
water bowls were left at the grave sites. The X-Group remains are
close to the Ballana (q.v.) assemblage, and the latest evidence at the
site is of early Christian (q.v.) times.

ARNEKHAMANI (235–218 BCE). This early Meroitic king “The Mighty
Bull and Beloved of Maat” ruled only three decades after the Kushite
capital was moved from Napata to Meroë, probably during the time of
Ptolemy II or IV (qq.v). A detailed relief in his name is on the southern
wall of the Lion Temple at Musawwarat es Sufra (q.v.). Indeed, King
Arnekhamani is the only Meroitic king attested at this site. This shows
him with a hemhem war crown with protective cobras as well as the
curved horns of Amun wrapped around his ear. He was handsomely
adorned with armlets, necklaces with the ram form of Amun, and other
state regalia, including a royal staff. The titulary in Egyptian hiero-
glyphs still terms him “Lord of Two Lands” and the “Son of Re” and is
written in Egyptian hieroglyphics. Perhaps he was the father of King
Arkamani II. Arekhamani was an early royal resident of the northern
royal cemetery and was perhaps interred in pyramid 53.

ARROWS. See BOWS AND ARROWS.

ASHKEIT. Ashkeit is about twelve kilometers downstream from
Buhlen (q.v.) and about three kilometers north of Argin (q.v.). Ar-
chaeological evidence dates it to Acheulian times in the Paleolithic
(q.v.). In much later times, it was a small church, and related Christian petroglyphs existed in the vicinity of Ashkeit.

ASHURBANIPAL (668–627 BCE). This king of Assyria ruled during the closing years of the Nubian administration of Egypt by Taharka (q.v.). Ashurbanipal was a king of the Sargonid period of the Assyrian Empire. Sargon II (721–705 BCE) had founded this dynasty. Sennacherib (704–681 BCE) was the second, Esarhaddon (680–669 BCE) was the third, and Ashurbanipal (680–626 BCE) was the fourth in this line.

The Assyrian kings had been long frustrated and blocked by the Phoenicians, the Judaeans, and the Nubian kings of Egypt in the 25th Dynasty. Seeking to block Assyrian expansion into Egypt, the Nubians ruling Egypt at this time tried various measures, including diplomatic, strategic alliances with Judaeans and Gazans and the fo-menting of a diversionary revolt in Phoenicia. While each move gained them some time, it was inevitable that clashes would finally take place between Ashurbanipal and Taharka.

The sudden death of Esarhaddon during an earlier phase of this campaign put Ashurbanipal in power in about 668 BCE. He continued the plan to invade Lower Egypt to reinstate Necho I as king of Memphis and Sais, where his father, Esarhaddon, had originally set him up as a satrap. Then he would drive Taharka from his capital at Memphis. Nineveh palace scenes depict his attack on this Egyptian capital with his soldiers, bowmen, ladders, and wall undermining. Nubian captives with feathers in their hair are shown. Taharka had restored his residence in Memphis from where he had been driven by Esarhaddon earlier. Following the battle at Memphis, Taharka fled to Thebes, where he still had support of the God’s Wife of Amun, the High Priest of Amun, and the mayor. Ashurbanipal returned from Egypt with two obelisks that were displayed in his capital. It is not clear whether these were removed from Egypt in 667 or in 664 BCE, but considerable looting of Thebes may well have taken place.

Although the precise chronology is weak, it was probably at this time that Taharka returned to Napata (q.v.) to be coregent with Tanutamun (q.v.), who returned briefly to Egypt to carry on the struggle to restore Nubian influence. At about this time, Taharka died, so that Ashurbanipal’s second campaign in Egypt was against Tanutamun, in
664–663. Ashurbanipal again sacked Memphis but advanced all the way to Thebes and drove Tanutamun back to Kipkipi and on to Napata, never to return to Egypt. Nevertheless, the Nubians persistently claimed to be “Lords of Two Lands” and never granted legitimacy to these or subsequent outside rulers of Egypt.

Although famed as an aggressive militarist (nine campaigns in forty-two years) and game hunter, Ashurbanipal also built a cuneiform-text library of tens of thousands of clay tablets at the Sennacherib palaces at Nimrud and Nineveh. These collections were central in preserving much ancient Mesopotamian literature, and Ashurbanipal boasted that he was literate. These literary works were in the cuneiform writing systems that produced texts found as far back as the Amarna letters in fourteenth-century BCE Egypt.

When Ashurbanipal died in about 627 BCE, his son Sinsharrishkun (623–612 BCE) followed him. Even though they had defeated the Nubians, the Assyrians were not at full strength since their Egyptian campaigns had left them overextended and vulnerable to the Babylonians. Ironically, in 616 BCE, the desperate Sinsharrishkun even called for Egyptian aid against the Babylonians. Not surprisingly, the Egyptians did not respond quickly or adequately enough, so the huge and powerful Assyrian capital fell in 612 BCE.

**ASKUT ISLAND.** Askut Island is located at the Saras Cataract, downstream of the great fortress complex of Semna and Kumma. Askut was just upstream of a western bank lookout point on the Nile and upstream of the fortress at Mirgissa. Its strategic position allowed it to relay messages from the fort at Shelfak to the fort at Mirgissa. Built on a rocky hill on the midriver island, it was easily defended and served as one of many Middle Kingdom border forts in Nubia. In Christian times, a small town also occupied the site of Askut. The University of California excavated the site during the Nubian salvage campaign.

**ASPELTA** (593–568 BCE). This Napatan king ruled a smaller but still powerful kingdom from Jebel Barkal (q.v.). He is known for a colossal figure at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston that was removed from Nubia by G. A. Reisner (q.v). This likely stood in front of the huge Amun temple, but it was found buried elsewhere in circum-
stances that are still unclear. A massive granite coronation stela (Egyptian Museum, No. 692) from Jebel Barkal (q.v.) shows Aspelta kneeling in front of the ram god Amun, but he is looking away from this deity toward the “royal sister” and sistrum player (probably Queen Nasalsa). Although Amun is shown in this icon, the stela also refers to the Nubian god Dedun (q.v.). Originally, this stela was next to the stela of Piankhy (q.v.) at Jebel Barkal. Every cartouche with his name has been carefully effaced while foolishly leaving his Nebti, Golden Horus, and Horus names, which had other references to Aspelta, thus confirming his identity.

This text also tells us something of the power structure of Napatan society at this time, as the “electoral council” was composed of six military men, six appointees of the chief councilor, six men from the keeper of the archives, and six men from the royal household. Apparently, Aspelta was himself a military officer. Finally, the priests of Napata confirmed this broad consultative process, and the coronation gave the new king his crown and office insignia.

A sphinx of Aspelta was found at Defeia, suggesting that his administration reached the confluence of the two Niles. Some believe that Aspelta was on the throne at the time of the invasion by Psamtik (q.v.), since his Jebel Barkal statuary was perhaps the last to suffer from destruction and looting. More recently, doubt has been cast on this theory, and perhaps he was on the throne but escaped to secure regions and returned once the danger had passed. As with the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) kings, the role of the queen mother was an important source of legitimacy for Aspelta, but it is perhaps too strong to state that this was matrilineal rule. Aspelta and his senior brother Amanlamani were born of the Queen Mother Amanimalol. He did note on his stela that his grandmother was a High Priestess of Amun (not God’s Wife of Amun) in Thebes during the 25th Dynasty. Perhaps more important, legitimacy came his way from consultation with a military council and possible opposition from a priestly group.

He also appointed Matisen as his High Priestess of Amun at Jebel Barkal in a fashion similar to that reserved for the God’s Wife of Amun common in the 25th Dynasty. Matisen is known from another Napatan hieroglyphic stela (now in the Louvre). This rounded stela depicts Aspelta offering Ma’at to an anthropomorphic Amun, behind whom are Mut and Khonsu. Behind Aspelta are libating sistrum.
players: Nasala/Nenselsa (his mother), Matisen (his wife), and Khebit (his daughter). The two senior women are shown as broad-hipped, as was the popular form in Meroitic times. The text relates to gifts of ritual temple objects and rations of bread, beer, and oxen offered by Matisen for the priests. A son of Aspelta, Khaliut, is also known.

Still another stela text of Aspelta is known that shows him with a ram-headed Amun, Mut, and Khonsu but without other family members. Here Aspelta is promising or offering to Amun the “Lord Ma’at” (“the true and correct order”). This text found on stela 693 at the Egyptian Museum proceeds with standard invocations and titles but then goes on to excommunicate certain conspiring priests (heretics?) for hateful crimes against Amun. Perhaps murder was their crime? Perhaps it was a conspiracy against Aspelta? Perhaps a violation of temple protocol was committed? Who was the victim? We do not know the answers to these questions, but evidently they were executed by burning. Any future priests thinking of such actions are certainly warned by this proclamation.

Madiken (or is this Matisen?) was the wife of Anlamani (q.v.), Aspelta’s brother. Aspelta was buried in the well-designed pyramid 8 in a handsome granite sarcophagus at the royal cemetery at Nuri. This was also removed to the basement of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, but a full-scale model of it has been constructed at the Museum of African-American Artists in Boston. A queen–wife of Aspelta is known to be Mernua, whose bead-net cover for her mummy was saved although her tomb was plundered. This net, along with a silver face cover, a winged Isis chest cover, a silver pectoral, and silver “four sons of Horus,” is on display at the Museum of Fine Arts.

ASSYRIANS. See ASHURBANIPAL; ESARHADDON; SEN-NACHERIB.

ASTABORAS. This is the classical reference used by the Ptolemies and Roman geographers for the Atbara River and is the modern corruption of the Astaboras. Axumites referred to the same river as the Takaze, and King Ezana used this as the route to Meroë during his conquest of Meroë in about 330 ce. Although the etymology is unknown, it is speculated that “Astaboras” may mean the “waters of
Boras,” a toponym or a local deity. Pliny (q.v.) (V[X]:52–54) refers to the Astaboras as a “branch of water coming out of the shades.”

ASTAPUS. This is the classical Greco-Roman reference to the Nile below its confluence at modern Khartoum. The prefix “Asta-” is a possible corruption of a Nubian word “essi” for “water,” and the suffix “Pus” is conceivably a reference to a regional deity (Bes?) or a local toponym. The Astapus is differentiated from the Astasobas (q.v., the Blue Nile, passing by the town of Soba) and the Astaboras (q.v.), corrupted into today’s seasonal Atbara River. Pliny (q.v.) (V[X]:52–54) refers to the Astapus as “water issuing from the shades below.”

ASTASOBAS. This is the classical Greco-Roman reference to the Blue Nile from its confluence with the Astapus (q.v.) to the Ethiopian highlands. The prefix “Asta-” is a possible corruption of a Nubian word for “water,” and the suffix is conceivably a reference to a local toponym or a regional deity such as Seb. It was believed that Seb resided as a god of the east, that is, of the Butana. This name may be revisited in the Christian town of the name Soba, which was the capital of the last Nubian Christian kingdom of Alwa, overthrown in 1504 CE. This Christian capital was on the Blue Nile.

ASWAN, SYENE, SWEN. This very important border town has historically represented the northern frontier between Egypt and Nubia. The etymology of this place name is derived from the Egyptian word for “trade,” as it certainly was and still is a major center for trade between these two regions. The modern and ancient towns lie below the First Cataract, which had proved very difficult to navigate, especially at flood times, since the Nile is narrow, the current is fast, and rocky outcroppings are numerous.

It was from Aswan that some of the very earliest records of trade between Egypt and Nubia (Yam) are noted in the renowned tomb of Harkuf (q.v.), who served under Pepi II (q.v.) after the First Intermediate period. Its strategic significance as a “break-of-bulk” trade center, as well as its role in the military defense of this point in the Nile, is an ancient and persistent reality. Just above the First Cataract, where the waters were again calm, one enters Lower Nubia.
Facing the town is the island of Elephantine (q.v.), or Yeb, which has been a shrine town and fortified base for at least five millennia. Elephantine was long celebrated as the source of the Nile flood, and the deities Khnum and Hapi were especially revered in cults on this island. The history of Elephantine and Aswan embraces all dynastic time as well as Greco-Roman times, and it is today the last major town in Egypt. Aswan features numerous important monuments from all historic and prehistoric periods of the Nile valley. The nearby Philae temple is one of the loveliest in location and architecture. Today in Aswan, one must visit the New Nubia Museum as well as the Old Museum and New Annex on Elephantine and the marvelous German excavations of multiple important features and constructions on Elephantine. Important landmarks in Aswan also include the Deir Siman Christian monastery, the tombs of the Nobles, and the Kitchener Island Botanical Gardens among living communities of Kenzi Nubians.

ATBAI. The Atbai region is located in southern Nubia between the Atbara and Gash Rivers. At its peak, it covered about 100,000 square kilometers east of the Nile and came to be known as the Atbai ceramic tradition (5000 BCE–500 CE). This tradition is closely connected with the development of large villages (over ten hectares) during the fourth millennium BCE. The Malawiya group represents the earliest phase. Ceramics are mainly sand-tempered unfurnished buff-colored ware that broke from the traditional technological and stylistic production of ceramics. The Atbai tradition is divided into the Saroba phase, the Kassala phase, and the Jebel Taka phase. The Saroba phase consisted of small sites (5,000 square meters) and the hunting of small bovines (cattle and oxen), warthogs, and monitor lizards.

The Kassala phase was the most complex and developed of the phases and lasted from the middle of the fourth millennium BCE to the end of the second millennium BCE. This phase was characterized by the Butana and the Gash groups, which pursued fishing and riverine exploitation of tortoises, crocodiles, and hippopotamuses. Large villages of 45,000 square meters up to the largest of 120,000 square meters existed during this phase. The largest sites are Mahal Teglinos of the Gash group and KG23 of the Butana group. The Hagiz group represents the Jebel Taka phase. These small sites of 20,000 square me-
ters and their pottery suggest links to the Meroitic and Pre-Axumite (q.v.) cultures. [by P. Saucier]

ATBARA. This northern Sudanese town is located between the Fifth and Sixth Cataracts on the eastern bank of the Nile. In Meroitic (q.v.) times, it functioned as a small-scale trade center along the river and to the Red Sea. See also ASTABORAS.

ATHANASIUS (ca. 295–373 CE). This important bishop of Alexandria presided over the formation and development of early Christianity in Egypt and Nubia (q.v.). By the start of the fourth century CE, perhaps as many as half of the Egyptians were Christians, but the Diocletian persecutions of 303 CE against the early Christians sought to restrict their further spread. This all took place during the life of Athanasius, who also saw the acceptance of Christianity by Constantine II in 312 CE.

Much of the life and theology of Athanasius was centered on the doctrinal dispute between his rival Arius (q.v.; 250–336 CE) and his followers, such as Eusebius of Nicomedia, whose views could be said to be Unitarian insofar as it considered that only the universal and invisible God was divine. This was opposed to the views of Athanasius that were Trinitarian, namely, that God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit were all divine. Athanasius argued that if Christ were not a god, then those who prayed to him would be guilty of idolatry and that Christ could not be capable of the powers of redemption.

Athenasius attended the pivotal Council of Nicaea in 325 CE, denouncing the “heresy” of Arianism. When he returned to Alexandria in 328 to become bishop, he deposed the pro-Arian bishops. In 335 CE, Athanasius attended the Council of Tyre, which again tried but failed to address and resolve the Arian dispute. That he was a leading figure of the time is clear from the fact that it was Athanasius who introduced the forty-day fast of Lent in 337. In 356 CE, George of Alexandria, a strong Arian, took power in Alexandria, while Athanasius found refuge and exile in Upper Egypt for more than five years. Roman Emperor Jovian recalled Athanasius from exile, but after two years, he returned to exile and only in the last seven years of his life was he in Alexandria.

The views of Athanasius centered on Christ’s divinity, so that these early Christians could find personal redemption for their human sins
and ultimate resurrection by accepting Christ as their savior. The theology of Coptic Monophysites (q.v.) that prevailed in Egypt and Nubia was that Christ was divine but that he was just an aspect of God. At the time of his death in 373 CE, Athanasius was still embroiled in the dispute with the followers of Arius, but his steadfast support of the Council of Nicaea was gaining ground in general.

**ATIRI ISLAND.** Atiri Island is located in the Butn al Hajr (q.v.) region of Nubia, just upstream (south) of Semna (q.v.). It was occupied especially in late Christian times and was a substantial regional center for the production or shipment of palm fiber products, such as sandals and mats. A small church was built in the center of the island, around which was a cluster of houses. It is speculated that the location and settlement configuration suggest a threatened and defensive community on the eve of Arab incursions into the area.

**ATLANERSA.** Atlanersa was a Napatan king who ruled from 653 to 643 BCE or shortly after the kings of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). He still claimed to be lord of Egypt as seen in his “nesubity” name, but no evidence exists that he ever went to Egypt. He certainly perpetuated the art styles of the earlier period but not the political achievements. An important construction of Atlanersa was the two-room Temple B700 at Jebel Barkal, which was started by him but completed by Senkananisken (q.v.). His iconography makes it clear that he kept a high reverence for the ram god of Amun, thought to reside within Jebel Barkal.

At this temple, Atlanersa commissioned a granite pedestal for the holy bark with high-quality inscriptions; this is now removed to the Museum of Fine Arts (No. 23.728) in Boston. The pedestal shows Atlanersa (with his Sa-Ra name) on a platform resting on a symbol of the unified Nile. The gods Horus and Thoth provided the stability for this platform. Atlanersa is depicted as holding up the sky.

After the known dates for Atlanersa, the precise dating for the Napatan kings falls into some confusion, although the general sequence is close to correct. He was buried in a stepped Napatan pyramid with a divided burial chamber at Nuri (q.v.). The tomb of his royal wife was almost of the same size, again recalling the relatively elevated position of Nubian queens, which might be contrasted with Egyptian queens.
AUGUSTUS (OCTAVIAN) (r. 27 BCE–14 CE). This Roman emperor was first known as Octavian, but on his succession to power after the assassination of Julius Caesar (q.v.), he took the name Caesar Augustus. Augustus feared only his rival Mark Anthony, who was known for his faithful service to Caesar, and he followed a similar strategy of wooing (or being wooed by) Cleopatra VII (q.v.) into an alliance between Ptolemaic Egypt and Rome. Augustus struggled for power with Anthony after the death of Caesar. Cleopatra VII, still ruling from Egypt, had backed Anthony as her strategic move to keep the Ptolemies in power in Egypt and to be kept out of the Roman conflict. However, the famed sea battle at Actium in September of 31 BCE found Anthony’s naval forces defeated by (or retreating from) Augustus’s admiral, Marcus Agrippa. This victory led to an unexpected withdrawal by Anthony and Cleopatra, who escaped back to Alexandria.

It then remained for Augustus to pursue his victory to Egypt itself. In highly romanticized events celebrated by Shakespeare, Cleopatra and Anthony determined that suicide was their only option in August of 30 BCE. The drama was apparently heightened by Cleopatra’s mistaken belief that Anthony was already dead, and so, coupled with her own fears of captivity and humiliation in Rome, she took a highly poisonous asp to her breast and promptly died. This brought an end to the Ptolemaic rule of Egypt and the start of very different Roman relations with Nubians, Egyptians, and Jews.

Although Augustus visited Egypt only once, on the occasion of its conquest, his prefects represented his interests for steady revenue, grains, slaves, and wildlife. Generally, the Roman administration used the existing Ptolemaic structure as well as the Greek language, but Roman law was introduced as far as possible. Following the example of the Ptolemies he defeated, Augustus accorded himself the status of pharaoh and made numerous additions and repairs to temples in Egypt (e.g., Dakka, Debod, Dendera, Dendur, and Kalabsha [qq.v.]) and celebrated Apis bulls at Memphis. For Lower Nubia (q.v.), Augustus declared that because of the unique history and wealth of Egypt, this land would be under his personal and direct authority. In order to legitimize his presence in Egypt, he observed local religious practices and made his inscriptions in hieroglyphics. Augustus was the only Roman emperor to note both Napata and Meroë in his celebratory document titled Res Gestae Divi Augusti.
The vast wealth from Egypt was essential for the political stability of Rome. As a symbolic expression of this relationship, Augustus took an obelisk of Ramses II from Egypt and set it up in the Circus Maximus in Rome. His appointed prefect of Egypt was Cornelius Gallus, who may have helped engineer the death of Cleopatra VII. In his years as prefect, the city of Alexandria was much expanded. Gallus met with envoys from Meroë at Philae (q.v.) in 28 BCE to inform them of the new Roman policies and territorial claims. At the north end of Philae, he rebuilt the Hathor temple. In the name of Augustus, Gallus made additions to the Nubian temples noted previously. His most impressive Nubian work was the completely rebuilt temple of Kalabsha (q.v.), which became popularly known as the “Karnak of Nubia.” This temple was dedicated mainly to the Nubian/Medjay deity Mandulis (q.v.).

At about the same time, he crushed revolts at Hermopolis and in various places in Upper Egypt. He declared that Roman territorial administration would be based at Aswan but that a buffer zone of the Dodekaschoenos would continue as it had during Ptolemaic rule. During this time, the Greek geographer Strabo (q.v.), who had known Cleopatra VII, continued to reside in Egypt and visited as far south as Aswan. Now he served the Roman rulers, who were interested in his accounts about contemporary Meroë (although he did not travel there) and used the information provided by travelers to that region.

In Lower Nubia, Cornelius Gallus adopted the age-old strategy of bringing Medjay (Blemmye [q.v.]) soldiers to police his southern border with Nubia. One means adopted to honor them was to invoke and propitiate their local god Mandulis, as was done at Kalabsha. He also appointed the Medjay chief Quper to supervise this local operation. Using circumstantial evidence, it appears that Nubians revolted against the Roman–Medjay intrusion, and perhaps it was then (or was it the following year?) that the Medjay Quper and his two son/princes were killed and memorialized at Dendur Temple (q.v.). The precise order and causality of events is in some confusion. Cornelius Gallus evidently assumed too much power or used too repressive means in Egypt. In any case, Augustus felt threatened and demanded that Gallus take his own life in 26 BCE.

The successor prefect of Egypt in 25 BCE was Aelius Gallus, who closely followed Roman orders to expand the empire further. He removed a large number of Roman forces for a military campaign in Ara-
bia Felix. It was likely that in 24 BCE, while he was engaged in the Arabian campaign, the Meroitic queen (*kandake*) Amanirenas (qq.v.) (or was this Amanishakete [q.v.?]) sent her army to defeat three Roman cohorts who weakly defended Aswan, Philae, and Elephantine. Some sources suggest that the Arabian and “Ethiopian” (Nubian) campaigns were simultaneous rather than consecutive. It is widely assumed that it was during this Meroitic attack that a bust of Augustus was seized and removed to Meroë, where it was excavated by John Garstang (q.v.).

In the following year, when the troops of Aelius Gallus had returned from Arabia, they mounted a severe retaliatory raid led by Petronius against Thebes, Philae, and Lower Nubia. Lively scholarly debate is ongoing about the relative success or failure of Roman objectives. From there, they may have advanced as far as Napata, killing and capturing many people and looting towns on the way, but the duration and extent of this attack is not perfectly clear. Alternatively, the forces of the queen may have been defeated in the vicinity of Dakka, or this may be the site for a field truce negotiation between the warring parties. It is certain that Roman soldiers temporarily occupied the commanding heights of Qasr Ibrim (q.v.) to control the southern end of Lower Nubia.

The final result of these cross-border raids of Romans and Meroites was a formal peace conference negotiated on Samos Island in about 22 or 21 BCE. Emissaries of Amanishakete and Augustus then established some temporary understanding of Roman control of the Dodekaschoenos. By 20 BCE, the Romans withdrew to Aswan and settled on Maharraka (q.v.) as the border between Roman Egypt and Meroë. Managing a huge empire made them cautious of the common imperial error of overextension, especially into Nubia. By this time, his Meroitic contemporary was king Natakamani (12 BCE–12 CE). After his death in 14 CE, Augustus was deified in several shrines, such as at Kalabsha temple. His stepson Tiberius (q.v.) became his successor as emperor of Rome. Augustus was buried in Rome, where he also built a famed Market Forum and a temple to the military god Mars.

**AUSHEK.** *See AKUYTA.*

**AXUM, AKSUM.** Connections certainly existed between Ethiopia and Sudan in Paleolithic and Neolithic times, but the excavation,
documentation, and analysis of this relationship is not complete. The history of Axum articulates with Meroitic history in geographical and historical terms. Axum is the capital city of the ancient state of Axum, which lies between the Gash and Takezze Rivers, which flow into the Meroitic heartland of the Butana (q.v). The Takezze joins the Atbara River, which was the northern border of the “Island of Meroë.” Although Meroë and Axum are over 600 kilometers distant, the shared waterway was a corridor that linked the two civilizations. When they became rivals, it was along the Atbara that Axumites troops came to administer the coup de grâce against a moribund Meroitic state at an unknown date, perhaps in the first third of the fourth century CE. The archaeological research of Rodolfo Fattovich and Kathryn Bard in Ethiopia has explored the complexities of the Axumite–Meroitic linkages to discover some ceramic and funerary similarities and some possible cases of diffusion (iron?) through the Gash and Butana groups, but with light evidence to date. The most tempting connections seem to have been in late Meroitic and early Axumite times.

The Pre-Axumite history of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE appears to be oriented mainly to Sabaen culture in South Arabia across the Red Sea. A Pre-Christian period flows from the third century BCE to the first century CE, in which Ethiopia gained greater autonomy from South Arabia in part because of heavy use of the port of Adulis (q.v.) by Ptolemaic and Roman shippers.

Classical reports, such as the famed Periplus of the Erythrean Sea, begin to be written on Adulis at this time. It is in the period of the first to ninth centuries CE that Axum achieves many of its characteristic features, including its own coinage, flourishing use of the Ge’ez language, immense monumental stelae, and unique pottery styles. Notably, Axum was early converted to Christianity, although it had an even earlier experience with monotheism through Falasha Jews (q.v.).

The interaction between Axum and Meroë (not to mention Yemen and Somalia) was complicated in the first centuries of the common era. Relations between Meroë and Roman Egypt and the Blemmyes (q.v.) were tense, and insecure river trade was made difficult. Consequently, Meroitic kings turned toward Axum and especially to its Red Sea port of Adulis as a strategic connection to the outside world. Since Adulis was only some 150 kilometers from Axum, it easily
served that state and diverted the Meroitic trade through Axum, thus substantially weakening the Meroitic economy to a secondary status as a supplier of natural resources rather than a broker of them.

If this were not enough, Meroë was also being threatened by Blemmyes to the north and east and Noba to the south and west. The precise circumstances of the final blow against Meroë are much discussed, but more needs to be known to clarify this transition. Certainly, military forces came out of the Axumite Kingdom and entered a very much weakened but still occupied Meroë. Although the leader of Axum is usually said to be Ezana I at this time, it is possible that the Axumite attack was even earlier or else later under Ezana II. The rough date of this terminal event was as early as 320 CE to as late as 360 CE. Further confusion in the classical source is caused by the fact that ancient Nubia or Meroë was called “Ethiopia” at that time and Axum, in modern Ethiopia, is no longer extant as a state.

Since Constantine I (q.v.) had converted the Roman Empire to Christianity in 312 CE, it is certainly most likely that Ezana was inspired by this event and that they were in communication. In the 350s CE, Frumentius and his brother Aedesius launched active Christian missionizing of Axum on behalf of the Alexandrian Monophysite (q.v.) patriarch Athanasius. The subsequent life of Axum had progressively less contact with its neighbors, and it was more isolated in the ever widening sea of Islamic culture and conquest. By the eighth or ninth century CE, Axum had ceased to exist, while descending Ethiopian empires and dynasties continue to use Axum in their own legitimating pedigrees. [by K. Rhodes with R. Lobban]

**BA, BA-BIRD STATUES.** The belief in and use of *ba* figures was among the complex concepts of the soul and afterlife that were probably introduced to Nubia during the New Kingdom since no clear use of *ba* figures is seen Kerma. The 25th Dynasty in Napatan and Meroitic times continued to use *ba* figures. In its simplest form, the *ba* figure was most often in the form of a bird hovering over the scales of truth on judgment day. If one’s soul were favorably judged, then you might rise to eternal life in this human-headed bird form. It also became popular to have *ba*
figures as little humans, and especially in Meroë, this finally evolved into making stone carvings of the deceased, both men and women, with wings attached so that they could rise from the dead. The *ba* statues would be placed in front of the funerary chapels attached to pyramids in Napatan and Meroitic times. It is believed that this ancient funerary concept was reborn or continued with the Western notions of angels.

**BAHAN CULTURE.** Bahan culture is named for Khor Bahan, just above the modern High Dam at Aswan. Because of the creation of Lake Nasser/Lake Nubia, Khor Bahan is now fully underwater but was the site of the discovery of some of the early evidence of Neolithic culture in Nubia. It has a possible date of 3500 BCE.

**BAIT AL-WALI.** The original location of this small, largely rock-cut temple was about fifty kilometers south of the Aswan Dam area. It is now relocated on the northwestern shore of the island of New Kalabsha behind the Kalabsha (q.v.) temple. It was and still is associated with the much greater Kalabsha temple, although it differs in being much older and rock cut, unlike the freestanding Kalabsha temple. Although both structures can be dated to the New Kingdom, the Bait al-Wali temple was built by Ramses II and was not adjusted or rebuilt by the Greco-Romans, unlike the completely reconstructed Kalabsha temple. The joint effort to study and relocate this temple was supported by Egypt, Switzerland, and the United States. The increased popularity of the temple unfortunately accounts for its abuse and the loss of color in its wall paintings in the past century.

Its original form included all standard architectural features for dynastic temples, including a pylon, an entryway, a small hypostyle hall, and an inner sanctum. The main function of this small temple was to memorialize the god Amun for his support in successful military campaigns by Ramses II. The Egyptian deities of Isis and Horus (of Buhen) are also celebrated at this temple. On the left, or southern, side of the narrow forecourt are scenes of chariot war and a tribute of monkeys, ivory, gold, and giraffes from Nubia being presented to the viceroy of Nubia, who is honored by Ramses II. Apparently, this referred to the Nubian raid led by Prince Ramses II in the thirteenth year of the reign of his father, Seti I. Ramses swiftly attacked villages of Irem (Kerma [q.v.]) and made off with plunder.
On the right, or northern, side are battle scenes and images of prisoners of Libyan and Asian origins. Consequently, images of conquered peoples and war scenes similar to those of Abydos and Abu Simbel may be found at Bait al-Wali. The abbreviated hypostyle hall consists of just two columns, but some of the original colors of the painted reliefs may still be seen.

In the innermost sanctuary of the Bait al-Wali temple, Ramses II is not yet seated among the gods, so it is presumed that this smaller temple precedes his later, more formidable Nubian works at ed-Derr and Abu-Simbel. Here, as in the Seheil Island inscriptions, Ramses shows his devotion to the Nubian deities Khnum, Satis, and Anukis (qq.v.), suggesting that both a policy of fear and religious legitimization or incorporation were parts of his relationship with Nubia. Bait al-Wali temple, like Kalabsha temple, saw some use as a Christian church, at which time the depictions of Egyptian deities were likely damaged.

**BAKENRENEF, BAKENRANEF, BOCCHORIS (717–712 BCE).** Bakenrenef was one of two Libyan princes of the delta in the 24th Dynasty who were rivals to Nubian authority as the 25th Dynasty entered Egypt. Following Tefnakht (q.v.), Bakenrenef reluctantly accepted the Piankhy’s start of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), which pursued a policy of indirect rule allowing Tefnakt to remain in local control. Bakenrenef sought to restore power to the delta princes, and after the death of Piankhy in 716 BCE, he felt that his opportunity had come.

Shabaka (q.v.) succeeded his brother Piankhy and began an extensive program of construction in Egypt and Nubia. His effort to proclaim himself as the legitimate pharaoh of both lands is illustrated by his devotion to the Apis bull cult at Memphis and his reference to Old Kingdom texts on the “Shabaka stone.”

Although the previous conflict and crisis between Tefnakht and Piankhy was resolved by political means, the conflict between Bakenrenef and Shabaka would be resolved by military might. Once the forces of Bakenrenef were defeated on the battlefield, Manetho reported that Shabaka burned Bakenrenef alive as an object lesson that he wanted no further trouble from the Libyans.

**BAKI.** See QUBBAN.
BALLANA CULTURE. Ballana culture is a common referent for a regional form of the so-called X-Group (q.v.) culture in Lower Nubia of the period from the 330s to 600 CE. Other examples of the X-Group are found at Qustul (q.v.), or at Tangasi (q.v.) in Upper Nubia. The X-Group arose in the wake of the collapse of Meroë. Perhaps they were northward-bound refugees from the defeat of Meroë under the Axumite king Ezana. Such individuals sought to reoccupy Upper and Lower Nubia and thereby constitute what we now term the X-Group. Some debate exists about the relationship between the X-Group, who usually are considered Nuba/Nobatae (or Nubians), versus the Medjay (q.v.), who were either incorporated or subjugated by the X-Group. Karamadoye (q.v.), a late X-Group king, likely was in such a relationship, perhaps on the eve of the Nubian transition to Christianity.

Living at the frontier between the Nubians (Nobatae) with Hellenized Roman Egypt, they came under those influences while retaining their own Nubian character. Toward the end of the Ballana horizon, additional elements of Christianity began to percolate into their art and funerary goods. One interpretation is that the King Silko (q.v.) inscription relates to his assertion of political control over the Ballana people or at least over whomever was controlling Lower Nubia. Therefore, he is credited with starting Nubian Christianity (q.v.). Their lack of a system of writing has provided notable limitations in determining Ballana chronology. Even though rich, immense tombs are known, it is not possible to determine which belongs to those kings who have known names.

This post-Meroitic group came to light especially from the fieldwork and excavation of L. P. Kirwin and W. B. Emery in 1938. Many of the sites they investigated are now lost to the flood of the High Dam at Aswan. However, a rich example of the material culture of the Ballana and Qustul sites is presented at the Egyptian National Museum in Cairo and at the Aswan Museum. Ballana grave tumulae are noted for their lovely crowns of silver with semiprecious stones often involving crescent or horn motifs, sometimes with the survival of the ate-form or Isis-form crowns from ancient Egypt or likewise from Meroë. Such crowns are similar to that worn by King Silko. Other objects from X-Group rulers include bronze cast oil lamps, Roman glass, horse burials, and burials of wives and/or servants associated with that king.
BANAGGA, WAD NAQA. See NAQA.

BAQT. See CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: MUSLIM RITUALS.

BASA. Basa is located along the Wadi Hawad in the “Island of Meroë,” or the Butana grasslands, about thirty kilometers southeast of the capital city of Meroë. As with other Meroitic sites, Basa is known for lion temples, with brick surrounding walls, devoted to the war god Apedemek (q.v.). One lion statue found at Basa has the cartouche of King Amanikhabale (50–40 BCE), that is, a contemporary of Ptolemaic Egypt, from which his architecture was probably influenced. The lions are similar to those at Philae (q.v.) temple. This lion sculpture, now at the Sudan National Museum, was devouring a war captive as a symbolic warning. At Basa, a marble sundial was discovered; this unusual object certainly indicates some local interest in measuring time, and this had been the case at least since the time of Eratosthenes (q.v.).

Another prominent feature of the area is the presence of hafirs, or low-lying earthen dams, across the wadi for water management in animal husbandry (q.v.). Although only one or two meters high, they stretched as much as 250 meters to allow the inhabitants to conserve water through the dry season for their pastoral herds. The presence of the guardian lion and frog sculptures along the crest of the hafir is evocative of frogs on Meroitic pottery and in Nubian folklore and as an ancient symbol of fertility or abundance, as in the number for 100,000. It appears that Basa was not used for very many successive generations; even the few Meroitic hieroglyphs found there were painted and not inscribed.

BATN AL-HAJAR. See BUTN AL-HAJR.

BATALLION COMMANDER OF KUSH. See KUSH.

BAYUDA. The Bayuda is the rocky desert plain within the large southward-curving stretch of the Nubian Nile. Tracks across the Bayuda represented a shorter route between the Fourth and Sixth Cataracts to avoid the longer and more dangerous reach of the Nile between the Fourth and the Fifth Cataract. The northern terminus of the Bayuda
road led to Sanam (q.v.) across from Jebel Barkal. From Sanam, one could cross the Nile and begin another desert shortcut to Kerma (q.v.) to avoid another long diversion of Nile boat travel. The southern terminus of the Bayuda road would bring travelers far up the Nile to either the mouth of the Atbara River or farther to Meroë, which served as an entry point to the eastern Butana (q.v.) trade routes. Control of the Bayuda track was essentially for the political and military articulation of Napata with Meroë. It likely carried considerable animal-born freight and lighter items that did not require travel by boats (q.v.). Much of Nubian trade to Egypt was of light luxury items, such as ostrich eggs, animal skins, and incense, or of high-value heavy ivory and gold. Recent excavation in the Bayuda by Timothy Kendall suggests some number of way stations to service the trans-Bayuda caravans.

BEER AND WINE. Beer, a common alcoholic beverage, formed an important part of the diet in the ancient Nile valley. Beer was a secondary product from the staple crop of barley and was prepared in the household as well as by specialized brewers. Beer likely was made by mashing partially baked loaves of barley bread with screened water or by directly fermenting grains, which for Nubia was mostly millet. The resulting brew was often flavored with dates, honey, and spices and then left to ferment. Not necessarily high in alcoholic content, beer made in this fashion was an extremely nutritional dietary supplement. Nubian beers (modern merissa, “sour water”) are made with fermented millet.

Since the Old Kingdom, both red and white wines had been exported to Nubia from Egypt. In the New Kingdom and during the Napatan period, attempts were made to cultivate vines in Nubia without success. Given the insufficient local production and the cost of transport, wine was mainly a beverage for the elite. However, the drink gained in popularity with the spread of the popular “cult of the grape” during Greco-Roman times. In the late Meroitic period, dozens of winepress installations appeared at various settlements. A well-known winepress was found at Meinarti in Lower Nubia. An indoor installation, the press consists of a series of three basins arranged in descending series in a long, narrow room. Grapes were trodden in the uppermost basin, and the extracted juice flowed down a gutter into the lower basins, where fermentation took place and from which skins
and amphora were filled for storage and transport. More modest winepresses were located outdoors in the open, presumably close to the vineyards. However, these presses were used for a remarkably short period of time. The hot, dry climate of Sudan was simply not suitable for viticulture. Before the end of the Meroitic period, the winepresses had been abandoned and filled with refuse. [by k. rhodes]

**BEJA.** The Beja and related groups are members of the northern branch of Cushitic languages that belong to the Afro-Asiatic family of languages. Although generally egalitarian, the pastoral Beja have extended family or lineage heads and occasionally have moved into a political organization of regional chiefdoms or small kingdoms.

In very ancient times, the Beja might have roots in the Arabian Peninsula, but for as much as 4,000 years, the Beja and their ancestors have occupied the region between the Red Sea and the Nile. The Blemmyes (q.v.), or ancient Medjay, are considered the ancestral group of the Beja. Relations between dynastic Egyptians, Kushites, and Nubians show repeated reference to trading or raiding of the Blemmyes. After the seventh century, they gradually converted to Islam and Arab social customs, and the various Beja subgroups began to emerge. In Sudan, these groups include the Ababda (on the coast), Amarar, Bisharin (along the Nile near Atbara), Beni Amer (next to Eritrea), and Hadendowa.

Echoing the ancient complexities of Beja–Nubian relations during the nineteenth-century Mahdist movement (led by a Danagla Nubian), some Beja were militarily active in support of the Mahdist Ansar, especially around Suakin, under the leadership of ‘Uthman Digna. Meanwhile, other sections followed the Khatmiya leadership in Kassala and were opposed to the Mahdi.

**BEJRAWIYA.** See MEROË.

**BELZONI, GIOVANNI BATTISTA** (1778–1823). Belzoni was born in Padua, Italy, and was a neophyte priest, hydraulic specialist, adventurer, and circus performer in magic and weight lifting, as he was of a gigantic stature of 200 centimeters. He had a great interest in exploring regions still poorly known in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. After extensive travels in Europe, he finally found
his way to Egypt to experiment with some irrigation designs. He had already been intrigued by Egyptian antiquities, and his knowledge of rigging and lifting devices came into use to remove some of Egypt’s great antiquities, such as the huge statue of Ramses II (q.v.), now at the British Museum (No. 19). He also explored the Valley of the Kings and Karnak, where he liberally removed ancient objects that found their way back to European museums. As this was long before the dams at Aswan, he sailed farther upstream on the Nubian Nile to try to penetrate the colossal temple at Abu Simbel (q.v.).

Belzoni failed on the first instance given the tremendous amount of drifted sand that had obscured the central opening but succeeded in his second trip in 1817. This made him the first in the early modern era to see inside this majestic Egyptian monument in Nubia. He was also among the first Europeans in the predecipherment era to reach and record elements of the Isis temple at Philae (q.v.) as well as the temples in Upper Egypt at Esna, Edfu, and Kom Ombo. He traveled to the Red Sea coast to locate the Ptolemaic port of Berenice as well as into the Western Desert to the Fayum and Bahariya Oases.

Belzoni’s work is recorded in several publications, but of relevance to Nubia are his *Narrative of the Operations and Recent Discoveries within the Pyramids, Temples, Tombs, and Excavations in Egypt and Nubia* and the forty-four plates that illustrated these travels. His methods and ethics have come to be seriously questioned over time, but he certainly managed to stir up great interest in Egypt and Nubia. He died exploring coastal West Africa in 1823.

**BENI KANZ.** At some point in the early Middle Ages, the Beni Kanz migrated across the Red Sea from Arabia to Upper Egypt. They became greatly mixed with the Bisharin (q.v.) people in terms of kinship, economy, and local Upper Egyptian politics. Since they controlled the pilgrimage and commercial port of Adhab on the Red Sea, it was critical to the Egyptians that they be under their control. In order to ensure this loyalty, in the early eleventh century the Fatimids began to award them the honorary title of “state treasurer” or Kanz al-Dawla. Gradually, it was assumed that a sheikh of the Beni Kanz would always hold this position, hence their name.

William Adams reported that their strategic position in the early twelfth century was such that they were a threat to the weakening Fat-
timids, who executed the leader of the Beni Kanz. In the following Ayyubid period in 1174, a similar incident took place. Retreating farther into Nubia as a result, the Beni Kanz kept their Islamic faith but also accepted the Nubian language as well as wives, house styles, and material culture. This process led to the creation of the population known today as Kenzi and Kenuz Nubians, who occupy Lower Nubia all the way to Aswan.

Being both Nubian but also Muslim, they played a complex role in the region, especially when Muslims sought to push farther into medieval Christian Nubia. Linked by Nubian culture and language, the Beni Kanz people sometimes married into the Nubian communities in Nobata and Mukurra (qq.v). A particular titleholder of the Kanz al-Dawla position in the fourteenth century thereby found himself again as an intermediary who was under suspicion by the Mameluke sultans of Egypt while controlling Lower Nubia and seeking to wield power or influence in the declining and precarious decades of Nubian Christianity.

The thirteenth-century power struggles in Dongola inevitably found the Beni Kanz propping up those they supported to further their own interests while conspiring against those other Christian kings they saw as a threat. The case of Dongola King David (q.v.) and his rival Shekanda is a perfect example of this dynamic situation. The complex insinuation of the Beni Kanz into Dongola politics was also apparent when the last Christian king, Kerenbes, capitulated to the first Muslim king of that town. However, the Beni Kanz opposed the Mameluke appointee, Barshambu. This was because King Kerenbes’s sister’s son was the current Kanz al-Dawla, and he would be entitled by kinship to inherit the title and thereby convert the Christian kingdom to Islam. Barshambu was promptly assassinated, and the independent-minded Kanz al-Dawla took the throne of Dongola. That Kanz al-Dawla was soon recognized as the king of the tiny and threatened kingdom of Dotawo (q.v.), which tried to survive in those tumultuous times and region.

Kerenbes, still a captive in Cairo, was then mobilized by the Mamelukes to overthrow his nephew, the Kanz al-Dawla. He succeeded only briefly before the Kanz al-Dawla struck back and deposed Kerenbes once again. Dismayed by this bloody infighting, the Mamelukes at last determined that they could leave the Kanz al-Dawla in power in Dongola. By 1323 CE, the Christian kings of Dongola were
never to rule Nubia again, although believers certainly carried on at Dotawo (q.v.), and the Christian kingdom of Alwa persisted until 1504. Following the now old regional pattern, turmoil swept into Aswan. As long as the powers in Cairo or Christian Nubia were weak, the Beni Kanz could play a strong regional role. They must have added substantially to the fourteenth-century break in theological and political relations between the Nubian church and the Alexandrian patriarchate.

Today, the Kenzi people of Aswan and Lower Nubia are a constant reminder of this intriguing history, and while all are strongly Muslim, they also have a very deep devotion to Nubian language and culture as well as a strong affinity to and interest in Sudanese Nubia. Further proof of the enduring linkages between the Beni Kanz of Aswan to Dongola is the linguistic evidence that the Nubian dialects at the extreme north and south of Nubia are more similar than either are to the Sukkot and Mahas varieties in between.

BEN NAQA. See NAQA.

BERTI. The Berti, Zaghawa, and Bideyat are Sudanese remnants of the ancient Garamantes (Berber) people who controlled the trans-Saharan trade with Egypt, in this case, along the Selima Trail to the Selima Oasis. These three groups have linguistic and cultural affinities through their common membership in the Kanuric language family. They are found mainly in western Darfur, where today they express their commitment to Islam in various syncretic ways.

BES. Bes was the dwarf god of Nubian origin who probably joined the Egyptian deities in the 12th Dynasty (q.v.). This deformed dwarf offered protection against danger, especially against animals such as snakes. According to a new discovery by Derek Welsby, his female counterpart in Nubia was Beset, who was also linked to protection and pregnancy, like Tauret. He was used by royalty, as in the case of protection for the royal birth of Hatshepsut. He brought happiness and laughter with his dances and tambourine and harp playing. Bes was especially beneficial and protective at childbirth for all people when he frightened or diverted evil spirits that would put infants at risk.

Bes was shown in full face, unlike Egyptian deities, who were mostly in profile. He may have been a form of a lion god as he re-
tained some lionlike characteristics. Lion deities such as Apedemek and Sekhmet have links to Nubia.

**B-GROUP, B-HORIZON.** This is the name given to the Nubian culture that emerged after the Egyptian conquest of Lower Nubia (q.v.) around 2600 BCE. It is considered a time of local cultural decadence with some new elements, although scholars disagree on the degree of distinctiveness from the prior A-Group or successor C-Group (q.q.v.) cultures. If the cultural horizon of the B-Group even exists, it ends within the First Intermediate period of Egyptian history, about 2160 BCE. In recent years, the increasing consensus is to abandon this B-Group terminology, which was first developed by George Reisner (q.v.).

**BIGA (SENMET).** Biga Island is just south of Philae (q.v.), was considered the “source” of the Nile, and was thus an important sacred site. Its symbolic importance was enhanced by the belief that its sacred place (the Abaton) was where a portion of the body of Osiris was buried. New Kingdom graffiti by Khaemwese (son of Ramses II [q.v.]) on the southwestern corner of Biga attest to this tradition. A cartouche of Pharaoh Apries of the 26th Dynasty may also be seen on Biga, as well as some mud-brick ruins of a Christian monastery.

**BION.** Bion, a Greek, was one of several foreigners, such as Dalion, Simonides the Younger, and Nicolaus of Syria, who were known to have traveled to Meroë (q.v.) during early Ptolemaic (q.v.) times. These accounts provided fragmentary but independent evidence of the life, circumstances, and ethnography of this kingdom at its height. It is from Bion that we know of the interpretation and application of the Meroitic title Candace (q.v.) as a “royal mother.”

**BISHARIN, BISHARHEEN.** According to tradition, this nomadic people are descended from the Blemmyes (q.v.) or the ancient Medjay (q.v.). Occupying the borderlands between Egypt and Nubia and serving more as pastoralists rather than settled agriculturists, the Bisharin variously played either a threatening, supportive, or marginal role to regional politics in the Red Sea Hills area as the larger riverine powers of Egypt and Nubia contested for their influence or sought to subdue them.
Although of ancient origins, they expanded into their present area on the western slopes of the Red Sea Hills in the fifteenth century and moved into the Atbara River area under a great chief, Hamad Imran, around 1760. There are two major sections, the Umm ‘Ali and the Umm Naji. They were not very active in the Mahdiya or twentieth-century national developments.

BISHOP GEORGIOS, GIRGIS. Bishop Georgios served in the Faras cathedral in Lower Nubia until his death in 1097 CE.

BISHOP IESU. Bishop Iesu served in the Faras cathedral until his death in either 1170 or 1175 CE. An earlier Bishop Ieso of Faras died in 972 CE.

BISHOP JOHANNES. Bishop Johannes served as the head of the Faras cathedral from 997 CE until his death in 1005 CE. He was buried in a domed tomb adjacent to the exterior southeastern wall of the cathedral. His remains included a bronze cross and rod for church rituals. The style of church frescoes of this period featured polychrome painting that was much more colorful than in previous religious art. Bishop Marianos (q.v.) followed Bishop Johannes. An earlier Bishop Johannes of Faras lived from 524–608 EC.

BISHOP KYROS. Bishop Kyros served in the Faras cathedral in the late ninth century CE. He is depicted in a church fresco that was salvaged and removed to Khartoum National Museum. His fresco shows the “white style” that is attributed to Palestinian origins. His image itself is naturalistic and Nubian.

BISHOP MARIANOS (?–1036? CE). Marianos fully assumed his position as bishop of Faras (q.v.) following the death of Bishop Johannes III (q.v.), bishop of Faras, on September 21, 1005. For reasons not known, he had been ordained in 1003 before he occupied the religious capital at Faras, where a famed polychrome portrait of Bishop Marianos resides in the Great Cathedral. The image is now in Poland (Warsaw 234036), and it shows his round brown face with full heavy beard and embroidered bishop’s clothing and adornment. In this portrait, Bishop Marianos is standing on the right side of Mary holding...
Jesus, and the bishop himself is termed “the son” of Joannes. This may have actually been the case, or it may be a general reference to his filial attitude toward Joannes. A tombstone from Qasr Ibrim dated to 1031 or 1036 CE suggests that Bishop Marianos died there, and it seems that a space reserved for an inscription at Faras was not used.

Bishops were present in Lower Nubia at Philae (q.v.) from as early as the mid-fourth century under the authority of Patriarch Athanasius (q.v.; 327–372 CE). In the area of Faras, some Christian iconography appears in the post-Meroitic tombs of the Ballana and Qustul (q.v.) cultural horizons. The official conversion of Nubia to Monophysite (q.v., Jacobite) Christianity is customarily put at 543 CE, some decades after the Council of Chalcedon and active missionary activities of Julian (q.v.). Alternatively, one might place this conversion at an earlier date of 536 CE under King Silko (q.v.), who may have still ruled.

Nubian Christianity at the time of Bishop Marianos needs to be contextualized as being contemporary with Fatimid Egypt (969–1171). This Shiite form of Islam carried a certain degree of crusading zealotry and desire for expansion; thus, Nubian Christians (q.v.) felt a special need for political and theological solidarity at this period. In the biography of Bishop Marianos is a discussion that his arrival might also have signaled a shift from observing the Coptic or Monophysite to that of the Melkite (royal) official Dyophysite position held by Alexandrian Greeks. This transition may have actually occurred prior to Marianos, as the Nubian church shifted from Jacobite to Melkite traditions, but scholarly debate continues on the facts and causes of this matter.

**BISHOP MERKI.** This bishop is known from some documents found in a jar in 1964 salvage work at Qasr Ibrim. In 1464, Bishop Merki presided at the Qasr Ibrim cathedral. Bishop Merki and the small Christian enclave at Dotawo (q.v.) were among the last Christian holdouts in Lower Nubia.

**BISHOP MERKURIUS (†1056 CE).** Abba (Bishop) Merkurus served at the Faras (q.v.) cathedral from 1031 to 1052 CE. His portrait was painted on the wall of that building. His funerary stela notes that he was the “son of Johannes,” (q.v.), a former bishop of Faras. It is not
clear whether he was the true biological son of Johannes or whether this is a devotional reference.

**BISHOP PETROS.** The Monophysite (q.v) bishop Petros served at the Faras cathedral from 974 to 999 CE. He was buried near the church. In the second half of the tenth century, red and some yellow and green paints in religious paintings were the identifying colors for this short artistic period. His own face was painted a dark red/brown, and he had a mustache and a tiny beard. Behind him was the protective figure of the apostle Peter, from whom he likely got his name. An earlier Bishop Petros of Faras died in 662 CE.

**BISHOP TIMOTHEOS.** Bishop Timotheos was consecrated in 1372 CE in Cairo as the bishop of Faras and Qasr Ibrim (qq.v.). It is believed that he died at Qasr Ibrim shortly after his arrival. He is known from his northern crypt burial site at Qasr Ibrim. On his remains was found a long iron staff topped with a cross that dated to the late fourteenth century. These were the declining years of Christianity in Lower Nubia. Among his effects were paper scrolls in Coptic, Greek, and Arabic that indicated his official position under the Alexandrian patriarchate. These scrolls are in the Coptic Museum in Cairo, while his garments have been removed to the British Museum.

**BLEMMYES, BLEMYES, PELAMOS.** The Blemmyes are a very early, mostly pastoral group, mainly on the eastern bank of the Nile of Lower Nubia during the Middle and New Kingdoms through the period of the kingdom of Kush and into Greco-Roman times. Their ancient equivalent was the Matoi or Medjay (q.v.) people, famed for their military prowess and shifting allegiances. It appears that they were the same people known archaeologically as the Pan-Grave. This enigmatic group of nomads usually is identified as the ancestors of the modern Beja and Bisharin (q.v.) peoples. It is also believed that the X-Group (q.v.) may represent the archaeological remains of the Blemmyes if not the Noba (q.v.). Aside from these possibilities, the only undisputed evidence of Blemmyes activity comes from classical texts written in the third and fourth centuries CE.

The presence of the Blemmyes in the Nile valley undoubtedly precedes the first record of their activity, but, other than the possible
equivalence with the Egyptian Medjay, evidence of such is lacking. It is known from historical documents that near the height of the Meroitic period (first century BCE–second century CE), the Blemmyes were attracted by the kingdom’s growing wealth and prosperity, and they became increasingly active and hostile rivals to Meroë. From the second century on, the Blemmyes conducted several raids on the settlements in Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia, particularly in the area of Aswan and Philae (q.v.), which might have fallen out of strong Meroitic control by that time. Records indicate that they also participated in two failed Egyptian rebellions against Roman authority. Roman and Meroitic forces briefly combined to defend the gold mines of the Dodekaschoenos in the Eastern Desert from more attacks from the Blemmyes.

By the third century, the Blemmyes increasingly threatened regional trade caravans and river settlements. Their capacity for disrupting everyday life and commerce was enlarged with the introduction of the camel (q.v.). Their newfound mobility and growing military power made them particularly adept at menacing the long, exposed trade route between Meroë (q.v.) and Roman Egypt as never before. Blemmyes incursions so seriously disrupted trade that scholars have often cited their interference as a main factor in the decline of the Meroitic Kingdom. Indeed, their constant depredations in the Dodekaschoenos (q.v.) resulted in Roman abandonment of this province under Diocletian (q.v.) in the late third century CE. With the withdrawal of the Roman frontier, the Blemmyes were left in complete possession of this area, which they quickly settled. Loss of the Dodekaschoenos to the hostile Blemmyes also severed the Meroë from Roman Egypt and increased the disintegration of its former trade network along the Nile.

After the collapse of Meroë in the early fourth century CE, the Blemmyes gained complete control over the eastern bank of the Nile south of the Dodekaschoenos. Ballana (q.v.) settlements in this area were located on the western bank, perhaps to afford some protection from the encroaching Blemmyes. Also, gold is noticeably absent from Ballana burials of this period, suggesting that the gold available in the nearby Eastern Desert had been inaccessible. All evidence indicates that hostility between the two coexisting peoples continued intermittently through the fourth and fifth centuries CE.
By expanding their area, the Blemmyes came into conflict with the Romans in Egypt. The Romans attempted to create a buffer state in Nobatia, but the Nobatae later fought beside the Blemmyes against the Romans. Apparently in 453 CE, the Roman general Maximinus carried out an attack against Blemmyes and Nobatae peoples in order to release some Roman soldiers whom they had captured. At this time, the Blemmyes and Nobatae were still engaged in Isis worship at Philae temple. By 515 CE, an instance of Roman payments took place to the same people to ensure peace in the region.

The Blemmyes did not convert readily to Christianity, and in wars with the kingdom of Dongola (q.v.) in the sixth century CE, King Silko (q.v.) soundly defeated and subjugated the Blemmyes, according to his inscription from Kalabsha (q.v.). Those Blemmyes who surrendered were incorporated into his kingdom, while those who resisted were driven out of the area for good. The Silko inscription is usually taken as the marker of the first official presence of Christianity in a Nubian state. The earlier and immediately adjacent Meroitic proclamation of the Noba (?) king Kharamadoye (q.v.) also at Kalabsha may record another supposedly “decisive defeat” of the Blemmyes prior to Silko. When his inscription is fully understood, the historical periodization of Lower Nubia and important personages will be better known.

As an etymological note, most Meroiticists translate *pelemos* as “strategos” (local military commander) following the tradition of F. L. Griffith. The obvious linguistic parallel to Blemmyes suggests that these “pelemos/strategos” may have played that administrative role, but in fact they were actually Blemmyes. In looking over the geographical sources where the word *pelemos* is inscribed, it is only in areas where Blemmyes were known to be found and active. [R. Lobban and K. Rhodes]

**BOATS.** The history of boats along the Nubian Nile is ancient and may commence with simple flotation devices, such as logs, but evolved in Predynastic times to bundles of papyrus reeds. Such floats still persist in the Upper Nile and in Ethiopia, where they are known as *ambatch*. Boats of Naqada (q.v.) times showed sickle-shaped hulls that appear to be much larger than the small *ambatch* type. It seems that they still lacked keels and ribs but likely were made of hard acacia
and sycamore. The rough planks were then lashed together with com-
plex ropes and knots and with carefully made mortise-and-tenon
joints. The hulls were then caulked to become watertight.

The early Nubian or Egyptian varieties were virtually identical and
showed the tall curving prow and stern, long a style type for Nile
River vessels. Images of these vessels commonly appear as petro-
glyphs, on painted pottery, on a stone-inscribed censer from Qustul
(q.v.), and as wooden or clay models. These vessels were punt-
paddled, and sometimes rigged with small square or sometimes tri-
angular sails. Small cabins are sometimes depicted. The boats were
without a keel or deep draft because of the generally shallow river
depth. While some boats were small and utilitarian, others were much
larger and were used for moving bulk cargoes.

Still others were emblematic of pharaonic rule, especially if
equipped with a cabin and throne. The use of boats and boat
metaphors in funerary ritual is also of great antiquity. Boats could be
used to actually transport the deceased across the river, but this be-
came a metaphorical trip from the world of the living to the world of
the dead. This symbolism continued in funerary rites in which the
mummified deceased would be pulled on a boat-shaped sledge into
their pyramid or rock-cut tomb.

One of the earliest depictions of hostile relations between Egypt
and Nubia is drawn from the inscription of King Djer (q.v.) in about
2900 BCE. In this case, symbolic curved riverboats are shown attack-
ing Lower Nubia and bringing back a captured chief hanging from
the bow of Djer’s boat as he sailed victoriously back to Thebes. By
the Old Kingdom, more complex rowed and sailed boats appear with
planked hulls cleverly tied together. The sails were mostly, if not en-
tirely, square-rigged with a single mast. Multielement booms and
spars kept the sails taut. The sails were made from cloth or papyrus.
The larger vessels had trusses for hull stability and stays to strengthen
the mast and several lines to control the booms and yardarms. Large
vessels had “hogging trusses” to prevent midship sagging, and some
had stepped masts to be raised or lowered, while others had special
supports for the mast.

The image of a boat with a sail in use was a determinative of the
direction south since sails were needed to move against the Nile.
Boats with sails furled indicate the direction north (with the current).
In reaching Mesopotamia, where the Tigres and Euphrates Rivers flow to the south, the Egyptians were frustrated in how to deal with this, and they said that this was a “land where the water flowed in the wrong way.”

Boats were used for military transport and for carrying heavy construction stones, especially alabaster and granite, as well as fine stones for royal sculpture. During the famed trip by Harkuf (q.v.), he traveled to Nubia by donkey train but apparently, in at least one instance, returned by boat. Papyrus floats still persisted for small-scale purposes, such as hunting and fishing. At the same time, the Egyptians also built boats large enough for Mediterranean Sea trade, and they regularly traveled to Canaan and Phoenicia for cedar wood, purple dye, and other commodities valued in Egypt.

Egyptian forts in Nubia built in the Old Kingdom and Middle Kingdom made heavy use of river resupply. Vessels of thirty meters were not uncommon for major transport projects. Some were even far larger, judging from the so-called solar boat associated with Pharaoh Chephren at his Giza pyramid. In some cases, the channels through the First and Second Cataracts were deepened and improved to allow faster movement of these boats. At the Mirgissa fortress, remains of a mud-lubricated slipway were found to assist in moving vessels around the rapids.

At the start of the New Kingdom, boats played an important role in transporting Egyptian troops to fight the Hyksos in the delta. By this time, Egyptian boats were truly elegant, with classic lines and excellent dovetailed joinery. High steering oars in the spoon-shaped craft, along with upturned bowsprits, gave these vessels a real dignity. Some could reach lengths of thirty meters and would carry thirty rowers.

Also in the New Kingdom, Egyptian exploitation of Nubia required substantial use of river vessels to move troops and livestock, resupply fortresses, acquire stone and minerals, and maintain bulk commerce and communication. Among the most famed of these voyages was that undertaken by Queen Hatshepsut (q.v.) in her Red Sea trading expedition to Punt (q.v.) during the 18th Dynasty. In the 20th Dynasty, another depiction of large river vessels appears at the Medinet Habu temple for Ramses III that shows him engaged in intense combat with the Sea Peoples. Rowers on these naval vessels were protected from enemy arrows by raised gunwale planks. [R. Lobban with P. Saucier]
BODY DECORATION: CICATRICES, TATTOOS. The cicatrix, sometimes called scarification, is a permanent form of body art in which the skin is scarred to produce aesthetic patterns. Cicatrices are created by simply cutting the skin with a knife or through the application of cautery. Cuts may then be medicated with charcoal in order to promote a delayed healing that results in keloid scarring, an excessive growth of scar tissue that effects a raised pattern on the skin.

The earliest archaeological evidence of the cicatrix in the Sudan is found in the C-Group (2400–1550 BCE) of Lower Nubia. Patterned markings on small, pottery female figurines have been interpreted as representing the actual decoration of women’s bodies with tattoos and scars. More concrete evidence of the practice comes from the depiction of Nubians in Egyptian art. From the fourteenth century BCE, reliefs from the Middle Kingdom tomb of Horemheb (q.v.) at Saqqara carefully indicate facial scars on certain individuals. Most have four or five lines inscribed across the forehead. Identical marks

Examples of scarification.
also appear on a dancer represented in the Opet festival reliefs of the Luxor temple as well as among the wrestlers represented in reliefs at Medinet Habu. A second type of facial cicatrix is recorded at the Luxor temple. Cheek scars, three deep vertical furrows on each side of the face, are indicated on some of the Nubian captives carved on the base of colossi of Ramses II (q.v.). Curiously, during the Napatan period, no evidence of cicatrices exists among the Nubian rulers of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). However, the practice returns in the Meroitic period toward the end of the first century BCE. In Meroitic art, royalty are occasionally depicted in relief sporting cicatrices. Other representations of the practice are found on small clay heads and a number of ba statues that depict individuals with three vertical lines on the cheeks and horizontal lines on the forehead. Similar scars can also be seen on the painted faces used to adorn pottery. From the Karanog (q.v.) cemetery, three ceramic vessels were found painted with stylized faces, each shown with a crescent pattern, presumably a representation of cicatrix, on the forehead. Occasionally, the same type of scar is referenced in Roman caricatures of Nubians. Juneval (Satyricon) lists “forehead scars” as an essential feature of an Ethiopian disguise.

Some people of Nubia and Sudan continue the custom of cicatrix today, adorning their faces with a series of distinctive marks. Many modern-day Sudanese wear cicatrices identical to those representations discussed here. Today, the arrangement of scars varies from one group to another, referring to tribal, ethnic, and other affiliations. Cicatrices may also indicate social status or signify rites of passage. Through ethnographic analogy, archaeologists interpret the cicatrix to have held a similar meaning for Sudanese peoples in the past as in the present.

Tattooing is a permanent form of body art in which deep layers of the skin are painted or tinted to produce aesthetic patterns. Tattooing is done by piercing or cutting the skin with a needle, thorn (acacia), sharp bone, or other such instrument, and then a colorant for pigmentation is introduced in the wound. The tattoo may then be medicated with charcoal in order to promote a delayed healing resulting in keloid scarring.

From the earliest evidence, the custom of tattooing seems to have been reserved only for women. The oldest archaeological evidence comes from the Egyptian Predynastic period (ca. 5000–2950 BCE).
The patterns of tattoos on female figurines, the preservation of geometric designs on some mummies, and the depiction of patterns on some women in tomb paintings all attest to the practice. Evidence of tattooing in Egypt after this period is rather sparse. In fact, the practice seems to have been spurned by the Egyptians in general.

However, in the Middle Kingdom (1970–1640 BCE), the practice resurfaces as a Nubian custom. The earliest evidence of tattooing in Sudan, roughly contemporary with the Middle Kingdom, is found in the C-Group (2400–1550 BCE) of Lower Nubia. Patterned markings on small, pottery female figurines have been interpreted as representing the actual decoration of women’s bodies with tattoos and scars. In Egypt, the bodies of three female mummies from this period, believed to be Nubians living in Egypt, were tattooed with geometric patterns of dots and dashes. This same pattern is also tattooed on a female mummy found in the C-Group cemetery at Kubban (q.v.). Indeed, some scholars maintain that the reintroduction of the custom into Egypt in the Middle Kingdom is due to influences from Nubia.

By the New Kingdom (ca. 1539–1075 BCE), tattooing became firmly established as a form of Egyptian art. Still reserved exclusively for women, the pattern of dots and dashes yields to the representation of popular figures. The most common represents the god Bes (q.v.), who often adorns the thighs of female figures in Egyptian art. An ostracoon from the New Kingdom depicts a female dancer whose thigh is tattooed with the same design. During the period of Meroë, female mummies discovered at Aksha (q.v.) are also tattooed. However, these mummies are decorated with geometric designs similar to...
to those popular among C-Group (q.v.) women. Tattoos, like cicatrices, may also serve to indicate social status or signify rites of passage. Some have speculated that prostitutes were tattooed, but it may simply be that the source of forced concubines was in Nubia, where the practice existed quite independently. Unfortunately, little ethnographic work has been undertaken on this topic. [by k. rhodes]

BOWS AND ARROWS. The evolution of the bow and arrow in Nubia is extremely ancient, coming at least in the Mesolithic if not as early as the late Paleolithic (qq.v.) period, when microliths are found that were probably used as projectile points. Indeed, the common name for Nubia in the ancient Egyptian language was Ta-Setiu (q.v.), or “bow people.” It is not clear what Nubians called themselves. Certainly, bows (pet-t in Egyptian) and arrows (aha in Egyptian) are found for all ancient Nubian horizons, including A-Group, C-Group, Kerma, Medjay, Napatan, Meroitic, X-Group, Christian, and Islamic (qq.v.) times. Until Kerma times, the bow was a simple “stave bow” with stone or bronze projectile points.

During the Middle Kingdom (q.v.), the role of Nubian bowmen was critical for the development of the Egyptian state. In fact, if the supposition that its founder, Mentuhotep II (q.v.), was of possible Nubian origin, then it is even less surprising that the tomb models of Nubian archer-soldiers were so popular at this time. The Egyptian fortifications in Nubia at this time were carefully designed to accommodate archers safely behind narrow archer loopholes in the massive mud-brick walls that could give them a clear shot at the control defensive doorway of the fort. Bronze arrowheads were established during the Middle Kingdom and in contemporary Kerma.

The first major change in bow technology seems to have arrived in Kerma in conjunction with the innovations in military technology brought by the Hyksos (q.v.), that is, a more powerful composite bow as well as horse-drawn military chariots that carried a driver and an archer. The New Kingdom armies used a heavy military composite bow that was made by gluing or binding wood, horn, and bone together. It was slightly to substantially recurved for added power. Theban temple images exist showing generous quivers mounted on war chariots and illustrations of leather body armor against incoming arrows. The bow tips were sometimes ornately carved in the form of
the enemies of Egypt, such as Nubians, Libyans, and Asians. The Assyrians continued this weapon even until their wars with the Nubian pharaohs of the 25th Dynasty in the seventh century BCE.

Iron arrowheads came into widespread use in Meroitic and contemporary Greco-Roman times and thereafter. Often these arrows were barbed. At least by post-Meroitic Ballana (q.v.) or X-Group (q.v) times, leather archer bracers protected the bow-holding wrist from rubbing during the bowstring recoil. Though not found in archaeological sites, some form of wrist protection presumably was used before this time since it is extremely painful when a bowstring repeatedly snaps across the forearm. Nubians also used stone archer looses or thumb rings to protect the thumb from being cut by rapid and recurrent use. Militarily, bows and arrows were used by guards, snipers, and chariot-mounted archers or in prolonged sieges of walled towns. In such cases, ranks of archers could shoot repeatedly as a group while defenders hid or used shields of reed or animal hides. The bow is one of the oldest weapons for hunting and has undergone many innovations. [by F. Collins and R. Lobban]

BREITH. Breith is believed to be the brother of the Nubian god Mandulis (q.v.), well known from the Kalabsha (q.v.) temple. Since Mandulis was a solar god, this suggests that Breith was his lunar counterpart. Fraternal deities such as Breith and Mandulis can be compared with the other fraternal Meroitic deities, such as of Sebiumeker and Arensnuphis (qq.v.) These four Nubian gods are not known in ancient Egyptian theology, but the Egyptian fraternal deities of Osiris and Seth were certainly known in Nubia, thus making at least three sets of brotherly deities in Nubia. Nubian depictions of all six are concentrated in Greco-Roman and Meroitic times.

BRONZE TECHNOLOGY. Bronze is an alloy of tin and copper. The addition of about 5 to 15 percent of tin to copper causes this alloy to have desirable qualities, including increased hardness over copper, a lower melting point for the copper by over 100 degrees at 15 percent tin, and better properties of liquidity that are useful for casting. Bronze could be produced by hammering, which made it substantially harder, or by casting in the lost-wax process.
According to A. Lucas and J. R. Harris, almost certainly bronze emerged from very early western Asian origins and gradually replaced copper. The earliest bronze is known to date back to perhaps as early as 3500 BCE, and it slowly entered Egypt and the Nile valley. By the 5th Dynasty in the Old Kingdom, bronze was present in Egypt, but its use became much more widespread in the Middle Kingdom. At this time, it was used for simple implements, such as axes, adzes, chisels, and knives. It was also used as a bar that may have had value in commercial exchange.

In the New Kingdom, bronze metallurgists became very skillful. The inventory of bronze from the Middle Kingdom was much expanded to include razors, mirrors, bowls, swords, vases, bracelets, hooks, nails, rings, arrowheads, cups, flutes, dishes, medical tools, and mummy eye settings.

The introduction of bronze into Nubia was from Egypt, and especially during the Middle Kingdom, regular contact with Kerma (q.v.) not only resulted in bronze imports from Egypt but also stimulated local production at Kerma. The bronze knives and swords in Kerma military and royal tombs are prime examples, as are military fly medals, razors, and beautifully crafted bed fixtures.

In Meroitic and Ballana times, the use of bronze was almost as widespread as it was for their Greco-Roman contemporaries. All the inventory from the New Kingdom persisted with a prominence for chisels, adzes, spear points, and knives, with still more items added, including the elegant bronze lamps and lamp stands, door hinges, scissors and shears, kohl sticks, spoons, and lovely decorated ware, such as spouted pitchers, vases, and bowls that sometimes were inscribed with geometric patterns, Meroitic writing, and other symbols.

At last, bronze began to give way to iron (q.v.) technology in the New Kingdom and in the Late period but especially during Greco-Roman and Meroitic times, when the still harder iron became the metal of choice. Iron was much valued for farming adzes and barbed arrow points.

BRUCE, JAMES (1730–1794). Bruce was born in Kinnaird, Scotland, and destined for a life in the Portuguese wine business, but, as an early widower, he was drawn to the Middle East and especially to Egypt in 1768. He explored some of the extant tombs in the Valley of
the Kings and visible sites in the Luxor and Karnak temples. Intrigued by the information that Christian Ethiopia lay at the headwaters of the Blue Nile, he passed on into Nubia from Aswan and finally reached Axum (q.v.), where, some claim, he hoped to find the lost Ark of the Covenant. His precise mission remains in dispute, but he had a long stay in Ethiopia (Abyssinia) and did not return to Aswan until 1772. His account, *Travels*, was published in 1790 to considerable acclaim. Apparently, John Lewis Burckhardt (q.v.) was familiar with and stimulated by Bruce’s travels.

**BUDGE, ERNEST ALFRED THOMSON WALLIS** (1857–1934). This widely controversial, prolifically published, and massively reprinted Egyptologist is probably as much disputed and praised now as he was in his own time. His scholarship has been criticized, and his means of acquiring antiquities would not be ethically accepted today. The dubious circumstances of his birth in Bodmin, England, always made him something of an outsider. His early and profound fascination with ancient Egypt drew him to the British Museum and to distinguished scholarship at Cambridge University from 1879 to 1885, when he completed his master’s degree. Noting that 1885 was the heyday of the British imperial scramble for Africa helps give the context for his approach to acquiring Egyptian antiquities.

He held the position of keeper of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities at the British Museum from 1892 to 1924. Some of the criticism directed at Budge might also be directed at his official employer and his illustrious friend Gaston Maspero, both of whom were endlessly searching for additions to their massive and distinguished collections.

Relative to ancient Nubia, Budge was involved with excavations or collections at Aswan, Gebel Barkal, Semna, and Meroë (qq.v.). His studies and travels in Nubia, Egypt, and Mesopotamia resulted in well over 140 books and other publications. Of special relevance to Nubian studies are his *Account of Excavations at Aswan* (1888), the still handy guide *The Mummy* (1894) in multiple editions and reprints, and *On the Orientation of the Pyramids in the Sudan* (1899). His major reference work was his eight-volume *A History of Egypt from the End of the Predynastic Period to the Death of Cleopatra VII* (1902). His book *The Nile, Notes for Travelers in Egypt* (1905) has
excellent maps on the Nile, including detailed references to the antiquities and sites of all of Sudanese Nubia. Budge also wrote a two-volume work, *The Egyptian Sudan* (1907).

These works are still worth consulting if placed in their historical context and if viewed with a cautious eye for some of the details. Considering the explosive advance and interest in Egyptology, this field has necessarily compelled revision of some of the chronologies, data, and interpretations first presented by Budge a century ago.

**BUGDUMBASH**. Bugdumbash is an ancient settlement and cemetery site located on the eastern bank of the Letti basin of the Nubian Nile downstream of where Wadi Howar enters from the west. Bugdumbash is not far downstream from Old Dongola and about seventy kilometers from the modern town of Ed-Debba near the mouth of Wadi Milk. So positioned, it could control the access to these desert wadis while having adequate basin farmlands and controlling the traffic on the Nile at this point where the S-turn of the Nile reaches its southern bend. David O’Connor believes that this may have been another settlement area of significance during the time of Kerma. Conceivably, this was the site of chieftainship that was subordinated to contemporary Kerma, thus implying a greater territorial scope for Kerma itself. If Bugdumbash had this level of importance, then it would be based on a heavier use of the Nile than at later times, when the stretch between Kerma and Jebel Barkal was probably crossed more often by the land route known as the Maheila Road. O’Connor also believes that Bugdumbash may have been a district for New Kingdom colonial rule of that region. Future archaeological investigation may shed more light on this site and the political position it occupied.

**BUHEN, BOHEN, BOUN** (Greek). Buhen is at the strategic site of an Old Kingdom town and a major Middle Kingdom border fortification opposite the modern Sudanese town of Wadi Halfa. It is located just downstream of the Second Cataract and was favored to control troop movements, trade, and cultural interaction with Nubia. The massive rectangular layout was 170 by 160 meters. Mud-brick walls ten meters high and almost five meters thick guard the fortress. The stout fortification also included a dry trench (about six meters deep and
eight meters wide). The defensive structure also had three strongly buttressed entrances toward the river and the associated dockyard, and one toward the west, as well as towers, bastions, and ramparts with archer loopholes. The structure remained in situ until the flood of Lake Nasser. Inscriptional evidence of the fortified structure dates to Senusoret I (q.v.) in the 12th Dynasty as a rear area for his attacks as far as Argo Island (q.v.). Buhen was also noted in late Middle Kingdom papyrus found at the Ramesseum in Luxor. This papyrus lists seventeen forts in Nubia between Semna (q.v.) upstream of the Second Cataract and Shellal (q.v.) at Aswan. Buhen was clearly among the most formidable.

When the Middle Kingdom disintegrated into warring factions between Thebes and the delta, the Asian “Shepherd Kings,” or Hyksos (q.v.), saw their opportunity for intervention. The chain of border forts fell into disuse when the Egyptians were isolated in Thebes. Then, Nubians from Kerma, seeking to expand their regional control of Lower Nubia, sacked some of these imposing forts. It appears that the Hyksos were content with this relationship, which would further weaken their rivals in Thebes. However, when the New Kingdom began to rise with Kamose and Ahmose, the Hyksos remaining in Upper Egypt were left only with escape back into Nubia. When the 18th Dynasty was fully established, the valuable forts of Nubia were restored and reoccupied to serve the earlier purposes. Since the New Kingdom was a colonial regime rather than a hostile border state, the districts around Buhen (Ibshek, Teh-Khet, and Iken) were deep in Egyptian territory and were secure for the religious constructions of Amenhotep II (q.v.), who built northern temples for Isis and Min. Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III (qq.v.) built a southern temple for Horus.

The massive fortifications of Buhen were not unusual for Middle Kingdom defensive works, and they were well preserved until the flood of the High Dam that has entirely covered this site. Much of the foundation and lower courses of the southern temple of Buhen were removed to the Sudan National Museum, where they may be studied today.

The Nubian sandstone Horus temple inside Buhen’s walls was dedicated to this falcon god, regarded as “the Lord of Buhen,” and was the most significant Nubian monument for Queen Hatshepsut (q.v.) of the 18th Dynasty. Some reliefs and colors are still intact and
are preserved by a special metal shed that is drawn over the temple, relocated in Khartoum. The inner temple should be attributed to Hatshepsut and rests on a grid six columns wide by eight columns long. The inner rooms include a transverse hall that opens to a sacred bark chamber and three storage rooms for temple tribute.

Not only is this a refined work for Hatshepsut, but also it reveals something of the rivalry she had with her brother and successor, Tuthmosis III (q.v.), who systematically defaced her images and cartouches and made unique additions to the temple plan. A mud-brick (temenos) wall surrounded the temple, which had an inner forecourt (almost like a hypostyle hall) that was clearly added by Tuthmosis III, with depictions on doorjambs built on a different axis from the inner temple. This section shows his viceroy of Kush (q.v.), Nehi; the king receiving life from the gods; and his military victories over Asians in the twenty-third year of his reign. During the 19th Dynasty in the second year of Ramses II, specific endowments in slaves and food were allocated to Buhen. Cartouches of 20th Dynasty pharaohs are also found at Buhen, including those of Ramses III, IV, and V.

During the time of Taharka (q.v.), other additions were made at Buhen’s northern Horus temple. Taharka is depicted on the doorways leading into the sacred bark chamber and on relief in the southern mud-brick enclosure wall. Settlements at Buhen are known in Ptolemaic and Meroitic times judging from ostraca, Meroitic inscriptions with numbers, and an inscribed column drum and even during Christian Nubia (q.v.). Once the ancient fortress was placed at risk from the High Dam, the southern temple was removed to the Sudan National Museum in Khartoum.

**BURCKHARDT, JOHN LEWIS** (1784–1817). Burckhardt was born in Lausanne, Switzerland, and did formal studies in Germany and England. At Cambridge University, he learned Arabic and developed a keen interest in the Middle East, where he traveled under the Muslim name of Sheikh Ibrahim, as was the popular practice among nineteenth-century European travelers in the region. He traveled extensively in Egypt and Nubia from 1814 to 1817. He reported on Wadi es Sebua and Derr temples (qq.v.) and the sociopolitical differences among the Kenzi, Sukkot, and Mahas Nubians whom he encountered. His pioneering work *Travels in Nubia* remains a foundation of modern Nubian
historiography. His observations ranged from agriculture, dress and textiles, and foods and language to antiquities and local ethnography.

He visited Abu Simbel (q.v.) in 1813, but it was mostly buried in sand except for the heads of Ramses. This was before Giovanni Batista Belzoni (q.v.) arrived there, and no doubt their conversations stimulated the later work of Belzoni to dig through the massive amount of sand to become the first to see inside that rock-cut structure. Importantly, Burckhardt went much farther than most European travelers had to that time, and he went at least as far as Shendi near ancient Meroë. He described the great diversity of local products in that regional market town, including livestock and slaves, spices, metalware, and leather goods. At that point, the nominal Turco-Egyptian authority was meaningless, and the full Turkish military occupation of Nubia was not to take place until 1822–1823. Burckhardt died in Cairo.

BUTANA. This is the region of Sudan bounded by the Nile to the west, the Atbara (q.v.) River to the north and east, the Blue Nile to the south, and Lake Tana to the east. The Butana has long been a rich savanna grassland that supported herds of wild animals, including valuable leopards and elephants in the past, but today is used mainly for various modes of pastoralism of sheep, goats, cattle, and camels, watered by wells and hafirs. This is the heartland of the ancient Meroë and the site of monuments at Bejrawiya, Ben Naqa, and Musawwarat es-Sufra (q.v.). During Greco-Roman times and long thereafter, the Butana was termed the “Island of Meroë” and was depicted on maps in the tradition of Claudius Ptolemeus (q.v.) as actually being an island in the Nile, which is certainly not the case in fact. The Butana represents the continuation of an interior overland trade corridor crossing the Bayuda (q.v.) steppe to the west and north.

Today, the Butana is an arid grassland, termed a steppe, dotted with acacia trees and traversed by several wadis, the most notable being Wadi Hawad. On average, the region receives from ten to sixty centimeters of rain annually, with higher rainfall occurring in the extreme south. It is generally agreed that the region was considerably less arid in the past. Geologically, the Butana is composed of two major formations of Nubian sandstone and a “base complex” of granite—two types of stone that were regularly utilized in local architecture. In ancient times, the region provided no exceptional single resource, such as gold.
The Butana contains numerous sites dating from the Khartoum Neolithic, late Napatan, Meroitic, post-Meroitic, and Christian (qq.v.) periods of Sudanese history. Napatan and Meroitic sites include Meroë, Musawwarat es-Sofra, and Naqa, among others. In the Christian period, southwestern Butana is the site of the kingdom of Alwa (q.v.) and its capital at Soba (q.v.). During the Napatan and Meroitic periods, several trade routes passed through the Butana. Perhaps the most important was an easterly continuation of the Bayuda Road along Wadi Hawad, crossing the Butana to the Ethiopian highlands. William Y. Adams has suggested (1977:303) that this road may have been the main route traveled by the Axumite army in their proposed conquest of the Meroitic Kingdom in the fourth century CE. [R. Lobban with k. rhodes]
BUTN AL-HAJR. This Arabic term for “the belly of stones” is the general reference for the region between the Second and Third Cataract. Its very rocky riverbed in low water made navigation difficult, and it became a key region for the defense of ancient Egypt against Nubian attacks. Consequently, in the Old and Middle Kingdoms, the Butn al Hajr was the site of a number of forts or a series of early warning stations to block or restrict Nubian military movements and trade. See BUHEN.

CAESAR, JULIUS (100–44 BCE). Julius Caesar was born in Rome. He reached the position of consul of Rome in 59 BCE, and from 58 to 51 BCE, he was concerned with the conquest of Gaul and Britain as well as many other former Greek possessions. He was especially interested in bringing Egypt into his empire and consolidating a border with Nubia. One of Caesar’s rivals was Pompey (106–48 BCE), the conqueror of Jerusalem in 63 BCE after the Maccabean revolt. Pompey was a formidable foe, and after Caesar and his then ally Anthony crossed the Rubicon River from Italy to Greece, it was inevitable that civil war between Caesar and Pompey would be the only resolution. In 49 BCE, Caesar was the military victor, but Pompey survived and was pursued to Egypt by Caesar. Pompey’s flight ended when he was killed by Lower Egyptian supporters of Ptolemy XIII (q.v.) in 48–47 BCE in Pelusium. This represented one of the final stages of the transformation of Greek to Roman rule of Egypt. From 47 to 45 BCE Caesar confronted the sons of Pompey, and in 46 BCE he seized Numidia in neighboring Libya. After he proclaimed himself the emperor of Rome for life, he was assassinated in March 44 BCE, but this ushered in a civil war between Augustus (q.v.) and Anthony.

The relations with Nubia in the late Ptolemaic period were rather peaceful because of the weakness and confusion among the Ptolemies under Cleopatra VII (q.v.). However, the transition to Roman rule of Egypt and Nubia under Augustus was violently contested at times. The Romans clearly realized that their empire was overextended, and they withdrew from much of Lower Nubia while maintaining a presence at Aswan. During most of the time of Julius Caesar, Cleopatra VII was the
most significant ruler of Egypt, so much of this period revolves around the foreign and intimate relations between these two sovereigns.

CAILLIAUD, FREDERIC (1787–1869). Cailliaud could be termed the grandfather of Nubian archaeology. He was among the earliest European scientific explorers of the Nile, which also included Giovanni Belzoni, James Bruce, Louis Burckhardt, and Richard Lepsius (qq.v.). Cailliaud was born in Nantes, France, and was formally trained in mineralogy. It was in this capacity that he traveled to Egypt in 1815, under the authority of the Khedive Mohammed ‘Ali Pasha to seek the famed emerald mines in the region of Upper Egypt and Nubia (qq.v.). On this visit, he focused on the Red Sea Hills, and he went as far as Wadi Halfa (q.v.) in Nubia. A second trip was undertaken in 1819, to the oases of the Western Desert of Egypt. His third trip, in 1820, was started with Isma’il Pasha, a son of the Khedive. Cailliaud reached Berber in April 1821, and then appealed to go on to the ancient ruined capital and pyramids of Meroë, where he arrived on April 25. He and his French traveling companion, Letorzec, spent about two weeks there measuring, drawing, and surveying. He swung back to join the Egyptian army at Shendi before traveling farther on the Blue Nile (q.v.) with a stop at the ruins of Soba (q.v.) in May. On his return, he stopped to map Musawwarat es Sufra, Naqa (qq.v.), and perhaps Jebel Geili, making him the first European scientist to have done so. At Musawwarat and Jebel Barkal, he carefully recorded Meroitic inscriptions that he later published.

The French government gave him prominent recognition for this service and for his collection of hundreds of objects of antiquarian interest. Beside the texts that he wrote, he compiled some maps of the region of Nubia that were among the earliest versions that could be considered accurate. His major works relevant to Nubia include Voyage to Meroë, au fleuve Blanc au dela de Fazoql, dans le midi du royaume de Sennar . . . and his huge four-volume work with three folio texts titled Recherches sur les arts et métiers, les usages de la vie civile et domestique des anciens peuples de l’Egypte, de la Nubie et de Ethiopie . . .

CALENDARS AND CHRONOLOGY. The topic of calendrical reckoning and chronology is both ancient and complex. The ancient peoples of the Nile had great reverence for the sky goddess Nut. Her as-
sociation with the moon and stars appears at very early times. Their close association with nature made the inhabitants along the Nile keen observers of the sun, moon, and stars. Solar or stellar sighting devices were known from as early as the Archaic period.

In calendrical calculations, only some dates can be absolutely fixed. This requires a known astronomical event, such as the appearance of the Sothic (Sopdu, or Dog) star, which appears on July 19 at the dawn horizon. This was usually at about the time of the annual inundation. Any faulty calendar could be annually reset to this benchmark day. On the other hand, uncorrected calendars would be brought back into alignment every 1,456 years of the Sothic cycle. This could provide an additional fixed reference point (at a fixed latitude) for chronologists, who could reset their primary reference to it at, for example, 2773 BCE, 1317 BCE, 139 CE, or 1595 CE. Despite a persistent lack of precision in the earlier times, one may assume that after 664 BCE (the end of the reign of Taharka, or the start of Psammetichos I [q.v.]), the dates become quite reliable, as they precisely correlate with historical observations of the Sothic star as well as with correlations to events external to the Nile valley in an unbroken record thereafter. Before that time, the king lists are helpful for a given reign, but the endless restarting of the calendar leaves many earlier periods quite sketchy.

As noted by the vital Sothic star, the Egyptian and Nubian reckoning was solar, lunar, or stellar in varying circumstances. Solar reckoning (borrowed from Mesopotamia) provided twelve months of thirty days with periodic adjustments to get the calendar back on schedule once again after losing time by five and a quarter days per year. They also had a notion of a twenty-four-hour day perhaps from the same sources. As early as the fifth millennium BCE, this calendar was being worked out and cross-checked with Nilometers that carefully measured seasonal floods of the Nile and astronomical observations. Lunar calculations in ancient Egypt were based on a calendar of twelve months, each having three ten-day workweeks, or thirty days. Four of these months (i.e., 120 days) composed a season, and each year had three seasons. This began with the flood season (akhet), then the planting and growing season (peret), and finally the harvesting and fallowing season (shemu). As the shortfall of five and a quarter days per year finally accumulated, seasonal events would be held at an inappropriate time of the year. Thus, corrections were
made to add five additional days (epigomenal days) to worship five deities and make up the deficiency in the calendar. Otherwise, the steady accumulation of uncorrected dates would finally have the winter season in official summer months and so forth.

This adjustment slowed the repetitive error but did not correct it. Variants of this lunar system were used by the Greeks and still appear with Muslims and Ethiopians. Measured candles, water clocks (clepsydras), sundials (gnomons), and hourglasses were used to measure the daily passage of time.

A comet, planetary motion, an exceptional flood or drought season, or corroboration with a parallel known historical event can all assist the chronologist. The use of fixed dates made possible by dendrochronology (absolute dates determined by tree growth rings) is little used in Egypt because the great length of Dynastic times and the conditions promoting seasonal wood growth are not ideal. Dating by numismatic records is also limited in ancient Nubia or Egypt, as coinage did not arrive until the Ptolemaic period in the fourth century BCE. Cartouches and cylinder seals are helpful, but are also imperfect given the popularity of some names long after that king had died. All together, the circumstances promoting fixed dating in ancient Egypt and Nubia are not regularly met.

Often dates are determined with reference to the coronation and regnal years of a given pharaoh or to lists of successive kings. The most important king list is that developed by Manetho (323–245 BCE), an Egyptian priest residing at the delta temple of Sebennytos during the reigns of Ptolemy I and Ptolemy II (qq.v.). Manetho published his findings in his book *Aegyptiaca*. The original has long been lost, but it is from Manetho that the approximate sequence of thirty Egyptian dynasties is still known. One may never be sure about intervening but missing rulers. Several famed sources of king lists exist. These include the Royal List of fifty-eight kings ordered by Ramses II for Sakkara, covering the 1st through the 20th Dynasties, with some omissions. The Canon of Turin, also compiled at the time of Ramses II, is comprehensive, being written in the New Kingdom; sadly, it is also very fragmentary. In some cases, it offers regnal dates to the months and days. The list of eighty kings at Abydos is lovely in its presentation but has numerous, deliberate omissions. To this can be added the list from the Palermo stone. The Karnak list attributed to Tuthmosis III gives the names of sixty-two kings.
Other classical writers, such as Josephus and Eusebius, added more data to Egyptian chronology. Thus, we can be fairly sure of the sequence of kings, but we also know that much can be missing from this account. When the Egyptian and Nubian interaction was close, one gains a measure of the Nubian record with reference to Egyptian chronology.

Chronology developed archaeologically provides relative dates determined by stratification, measures of radioactive decay, or stylistic sequences. These are useful to obtain material assemblages in the correct order, but it is more difficult to assign precise beginning and ending dates. Annual events, such as the Opet festival, or funerary rituals also had specific temporal sequences. Consequently, the work on chronology may be considered generally accurate but in most cases is still a work in progress for refined dates.

The essential problem of chronology is that the written record is not consistent or continuous. In the cases of Egypt and Nubia, one may correlate specific named seasons or dates to specific pharaohs or dynasties with a great sense of confidence; at other times, the written records fall into obscurity. Hieroglyphic and demotic number systems are generally well understood, although Meroitic numbers are not fully translated.

The Ptolemaic Greeks were hugely influenced by their three centuries in Egypt, where they configured the leap year to correct for the weakness in their calendar. In 47 BCE, as their era was closing, the Greeks officially introduced the better Egyptian calendar to Rome, with a strange “catch-up” year inserted with 445 days. The Greek calendar had twelve named months with intercalary, or corrective, months inserted to keep the calendar on time. Other Greek adjustments were made to set the schedule for the Olympic Games beginning in 776 BCE, and in 432 BCE, the Greek astronomer Meton created a nineteen-year cycle with seven intercalary months.

The older Roman calendar was based on ten months named for important deities and numbers. The later Julian modification of the Roman calendar still has the same nomenclature but with twelve months after inserting the two additional months named for Julius and Augustus. We now face the odd circumstance that September (literally, the seventh [sept] month) is the ninth month of the year, and December (literally, the tenth [decem] month) is the twelfth month. Since Jews play an important role in the Nile valley, it can be noted that
their calendar begins in the sixth millennium. For example, the year 2001 is equivalent to about 5761 in the Jewish calendar. The Semitic roots of this calendar persist today with a seven-day week having the Sabbath (from the Hebrew “seven”) take place on the last weekday. Both the Jewish and the Muslim calendars are lunar. After the Roman emperor Constantine accepted Christianity as the state religion in the fourth century, the calendar shifted again. The modern Christian (Gregorian) solar calendar begins with Pope Gregory XIII’s corrective effort of 1584 (or 1582) that is now current. The breakaway Monophysite (q.v.) Copts of Egypt and Nubia still use their AM (Year of the Martyrs) calendar, which starts on August 29, 284 CE. In the seventh century CE, the AH (Year of the Hegira) was adopted by Muslims. The Hegira refers to the “flight” in 622 CE of the prophet Mohammed (570–632 AD) from Mecca to Medina.

CALIGULA, GAIUS CAESAR (37–41 CE). Caligula was the Roman emperor who was the successor and grandnephew of Tiberius (q.v.). His bizarre and brief rule was terminated in assassination by his own powerful Praetorian guards. In the Nile valley, his mad reign was expressed in a vulnerable formative period for regional Christianity (q.v.) and established Jews (q.v.) in Egypt. Meanwhile, Caligula ordered the Temple of Jerusalem to be transformed into a Roman temple with his own statue installed. Since this was still early in Roman rule, the local Greeks had a lingering sense of Ptolemaic nationalism. With Jews feeling threatened, some Greeks believing that the Jews were too sympathetic to Roman rule, and Caligula nervous about both, the Romans turned to the destruction of synagogues, looting, and rioting, culminating in the pogrom of 38 CE.

Some Egyptian Jews fled into delta towns for security, and the famed Christian apostle and martyr Saint Marc reached Alexandria in 40 CE. Philon, an important Jewish citizen of Alexandria, appealed to Caligula in the same year, saying that he accepted Roman rule but simply wanted the privilege of Jewish worship. Herein, some scholars see the early rise of Jewish secularism.

Although the identity “Christian” was only in formation at the time of Caligula, it is possible that the first Jewish (?) converts to Christianity made their way to Meroë (q.v.) during this time. Caligula did order an addition to the hypostyle hall at the Kalabsha (q.v.) temple
in Nubia. His assassination in 41 CE was widely celebrated and allowed the reestablishment of a more orderly Roman republic. Regional Jews and early Christians believed that his murder was simply revenge for the brutality that they had experienced under Caligula only three years earlier.

CALLIMACHUS (ca. 310/305–240 BCE). Callimachus was born in the Greek colony of Cyrene in Libya, but he moved to Alexandria. He was a prominent poet and writer but most renowned for his leading role as a cataloger and librarian of the great library of Alexandria, established by Ptolemy I and Ptolemy II (q.v.). Callimachus was central in creating this significant archive of ancient classics built from collections, translations into Greek, and documents in other foreign languages. His most important contribution was a 120-volume catalog of the library. Perhaps this lost library held works in Meroitic (q.v.), and it may have stimulated the creation of this first written form of the ancient Nubian language. His work continued with the librarian-geographer Eratosthenes (q.v.). [R. Lobban with P. Saucier]

CAMBYSES II (522–522 BCE). Cambyses entered eastern Egypt at Pelusium to terminate the Saite dynasty under Psamtik III in 525 BCE, the last pharaoh of the 26th Dynasty. As such, he was the founder of the first Persian dynasty in Egypt. From the delta, the Persian (q.v.) forces moved on to Memphis, where Cambyses committed the outrageous act of killing the divine Apis bull of that holy city. This was at the height of the Persian Empire, which sought to turn Egypt into a Persian province, although Cambyses ruled for only three years. Another of his notable events was the reputed loss of a sizable army in the Western Desert. The Greek historian Herodotus (q.v.), who visited Egypt during this Persian dynasty in about 450 BCE, gives a solitary reference that Cambyses sent a mission or invasion into Lower Nubia (q.v.) that was seriously overextended and resulted in the loss of many of his troops. The precise objective, route, and termination of this incursion are not clear. Persian administration was structured around the appointment of satraps, who were granted local autonomy but served the fiscal and military needs of the empire. The second period was terminated with the arrival of the army of Alexander the Great (q.v.) in 332 BCE, after defeating the Persian leader Darius III.
CAMELS. The role of the one-humped camel (dromedary; *Camelus dromedarius*) in ancient Nubia is of great importance to this desiccated land, which exceeded the capacity of horses to undertake transport or military activities. Camels live longer, are good swimmers, are stronger, and ultimately are faster in sand than horses (q.v.). This makes them especially important for the Libyan and Blemmye (q.v.) camel-herding peoples (q.v.) living away from the Nile. Before the camel arrived, long-distance desert transit relied on donkeys, which cannot go as long as camels without water. The dromedaries of Nubia are shorthaired and long-legged and can move through water efficiently.

The exact date for their arrival in Egypt and Nubia is contentious, but one may safely conclude that they were present by the end of the second millennium BCE or about 1100 BCE. Some iconography from the Archaic period confuses the Seth “animal” with camels. Scholars dispute the presence and extent of camels in Egypt at these Early Dynastic times, when they were probably rare or only periodically present, according to the synthetic article on this topic by H. Epstein. Images of camels increase substantially with the Assyrian invasion of Egypt against the 25th Dynasty Nubian administration. Presumably, at this time they were widely adapted in riverine and desert Nubia. The desert boundaries of the Ptolemies and Romans made heavy use of camels for heavy transport and military patrol. Certainly, the Nubians of this time also made heavy use of camels on such desert tracks as the Darb al-Arba’in (q.v.) or along counterpart eastern routes, such as the Korosko Road (q.v.), or those along the coast coming from Berenice to Adulis (q.v.) along the Red Sea Hills.

Clearly, camels had become very important for Meroë by the several centuries before the time of Christ. At least two representations of camels are made in Meroitic graffiti, and they certainly were used to reach places such as the pilgrimage centers of Musawwarat es-Sufra (q.v.), and instances of camel sacrifices for Meroitic burials are seen. As much as camels gave improved mobility for Meroë’s trade, they also gave improved mobility for the Blemmyes, the enemies of this state. Heavily laden transport camels were no match for the fast-moving camel cavalry attacks of these nomads. The Blemmyes could also intensify their control of the valuable gold and emerald mines of the region, so the arrival of the camel in the region was a mixed bless-
ing. In fact, it may well have been because of the camel that the
Blemmyes gained control of much of Lower Nubia until their expul-
sion by the X-Group kings from the south. Camel sacrifices are well
known in post-Meroitic times at the royal burials of Ballana and Qus-
tul (qq.v) kings. Camels were hugely important for the Arab conquest
of Egypt in the seventh century CE and their heavy military pressure
on Christian Nubia (q.v.) for centuries thereafter. At the same time,
Nubians and northern Sudanese Arabs, such as the Kabbabish and
Baggara, were famed for their own military skills with camels, not to
mention their importance in desert and savanna transport and as a
source of wool, meat, and milk.

CAMEL-HERDING ARABS. There are two large camel-herding
groups in the Sudan. Camels may have first appeared in the region in
Persian (q.v.) times and were widely used in the desert and steppe re-
gions thereafter. One of the camel-herding groups is descended from
the Blemmyes (q.v.) and the related groups of Medjay (q.v.), Pan-
Grave (q.v.), Beja, and Bisharin people, who were autochthonous in
the region. They have long been the inhabitants of the region east of
the Nubian Nile and in the Red Sea Hills of Egypt and Sudan. The
other camel-herding group is that of the Juhayna Arabs (q.v.) of the
Sudan, including the Kabbabish, Hamar, Shayqiya, Shukriya, and
Dubania. They range, in their respective territories and watering
places in the eastern Butana, in parts of the Bayuda steppe, and in
northern Darfur and Kordofan.

CANDACE, KANDAKE, KADAKE. The term *kadake* is probably
the original form of this Meroitic (q.v.) title that was generically ap-
plicated to regnant queens and perhaps others not regnant. It is possible
that it is derived from the Meroitic *kdi-qo*, which could be translated
as “royal woman.” The Greeks inserted their version of a more eu-
phonious variant form that has been transmitted as *kandake*, which
subsequently was Latinized as *candace* and may even be used as a
Christian name in modern times. Among the more prominent *kadakes*
of Meroë were Amanishakete and Amanitare (qq.v.).

CARACALLA (211–217 CE). Caracalla became emperor of Rome in
211 CE following Septimus Severus. By the time of Caracalla, most
of the Roman Empire had been assembled from conquered and subjugated territories, such as Egypt and the Nubian borderlands. In order to increase colonial revenue, in 212 CE he converted the inhabitants of these provinces into citizens of Rome to collect taxes from them. A ruthless administration, a powerful military, and a secret service kept Caracalla in power, but his unchecked expenditures resulted in severe inflation by 215 CE and in his murder in 217 CE.

CARIAN. The southwestern region of Asia Minor, or modern Turkey, this is the homeland of the Carian people. They have an ancient relationship to Nubia, as this region supplied some mercenary troops employed by Psamtik I (664–610 BCE) and Psamtik II (qq.v.; 595–589 BCE). Both sought to reestablish themselves, with significant Assyrian help, as the 26th Dynasty. This replaced the famed 25th Dynasty (q.v.) occupation of Egypt under Nubian administration. Some of these Carian troops placed graffiti at Abu Simbel (q.v.) as they were staged to conduct a punitive raid against Napata (q.v.) at this time. The precise result or route of this raid is debated, but Napata remained as the Kushite capital for about two more centuries.

CATARACTS. Cataracts are simply the general name for rocky outcroppings or rapids in the Nile. The six Nile cataracts have often proved to be important points for "break of bulk" in economic relations or for the construction of military fortifications as the rival Egyptian and Nubian empires rose and fell. The First Cataract is located at Aswan (q.v.) in Egypt. It is commonly recognized as the ancient and modern border between Nubia and Egypt, although today it is wholly within the territory of modern Egypt. The Second Cataract was the usual boundary between Nubia and Egypt in the Old and Middle Kingdoms and was heavily fortified at these times. Although the Second Cataract is now lost under Lake Nasser, essentially it is at the modern border between Egypt and Sudan.

The reach of the Nile between the Second and the Third Cataract is usually termed the *Batu al-Hajr* (Belly of Stones) since it was a particularly problematic stretch for navigation. The Third Cataract provided the frontier between Middle Kingdom Egypt and Kerma or Yam (q.v.), which lay just upstream of this point. Discussion is presently taking place to introduce still another Nubian dam at Kaj-
bar in this vicinity. Above the Third Cataract are located the town sites of ancient and modern Dongola as well as the periodic watercourse known as the Wadi Howar.

The Fourth Cataract was something less of a political boundary, except during the New Kingdom. The major Nubian site at Napata (q.v.) is situated just downstream of this cataract. Since the Nile sweeps to the north at this point, it was common to bypass this cataract and the region between the Fourth and the Fifth Cataract. By crossing the Bayuda plain to the southeast on foot or with beasts of burden, one could reach upstream and cross back to the Nile at ancient Meroë. This town rested strategically between the Fifth and the Sixth Cataract, on the Nile borders between the Bayuda and Butana (qq.v.) steppe lands.

This region has long been termed the “Island of Meroë”(q.v.) or the Butana plain. The Sixth Cataract, or Sabaluka Gorge, was usually bypassed by terrestrial travel but is navigable by deep-draft vessels in flood seasons. It lies just north, or downstream, of the confluence of the White and Blue Niles at modern Khartoum. Until one exits Sudan into Ethiopia, no further natural obstacles arise on the Blue Nile. On the White Nile, this was also the case until one reached the vast Sudd swamplands, which were an impenetrable barrier for exploration until the nineteenth century. A dam now exists on this site.

CATTLE-HERDING ARABS. Cattle herding is an extremely ancient pastoral mode of production in Egypt and Nubia. The early presence of cattle is closely intertwined with state formation, and as more cattle were raised in Egypt and raided for in Nubia, the desire to possess cattle only grew. Key deities and the pharaoh himself were associated with cattle. Cattle are prominent in some of the first historical records of interaction between Egypt and Nubia. Cattle were also central in the economy of the C-Group (q.v.) of Lower Nubia. In the New Kingdom, the common reference to Nubian cattlemen was *Menti*, but their precise location remains to be determined. See also AGRICULTURE; ARABS; CAMELS.

C-GROUP, C-HORIZON. The C-Group is the arbitrary name assigned by George Reisner (q.v.) to a local cultural group in Lower Nubia from about 2500 BCE or before until around 1500 BCE. They
were the purported successors of the B-Group (q.v.), but this reference has essentially been abandoned with the understanding that they may have been survivors of late A-Group (q.v.) peoples. More likely, they were a new, intrusive nilotic group moving from the south to the north to reoccupy Lower Nubia during the First Intermediate period. They spread toward Aswan as Old Kingdom Egyptian (qq.v.) forces were withdrawn.

The Egyptian references for the riverine peoples of Upper and Lower Nubia at this time were Wawat, Irtet, and Setjiu (Zetjau) (q.v.). Essentially, these seem to be the Egyptian place or ethnic names for the C-Group. In the Eastern Desert, one finds the contemporary Medjay (pl., Medjayiu [q.v.]) herders. It appears that these were regional polities under their respective chiefs, at least the equivalent of Egyptian nomarchs if not of greater powers. The C-Group economy was centered on cattle herding and generally gained in strength at times of Egyptian weakness. The C-Group perhaps emerged from refugee descendants of the earlier A-Group culture. The C-Group had contemporary and collaborative relations with Kerma (q.v.), which lay farther upstream beyond the Third Cataract. At the same time, they were distinct from the Kerma culture, which may be referenced as the state of Yam. Kerma gained a degree of political and cultural independence from Egypt during the Hyksos (q.v.) period but was crushed by the revived Egyptian Empire of the New Kingdom.

Like the prior A-Group occupants of the region, the C-Group cemeteries were above the floodplain on the adjacent desert fringe. C-Group occupation is known at numerous permanent settlement sites, including Amada, Aniba, Areika, and Debeira (qq.v.). These were built of stone and some mud brick and had varying degrees of fortification. The Coxe Expedition organized by the University of Pennsylvania was very productive in the case of the C-Group village at Areika. Foundations show a complex house site with internal divisions for special purposes, such as livestock, silo grain storage, cooking, sleeping, and perhaps gender distinctions. Pottery is both locally made and imported from Egypt.

Aside from living in a different time period from the A-Group, the pottery styles of the C-Group are also easily distinguished. Typical of C-Group pottery found at grave sites are their small round bowls that are heavily incised and stamped with geometric patterns, quite unlike
those of the A-Group. Eggshell-thin and ovoid pottery of the A-Group disappears with C-Group assemblages. Large, rather rough utilitarian storage or water jars are associated with C-Group burials. The C-Group also produced burnished black and red pottery that has some rough affinity to Kerma ware. Apparently, both were used for storage and cooking.

A common theme of inscribed C-Group pottery relates to the importance of cattle, which are also inscribed on cemetery stelae. Sheep, goats, and cattle also figure prominently as burial goods; cattle skulls and clay figures of longhorn cattle are similar to those of modern Nilotics of southern Sudan.

Also unlike the A-Group, the burial practices of the C-Group were usually extended or only slightly flexed burials. Cattle heads and stelae with inscribed cattle played an important role in the funerary ritual of the C-Group. Some Egyptian grave goods are found in early C-Group graves. In later C-Group times, this included large, round, unmortared stone superstructures with internal rubble fill over a burial chamber and sometimes with an adjoining funerary chapel. This architecture is most un-Egyptian in style.

At first, the relations between the First Intermediate Egyptians and their C-Group neighbors was one of active trade, as judged by the common presence of Egyptian pottery in graves of the C-Group. From about 2250 to 2050 BCE, Kerma began its growth, and this initially helped check Egyptian ambitions in the region.

However, around 2000 BCE, the intrusive Middle Kingdom Egyptians displaced the C-Group people of Lower Nubia and began to construct or renew their huge mud-brick forts at former Old Kingdom sites or at new places. This was done to control C-Group and Kerma river trade and gold mining in the Eastern Desert and neighboring valleys and to present a formidable barrier to Nubian movements. Middle Kingdom tomb models of Nubian bowmen may be considered C-Group recruits for this purpose, especially during the time of Mentuhotep II (q.v.). It is likely that Kerma was a slave-trading state, and the ready market in Egypt kept a reciprocal interest in each of these rivals.

As the Egyptian Middle Kingdom was strengthened, relations deteriorated, and sometime after 2000 BCE, the Egyptians deepened their strong military presence in the region. A series of forts were located at strategic signaling and defensive points on the Nile, especially from
the First to the Second Cataract. These forts were garrisoned by Egyptian and mercenary troops. Among these huge mud-brick forts were those at Aksha, Buhen, Faras, Kumma, Mirgissa, Semna, Shalfak, and Uronarti (qq.v.).

Aside from a desire to have strict control of the river trade, the Egyptians were clearly anxious about the military threat posed by the strong kingdom of Kerma (Yam), which likely was culturally associated with the C-Group peoples. However, with the reunification of Egypt by Mentuhotep in the Middle Kingdom (11th and 12th Dynasties, ca. 2065–1780 BCE), the C-Group people of Lower Nubia were demonstrably under an outright colonial and tributary relationship. Stela proclamations refer to the coercion required of C-Group gold miners to dig for gold to be exported to Egypt. This is not to say that daily relations were brutal and repressive; rather, the C-Group peoples occupied a region not under their own authority, and the cultural allegiance they may have had with Yam did them little good at this period of Egyptian occupation.

During the reign of Senwosret (Sesotris) III (q.v.; 1887–1850 BCE), the policy of raiding, trading, and fortifying was probably at its height, and this pharaoh was depicted as a god to help make his occupation more unassailable to Nubians. The Egyptian pharaohs had a high demand for Nubian produce and trade items, including mercenary conscript soldiers, seen in Middle Kingdom tomb models, and gold from the region.

The major state of Yam at Kerma (ca. 2500–1500 BCE) continued to grow above the Butn al Hajr (Belly of Stones) from the Second to the Third Cataract. Later, Kerma entered its classic period of power and material culture, as evidenced by huge grave tumulae, ritual human sacrifice, very high quality pottery, and the impressive ritual structures known as defufa (“ruins” in Nubian). Farther downstream, amidst military occupation and severe restrictions, the Nubian reaction was delayed but intensely felt. As the Middle Kingdom lost its coherence by the early eighteenth century BCE (13th–17th Dynasties), the Nubians had a certain measure of relief and even revenge. Apparently benefiting from the protective umbrella of Kerma and relieved of Middle Kingdom occupation, the late C-Group settlement sites show larger and richer graves contemporary with the Hyksos military invasion of Egypt from the eastern delta. Tactical alliances between the
Hyksos and Nubians, especially at Kerma, persisted until the efforts at New Kingdom reunification under Pharaohs Kamose and Ahmose (qq.v.) were successful in restoring and extending Egyptian rule over Nubia in the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries BCE. After this time, no further traces of the C-Group or of Kerma are found.

**CHALCEDON, COUNCIL OF.** See **CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: RELIGIOUS SCHISMS.**

**CHAMPOLLION, JEAN-FRANÇOIS** (1790–1832). This towering figure in Egyptology may be credited with starting the modern scientific direction of the field. His work on the trilingual text on the Rosetta Stone, along with English scholars, had resulted in 1822 in his famous *Lettre à M. Dacier*. This published the first phonetically correct understanding of hieroglyphics. By 1824, he added the understanding of the ancient linguistic relationship of Coptic to hieroglyphics and thus deciphered this otherwise lost language. In 1828–1829, Champollion was a member of the joint Franco-Italian (Tuscany) expedition with I. Rosellini (q.v.). After three months in Nubia, Champollion reached Thebes in March 1829, to work extensively in the Valley of the Kings. As with Rosellini, Champollion is also blamed for removing reliefs from temples and tombs against modern ethics and law. His early death at age forty-two, in 1832, did not prevent the posthumous publication, in 1845, of his *Monuments de l’Egypte et de la Nubie*, a foundation classic in the field of Egyptology and Nubian studies.

**CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: THE FORMATIVE PERIOD.** Convention has it that Christ was born on December 25, 4 BCE, in Bethlehem under King Herod during the reign of Caesar Augustus (q.v.). Fearing Roman taxes and an edict to put children to death, Christ and his parents are believed to have fled to Gaza and al-Arish, Egypt, as noted in Matthew (2:13–15). They went on to Pelusium in the eastern Egyptian delta, then under the authority of Prefect Gaius Tyranus, and then on to Kanatir, Saft al-Henna, Tel Basta (near Zagazig), and Samanoud, finally crossing the Rosetta branch of the Nile in the western delta. From there they traveled south to the Jewish (q.v.) village at Leontopolis, where they rested under a famed sycamore tree. This journey continued
through Roman Old Cairo, then called Babylon, and on to another Jewish synagogue at Ma‘adi, south of Cairo, where they boarded a small boat to go to Upper Egypt. Along the way, they again stopped at various places for food and rest that are today considered pilgrimage sites. The southernmost points reached included Beni Hassan, Minia, Ashmuneim, Hermopolis, Dairut, and Assiut, where they stayed for about six months. At their most southerly point in Upper Egypt, a church was later built and is now known as Deir al-Muharaka (Monastery of the Flight). A church was likely built there in 70 CE, although the present structure dates to a later time. With these deep roots of Christianity in the Nile, Nubian, Egyptian, and Ethiopian Copts have been attracted to these locations as pilgrimage sites.

The first Nubian convert to Christianity may be the case of the official of Meroë who was exposed to it in about 37 CE. As noted in the Acts of the Apostles (8:27–39), a ranking eunuch of “Candace (q.v.) queen of the Ethiopians” was converted to Christianity under the teachings of the prophet Esaias and was baptized in this faith by church deacon Philip. If the chronology is correct for Meroë, this would have been during the reigns of Pisakar or Amantaraqide. Presumably, this unknown royal eunuch of Meroë returned home, but as a solitary devotee. No record exists of others who might have followed this faith at such an early date at this Nubian city.

It was not until the disciple Saint Mark (q.v.) returned to Egypt from 61 to 65 CE, during the reign of Nero (q.v.), that one may say that Coptic (Orthodox Egyptian) Christianity reached the Nile in a more organized way. Mark was born a Jew in Pentapolis, Cyrenaica, but he had received a strong religious education that attracted him to this new faith. It was during these perilous early decades under such repressive Roman emperors as Caligula, Claudius, and Nero (qq.v.) that the gospel was first introduced, especially in Alexandria. Saint Mark was savagely martyred in 68 CE on Easter Monday after being dragged through Alexandria by a mob of Roman soldiers.

By the first half of the second century, some Coptic language fragments of the Gospel of Saint John are known in Upper Egypt. By the late second century, some small numbers of Christian adherents were found in parts of Upper and Middle Egypt. In 180 CE, the Catechetical Church-School (Didascaleion) was founded in Alexandria by
Pantaenus to study religion, philosophy, and ethics as well as the sciences they had inherited from the Ptolemies and Romans.

But Coptic Christians, often converted Jews, suffered tremendously from religious and political persecution under the Romans in the second and third centuries, particularly under the rule of Septimus Severus (193–211 CE), Decius (249–251 CE), and Valerian (253–260 CE). Septimus Severus actually visited Egypt from 199 to 200 CE, and his Edict of 204 prohibited Romans from accepting Christianity. Despite this persistent repression, Patriarch Dionysius actively sought more Egyptian converts to Christianity from 247 to 264. A result of his work was a period of major conversions of Egyptians to this faith.

Coptic monasticism in the Eastern Desert developed especially at this time under Saint Paul (228–343 CE) and Saint Anthony the Great (251–356 CE). Further percolation of Christianity into Nubia took place from about 260 to 300 CE.

An unintended result of this success took place during the reign of Diocletian (q.v.; 284–304 CE), who was increasingly fearful of this rival religion to Roman polytheism. The very foundation of the Coptic calendar (q.v.), the AM (Year of the Martyrs) calendar, is put at August 29, 284 CE, to commemorate those who died during the start of the particularly repressive reign of Diocletian (q.v.). Diocletian used Christians as easy scapegoats for his perceived threats of the division of the Roman Empire into eastern and western sections. Thus, he began a reign of terror against Christians, their books, and their property. But in 297 CE, Diocletian withdrew from Hiera Sycaminos (“holy sycamores,” or Maharraqa) to Aswan, ending Roman dominance of Lower Nubia. The repression by Diocletian against Egyptian Christians in 302 CE is said to have taken hundreds of thousands of lives.

Christians in the late third and early fourth centuries, such as Saint Anthony, were often struggling to survive in isolated desert retreats, caves, and monasteries. Saint Makarius and Saint Ammon (followers of Saint Anthony) spread the monastic gospel into the Western Desert, especially at Wadi Natrun, where the Monasteries of the Holy Virgin and of Saint John Kame (John the Black) at Deir al-Sourian may be seen today. In the Eastern Desert of the Sinai, Saint Catherine’s monastery and basilica, dating to the sixth century, still stand today. Additional Christian disciples of this “secret religion” were drawn from throughout the eastern Mediterranean, Armenia, and Nubia.
Ethiopia”) in the third century CE. The fifth-century Egyptian churches dedicated to Saint Sergius (Abu Serga) and Saint Barbara was constructed to memorialize these early Christian martyrs.

**CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: THE EGYPTIAN LINK.** Once trained, these early Christian adherents returned to proselytize in their own lands. The Christian population of Egypt is estimated to have reached as many as one million by this time. After the religious vision of the Roman emperor Constantine, as a result of his military victory at Milvian Bridge in 312 CE, he accepted Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire. The liberal Edict of Milan (313 CE) underscored his tolerant views that enabled Christianity to spread more widely in Nubia and elsewhere, such as to the Donatist church of Numidia. Yet the way ahead would not be easy. The Church of the Forty Martyrs in Wadi Natrun, Egypt, commemorates the test of faith of Christians in 313 CE. The early Christian converts in Armenia were tortured if they would not renounce their new faith. Meanwhile, the first Christian basilica in Rome was under construction from 313 to 322 CE.

Increased missionary activity from Egypt is recorded in 324 CE for Nubia. This represented a “pincer movement,” as this mission was synchronized with the Axumite (q.v.) king Ezana of Ethiopia entering and destroying the remnants of the “Noba” (q.v.) at Meroë and the “Red Noba” farther north. During the same period, Bishop Athanasius (q.v.) of Alexandria ordained the Ethiopian church. Thus, the collapse of Meroitic polytheism and the rise of state Christendom in Egypt and Ethiopia created a religious vacuum into which the missionary activities could begin slowly to take place throughout the entire Nile and Blue Nile valleys. The X-Group or Ballana and Qustul (qq.v.) period in Lower Nubia (or Tanqasi culture of Upper Nubia) was the first to fill this void with a pre-Christian syncretic blend of Egyptian, Kushitic, Meroitic, Greco-Roman, and Nubian beliefs, practices, and architecture, from about 350 to 550 CE. The presence of this early Christian influence is certainly illustrated in X-Group grave goods, including crosses and other icons. This transitional period also featured intense rivalries and military attacks against these settled people in Lower Nubia by the seminomadic Blemmyes (q.v.), who were long accustomed to such a role.
CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: RELIGIOUS SCHISMS. Despite, or perhaps because of, its early successes in the fourth century CE, Egyptian Christianity quickly entered into a schismatic religious debate that continues to the present. In 325 CE, more than 300 eastern bishops met at the Council of Nicaea, called by Emperor Constantine to “resolve” the issue about the “oneness” of Christ and give further momentum to the Christian missionary movement. The followers of the “heretical” Egyptian theology of Arianism (q.v.) had rejected the idea that Christ had a divine nature, which they reserved for God alone. Thus, their position was that separate “natures” existed: one for God and one for Christ. Pope Alexander of Alexandria sought support at the Council of Nicaea for his view that Christ and God were one. The view of Christ having a “single person with two natures” succeeded, and the Egyptian bishop of Alexandria was sustained. The Arian (as well as Jewish and “pagan”) creed was rejected. The Eastern Greek Church has followed the Nicene Creed since that time.

However, the sectarian division within Egypt over Arianism and the subsequent Monophysite interpretations of the status of Christ persisted. This early Christian schism served to isolate the Egyptian, Nubian, and other Eastern Orthodox branches from the western (Roman) branches of the Christian Catholic church.

The Alexandrian Coptic Church sought to follow the Nicene Creed proclaimed by Patriarch Saint Athanasius, who had attended the Council of Nicaea as an observer. After he returned to Egypt, he served as the pope of Alexandria from 327 to 373 CE. The bloody struggles between the followers of Athanasius and the Arians continued in Egypt even after the Edict of Theodosius in 384 CE declared that Christianity was the official religion of Egypt. In 391 CE Coptic (Monophysite) Christianity became the state religion, and the divisions continued.

Athanasius served as pope during the 357 CE visit of Saint Basil from Byzantium and Saint Ephraem of Syria (308–373 CE), who assisted the growth of Egyptian monasticism and the cautious encouragement of Nile valley Christianity. Around 400 CE, Saint Jerome reached Egypt to introduce a Latin version of the Bible, and the stage was set for spreading the gospel to the south.

The division between the official Monophysite view and that of the Arians continued, so Emperor Theodosius sought to resolve this matter.
once again at the 381 CE Council of Constantinople. This determined that the official center of Christianity would be shifted from Alexandria to Constantinople so as to isolate the Egyptians and marginalize the dispute with the Arians. Deeply insulted that the historic role of Alexandria as a center for learning and religion would be reduced, this council only added to the divisions. This debate and rivalry continued to the Third Ecumenical Council in 431 CE and thereafter.

In 451 CE, these festering divisions descending from the Council of Nicaea were only reaffirmed with the Council of Chalcedon (near Constantinople). Emperor Marcian and Pope Leo called this council to try again to “resolve” the doctrinal, political, and national differences between the Roman pope of Byzantium and Patriarch Dioscoros of Alexandria. The Dyophysite view was upheld that Christ was a single person with “two natures” (one divine and one human). The Monophysite (“one-nature”) view of the Egyptian patriarch Dioscoros was defeated, and he returned to Egypt. Although the theological dispute was “resolved” by declaration, another dimension of the conflict was introduced when the Council of Chalcedon sought to resolve the matter by force rather than further debate.

The Melkite (royalist) or Antiochian authority appointed by the emperor not only represented the Dyophysite view but also was given legitimacy to restore the unity of the church, even by force, to bring this “rebellion” to an end. Specifically, the effort to land in Alexandria and install an official Melkite priest, Proterius, in place of Pope Dioscorus was the final blow. The Egyptian and Ethiopian Copts could not accept this forceful intrusion into their religious lives. This offended their deeply rooted Christianity, which was parallel to their sense of their own proud nationalism.

Despite this isolation, the Orthodox Church in Egypt and Nubia then made a more aggressive attempt, which can be dated to 452 CE, to spread the Christian message from Egypt to Sudan, and perhaps the initial construction of a mud-brick church at Faras. This was a time when the rivals on the Nile were not only Egyptian Copts and Romans but also the Blemmyes and Nobatae of Nubia, who had attacked the Romans and took hostages whom Roman General Maximinus fought to release. An effort to calm this turbulent time took place with the 453 CE Treaty of Philae, which gave non-Christian Nubians and Blemmyes the right to continue to worship the goddess
Isis, celebrated at that temple. Ironically, the role of Isis and Horus reemerges in Christianity in a new conflated form as Mary and Jesus. Meanwhile, Egyptian Christian converts also traveled to Europe and the Middle East to spread the gospel. Not surprisingly, it was this confused local context that saw the formal end of the Roman Empire in 476 CE, although as late as 515 CE, Romans were still weakly seeking to negotiate a treaty with local Blemmye and Nobatae leaders if they would just leave them in peace.

CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: THE MISSIONARY PERIOD. Thus, the seeds of the Christian kingdoms of Nubia were germinated in Egypt but were transplanted to Nubia between 350 and 550 CE, with the formation of the kingdoms of Nobatia, Mukurra, and Alwa (qq.v.). At its height, Nubian Christianity would connect the Alexandrian church with its Nubian affiliates and finally reach deep into the heartland of Ethiopia, where it still remains. With the Roman Empire in collapse and active retreat, a political and religious alliance was established, by 524 CE, between Copts in Egypt and the Axumites in Ethiopia. Blemmye and Nobatian mercenaries also saw action in Yemen in support of Axumite ambitions there.

When Emperor Justinian (q.v.; 527–565 CE) and Empress Theodora came to rule Byzantium, this movement gained even greater force while taking an odd turn in the royal family. The history of Nubian Christianity, as written by Giovanni Vantini, notes that Justinian, as the emperor, naturally favored the Chalcedonian (Melkite) perspective on this simmering religious debate. Remarkably, his independent-minded Egyptian-born wife Theodora supported the anti-Chalcedonian Monophysite view that was still widespread in Egypt. Jacob Baradai actively proselytized this view in about 530 CE. This earned the anti-Chalcedonians the additional reference as “Jacobites.”

How their formal marriage held together amidst such deeply held but divided religious beliefs one may only speculate. Indeed, one may presume that their marriage was conceived as still another way to recover the lost unity of contemporary Christendom. The struggle continued when the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, Theodosius, was forced out of his church and banished to Thrace for his anti-Chalcedonian position. Since Theodora had supported
Theodosius, his death in exile only embittered the “marital” and political relations between Byzantium and Alexandria. After Theodosius died, the Justinian/Theodora divisions entered new forms. The Egyptians consistently rejected the three successive Melkite appointments as patriarch of Alexandria. Not surprisingly, the Melkites and Jacobites also sent out rival missionaries to Egypt and Nubia to win recruits for their respective positions.

During Justinian’s reign, several pivotal events are recorded relative to Nubia. He officially closed and suppressed the Isis cult at Philae. It is believed that much of the defacement of this Ptolemaic temple took place at this time. In addition, in Justinian’s alliance with King Silko (q.v.) of Nobatia, the Blemmyes were subjugated. The famed inscription of King Silko written in poor Greek at the Roman temple built by Augustus at Kalabsha (qq.v.) records this moment. Here Silko declares that his victory was a result of a singular god, thus establishing an official start of Nubian Christianity at about 536 CE. In 542, Silko was approached by an official delegation of papal authority, but he indicated that he was quite content with the Copts, who already were among the Nobatae, and that he wanted no further intervention from Egypt.

During the period 543–569 CE, the first Monophysite Christian kingdoms were formally organized in Nubia, following a flood of Coptic migration that was escaping the troubles in Egypt. The leader of this missionary effort was Julian, a priest deeply loyal to Patriarch Theodosius and who had been with him in his exile. In memory of Theodosius, Julian was committed to gaining new converts among the “Barbari” Nubians. This religious campaign was secretly backed by Theodora and secretly blocked by Justinian, who wished to win the new followers to the Chalcedonian position. If the pro-Jacobite accounts are to be trusted, it appears that Theodora was the temporary victor, as Julian reached the region of Nobatia first. In 543 CE, Julian established the town of Faras, at the Second Cataract, as the capital of Nobatia. It is not unlikely that the declaration of King Silko gives some possible veiled reference to the arrival of Julian to Nubia during his reign or of some other Nubian king close to that time.

Even after Julian had completed his stay in 545 CE, he left his work in charge of Bishop Theodore of Philae, who oversaw the priests and missionaries of Nubia in the mid-sixth century CE until his death in 575 CE. Thus, closely influenced by Egyptian Copts, Nubian Chris-
Christians joined the common fears of Byzantine intrusion into their affairs as a result of the stormy Second Council of Constantinople in 553. At last, in 565 CE, Emperor Justinian died, and some rest from this religious tumult was possible.

Mukuria and its capital of Dongola, situated farther upstream on the Nile, were converted to the Chalcedon Council in 569. However, the rival missionary Longinus (q.v.), serving as the bishop of Philae, had converted Faras of Nobatia to the Monophysite school. In 575 CE, he then took up missionary work in Egypt and Arabia before returning to Nubia. In 579–580 CE, Longinus dodged Melkite opposition and intrigue in the Chalcedonian kingdom of Makuria. This forced him to take a circuitous desert route to the south. Reaching Alwa, Longinus was instrumental in its conversion to Monophysitism, although the skimpy record suggests that some Christians from Axum in Ethiopia may have already been there sometime after 550 CE. The period of growth and consolidation of Nile Christianity was complete; it would not be long before new religious rivals would enter the scene.

**CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: THE MUSLIM RIVALS.** Following the death of the prophet Mohammed in 632 CE, his followers spread his message to Syria in 636 CE, and in 639–640 CE, Arab Muslims conquered Egypt and immediately began to move across North Africa. This new faith was quite welcome in Egypt for four reasons. First, it promised freedom to “all peoples of the book” (*ahl al-kitab*). Second, it was bent on the conquest of Byzantium, which had been such a bothersome burden to Egyptian and Nubian Copts since the divisive Council of Nicaea back in 325 CE. Third, it cleansed Egypt of the brief Persian occupation of 623–628 CE. Finally, fractious disputes in Christian Egypt prevented any effective local opposition.

Islam also spread quickly southward to Lower Nubia. By 641 CE, the forces of Amr ibn al-As reached the plain just north of Dongola, but they failed to capture this Christian capital of Mukurra. Frustrated by this barrier, these earliest Egyptian Muslims tried again in 646 CE to penetrate Nubia, but without further success. At last, in 652 CE, a famous *baqt* (treaty) was established between Nubia and Egypt under ‘Abdallah ibn Sa’ad ibn Abi Sahr. The Melkite patriarch left Egypt at this time. In the areas of Lower Nubia under Muslim control, the Nubian populations were forced to pay an annual tribute of 360 slaves.
and livestock and to promise no aggression against Egypt. Now Mus-
lim Egypt would provide 1,300 kanyr of wine to Nubia in return.

Although Christian Nubians were pressured to accept this tributary
status, active conflicts occurred between Makuria and its northern
neighbor of Nobatia. Apparently, this détente seemed to be a satis-
factory outcome, and amazingly, the principles of this baqt were to
last, more or less, for some six centuries. Under the Umayyad dy-
nasty in Egypt (661–750 CE), a renewal of a similar baqt in 720 CE
between the Egyptians and the Blemmyes did not fare nearly as well.

From fear of their northern Muslim neighbors and overcoming the
strife with each other, the two Nubian Christian kingdoms of Noba-
tia and Mukurra were finally merged to form the kingdom of Don-
gola under King Merkurius (697–707 CE). It may have been at about
this time that the existence of a combination of Greek, Arabic, and
Coptic languages signaled the final end of Meroitic writing, to be
succeeded by Old Nubian, especially for religious purposes.

The Egyptian efforts to project their power did not always fall in
their favor at this time. In about 745 CE, Cyriacus, king of Dongola,
countered the Umayyads, then under Khalifa Marwan, by besieging
their capital at Fustat (Old Cairo) in protest of the Muslim imprison-
ment of the Coptic pope. At some point in the eighth century, some
Nubian Christians are believed to have constructed a small church
near the Church of Ma’adi that marked the place where Jesus and his
parents had embarked to Upper Egypt. This building was pulled
down by Ibn al-Hafez, a Fatimid Khalifa.

While Cyriacus failed to restore Christianity to the Egyptian state,
the Umayyad dynasty collapsed in 750 CE, to be replaced by the Ab-
basids until 870 CE. During this dynasty, the emir of Egypt corre-
sponded with the king of Nubia. In 819–822 CE, the Christian kingdom
of Mukkura, under King George I (816–920 CE), his bishop Joannes
III, and the Beja, all refused to pay baqt tributes to the Abbasids. Nu-
bians and Beja also mounted joint attacks on Upper Egypt. At his
death, Joannes was entombed at the cathedral at Faras. Yet a degree of
mutual respect or autonomy between Muslim Egypt and Christian Nu-
bia may be seen after the coronation, in 835 CE, of King George I in
Mukkura’s capital town of Dongola. In 836 CE, King George traveled
safely to and through Cairo to Baghdad. It is not clear whether his
bishop Kyros (869–902 CE) traveled with him or stayed in Nubia.
During the independent reign of 'Amir Ahmed ibn Tulun (868–884) in Egypt, the relations between the two states were such that thousands of Nubians enlisted in the Tulunid army, probably to pay a service tax. No doubt some were converted to Islam at this time and earlier, but still the two religious states coexisted separately. During the time of the Alexandrian patriarch Gabriel I (909–920 CE), the famed “Door of Symbols” in the Virgin’s Church in Wadi Natrun was constructed (in 914 CE) with ebony and ivory from Nubia. In 920 CE, the allied Christian king of Dongola, Zakaria III, could begin his rule in peace. But by the mid-tenth century, a few Muslims were reported as far south as Soba, the capital city of the Christian kingdom of Alwa. Was it anxiety about the Arab presence that caused the Nubians to raid into Upper Egypt in 951, in 956, and, in 962 CE, as far as Akhmin?

The ancient pattern of rivalry on the Nile resumed in 969 CE, when the Fatimids came to power and al-'Umari initiated attacks on Nubia. Ironically, this may have been with some Nubian soldiers, since up to 50,000 Nubians served in the Fatimid army. Coming to power at this same time, in 969 CE, King George II of Dongola is reported to have attacked Egypt. Reports written between 975 and 996 CE by the Egyptian official Ibn Selim al-Assuani noted that Soba was a Christian city of splendid buildings and gold-endowed churches. Its economy was built from an extensive fertile land based on agriculture and livestock. The Alwa bishop was ordained from Alexandria, and the liturgical books used were in written in Old Nubian. Certainly, Faras in 999 CE was equally splendid in church architecture, as can be seen in the portrait of Bishop Petros.

A trace of the Nubian–Egyptian relations still appears in the marble tray recently found in the “Church with a Cave” at Wadi Natrun. Presumably, this tray was a gift brought by Nubian monks under the reign of King George IV of Nubia (1106–1158 CE), who had been enthroned in 1130 CE. Was he from the lingering Christian kingdom of Dotawo (or Daw), which still existed in the 1140s?

In 1171 CE, the Ayyubid dynasty (1171–1250 CE), led by Sultan Saladin, replaced the Fatimids. One of his first tasks was to force the Nubians to withdraw to Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia, then under Christian King George IV. Playing on the hope of a Christian alliance, the European Crusaders sought a tactical alliance with Nubian Christians.
in Upper Egypt in 1163 CE. This Nubian–Crusader alliance against the Ayyubids actually resulted in clashes in Cairo and delta towns in 1172, and with subsequent counterattacks by Turanshah in Nubia. In 1173 CE, Turanshah attacked Saint Simeon’s monastery in Aswan; its Coptic bishop and priests were sold in the slave market. He also sacked the church at Qasr Ibrim at about the same time. This was also a period of Egyptian Coptic flight to Nubia to escape this turmoil, recalling that Jerusalem had fallen to Saladin during the contemporary Crusades. In 1204, various Nubian and Crusader leaders met in Constantinople but finally failed in their plans to topple the Ayyubids, and, in 1235, the last recorded priest was sent from Alexandria to Nubia.

Christian Nubia and Islamic Egypt had fought to a standoff with the Fatimids and Ayyubids, but a different fate was in store for them during Mameluke rule. Under the Bahri Mamelukes (1250–1382), especially during the reign of Sultan Al-Zahir Baybars (1260–1277), Nubians were again forced to pay baqt tribute. Documents from 1268 CE show such tribute reluctantly paid by Dongola King Dawud. King Dawud II (?) showed his opposition through raids organized against the Mamelukes in Aswan in 1275 CE. In 1276 CE, the Mamelukes, under Shekanda (?), organized a punitive attack that captured King Dawud and sacked Dongola. Its citizens were forced to convert to Islam. Resistance continued, so in 1289 CE, the Mamelukes waged still another major attack on Dongola.

The Nubian king Kudanbes may have first come to power in 1309, but in the first decades of the fourteenth century, skirmishes continued. In 1317 CE, the first mosque was built at Dongola in a former church. ‘Abdullah Barshambu was installed as its first Muslim king, to replace Kudanbes, who had returned to serve as the last King Dongola in 1323. Baqt payments to the Mamelukes were reestablished under Al-‘Amir Abu ‘Abdallah in 1331. With these events, the formal presence of Christianity in Nubia was at an end, although Christian symbols and some communities of believers lingered on. Some records exist from the mid-fourteenth century of the king intervening on behalf of Pope Mark IV, who had been jailed by the Mameluke king Saleh II. Even as late as 1372, the bishop of Faras was officially consecrated by the Alexandrian patriarch, and in 1438–1439, the Synod of Florence was held to try to resolve the differences among Rome, Alexandria, and Ethiopia. It too failed.
CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: THE PERIOD OF DECLINE. When the western Roman Empire finally fell to Islam in 1453 CE, it was probably only a matter of time before the Muslims would advance farther into Nubia. A passing reference to Joel of the Christian enclave at Dotawo hints that it was still extant in 1464, but this was about all that was left of Christianity in Lower Nubia. The more remote, Upper Nubian Christian kingdom of Alwa collapsed in 1504 CE, during Burji Mameluke rule in Egypt to the north. However, Alwa was directly brought to an end not by these Egyptian Muslims but rather by the rise of the Muslims of Funj sultanates (q.v.) still farther south at Sennar.

Although the Christian kingdoms had been defeated, isolated Christian communities in Nubia were still reported as appealing for religious support from Christian Ethiopia as late as 1520. Such was the case during the visit to Ethiopia of the Portuguese missionary Francisco Alvares. Another visitor, in 1522, was the Jewish traveler David Reubeni, who visited both Soba and Sennar and later met with the pope and the Spanish king to discuss a plan to resist the Ottomans, who had come to power in Egypt only a few years earlier.

For much of the following two centuries, Christians in Ethiopia, backed by the Portuguese (who sought to avoid Arab control of the eastern Mediterranean), managed to maintain a rather stable frontier between Funj sultanates in southern Nubia and Christian Ethiopia. A variety of religious Christian missions and contacts took place during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 1541, a mission was made to neighboring Ethiopia. In 1624, Bishop Christdoulous, an “Ethiopian” monk at the Monastery of the Forty Martyrs, died in Egypt, where he was buried. In 1647, a visit to Sennar was undertaken by the Portuguese priests Giovanni d’Aguila and Antonio da Pescopagano, and in 1699–1711, three papal missions were made to Ethiopia, all of which passed through the Nubian towns of Dongola and Sennar on the way.

CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: ARCHITECTURE. Naturally, an important feature of any religion is its architecture, and the long evolution of Christianity in Nubia reveals many trends and styles. It is essential to recognize that, as with much of Nubian history, there are features that range from the unique to diffused and syncretic traditions. In addition, a long historical evolution has occurred in art,
iconography, and architecture, and buildings have been reused for purposes not originally intended. Moreover, many religious structures in Nubia were periodically modernized, replaced, and rebuilt. For these reasons, the now specialized field of Christian architecture in Nubia is particularly complex and sometimes controversial in interpretation.

With this proviso, this history begins with the examples of the Christian churches of Abu Odda, Amada, Aksha, Kalabsha, Philae, Qasr Ibrim, and Wadi es Sebua, which were inherited from structures in Dynastic or Greco-Roman times and were plastered over to accommodate new images. Often this involved some redesign, conversion, or modest reorientation of internal temple features. This gave them a new function by inserting a holy altar and retrofitting apse, installing baptismal fonts, defacing pharaonic icons, carving crosses, and reusing or rehabilitating existing buildings in other ways. Storage rooms and clerical chambers continued to be at the innermost, or holiest, portions of the churches, as they had been with pharaonic temples.

Once new buildings were constructed for Christian purposes, the architectural inheritance from ancient Egypt persisted in the longitudinal axis, described in the work of P. M. Gartkiewicz. From these times, the use of Roman-inspired arches for doorways, windows, and apses begins its long involvement with Christian Nubia. This innovation was central in spanning distances with brick vaulted ceilings in a more dramatic and open manner. Vaulted ceilings began to allow expansive multicolumned naves for the congregations in the square basilica-type floor plan, such as the Church of Stone Pavement in Old Dongola, which had abandoned the side entrance, which previously was more common.

By the seventh century and later, influences from the early Armenian and Antiochian church began to reach Nubia in the introduction and merging of biaxial simplified cruciform floor patterns. These were seen in the so-called Church of Granite Columns in Old Dongola and the Sai Cathedral, Paulos Cathedral at Faras, and Great Cathedral at Qasr Ibrim.

The cruciform pattern was much elaborated in the thirty-eight-meter Church (or Mausoleum) of the Martyrs, also in Old Dongola, and in the over ninety-meter Church of Saint Simeon at Aswan. The use of
prominent central domes and crosses with simplified cruciform shape appears to have arrived still later under Byzantine influences and was featured at the small churches or chapels at ‘Abd al-Qadir, Adindan (Faras East), Figirantawu, Naqa el-Aqba, Nuri, Qasr Ibrim, al-Ramal, Serra, Sheima Amalika, Sonqi Tino, and Tamit. Smaller, uniaxial Nubian churches persisted through Nubian Christian times for monasteries such as those at Abu Ghazali, the first church at Faras, Kageras, the Old Church at Qasr Ibrim, and Qasr el-Wizz.

Iconographic mural images from Christian Nubia were common to most of the churches. Many were utterly lost as mud-brick structures deteriorated, but some elements remain from Lower Nubian sites at ‘Abd al-Nerqi and Abu al-Adda. Wall paintings refitted into the Rameside Temple of Wadi as-Sebua have also been saved. These have been recovered in the Nubian salvage campaign of 1960–1971. Nubian wall paintings usually have more subtle color combinations than those of the Egyptian Copts, but they all follow the Byzantine style in general. Large, staring eyes are also common to Nubian church iconography, along with skin tones that are Nubian rather than Egyptian in appearance.

Egyptian Coptic materials are very well represented at the Coptic Museum in Cairo and in the Nubian Museum in Aswan. Nubian Christianity is well illustrated at the Sudan National Museum in Khartoum and in the National Museum in Warsaw, Poland. This is the result of the extensive Polish excavations led by Kazimierz Michalowski in 1961–1964, especially at the Cathedral of Faras, which is now submerged under Lake Nubia or Lake Nasser. Among the many frescoes is a lovely mural of the birth of Christ, angels, three horsemen, and Mary on her birthing bed. Also found there are images of Saint Anna, Saint Mary with a Nubian bishop, Nubian Bishop Marianus with Mary and Jesus, Nubian Bishop Petros with the apostle Peter, angels, and “Three Youths in a Furnace.” Other Christian iconography and architectural features are also known.

The most accessible monastery of Lower Nubia that is still in situ is that of Saint Simeon in the Western Desert at Aswan. The now-abandoned site appears to have been initiated in the fifth century CE or even earlier, when it may have been a Roman fortress for the region. This structure dates mostly to the seventh century CE and later. Some reconstruction took place in the tenth century, and it was finally
abandoned in the thirteenth century for reasons that are not clear. It has huge defensive walls, corner towers for observation, an internal water supply, facilities for food production and dining, sleeping cells, chapels, and facilities for monastic life. Large-scale religious celebrations were held in a grand arched hall where some of the original painting still exists.

CICATRIX. See BODY DECORATION.

CIRCUMCISION, FEMALE. Although no records exist that evidence the origins of female circumcision, it is believed to have originated in prehistoric, Predynastic times. What evidence does exist of female circumcision in ancient Africa comes primarily from historical sources. Herodotus, the Greek historian, reported the practice in Egypt during the fifth century BCE. He was of the opinion that female circumcision had originated in either Egypt or Ethiopia. Herodotus explains that infibulation was used on slave girls, while clitoridectomy was a mark of prestige and retained by aristocracy. In 25 BCE, even the Roman ethnogeographer Strabo reported that the Egyptians practiced female circumcision. Female circumcision is also recorded as a custom among several nomadic peoples of the Arabian Peninsula in pre-Islamic times.

A second source of evidence for female circumcision in ancient times comes from female mummies themselves. Mummies found in Egypt dated earlier than 25 BCE are thought by some to have been infibulated (Lightfoot-Klein 1989). Egyptologists heavily disputed this interpretation, claiming that no clear evidence of the operation is found on any surviving female mummies (Shaw and Nicholson 1995).

The practice of female circumcision was incorporated into “folk” Islamic belief when the jihad swept North Africa from the seventh to fourteenth centuries CE. Since that time, the custom has become firmly entrenched in Islamic ideals of virginity, modesty, and family honor and status. As a result, female circumcision is today erroneously thought an original practice of Islam. Female circumcision is currently practiced in many regions of the world, including Sudan and Egypt but also Kenya, Nigeria, Mali, India, and Belize, among others. Ferlini’s (q.v.) book In the Interior of Africa, 1829–1835
brought the widespread regional practice of female circumcision to much greater attention.

This operation typically is performed on girls ranging from the ages of four to ten years. In varying degrees, female circumcision involves the surgical manipulation of the clitoris as well as other exposed female genitalia. Several different types of circumcision are performed, each characterized by the extent of excision and stitching. Particularly interesting is the procedure known as infibulation (so-called pharaoic circumcision). This type of circumcision consists of complete removal of the clitoris, excision of the labia minora, and partial removal of the inner labia majora. The remaining labia majora are then stitched together to form a bridge of tissue over the vaginal opening. A small sliver of wood or straw is then inserted into the vagina to prevent complete occlusion and to leave a passage for urine and menstruation. The reference of this most drastic type of circumcision as “pharaoic” has never been fully explained but is often used as proof of the custom’s pre-Islamic antiquity. Circumcision (tuhur) is performed routinely on Sudanese Muslim males and females as a rite of passage in the preadolescent years. [R. Lobban and K. Rhodes]

CLAUDIUS (41–54 CE). The Roman emperor Claudius assumed power upon the assassination of Caligula (q.v.). His administration brought little change to Egypt. However, nonaggression negotiations took place between Claudius and the Blemmyes (q.v.) in 45 CE at Philae (q.v.) in order to prevent their future harassment. Following the death of Claudius in 54 CE, the emperor Nero (q.v.) came to power.

CLEOPATRA VII (69–30 BCE). This extraordinary Ptolemaic queen, who ruled from 51 to 30 BCE, was of Macedonian origin. She presided over Egypt at one of the pivotal times in its history, ruling as the very last pharaoh of three centuries of Ptolemies. Her death ushered in the start of Roman rule of Egypt and Nubia. Her appealing and tragic story has been often retold, including by Shakespeare and in film. While she was not the first to rule as a coregent monarch, she was certainly the first woman to rule in her own name in these intriguing times. Cleopatra was the great granddaughter of Ptolemy VIII (q.v.) and daughter of Ptolemy XII, “Auletes” (q.v.). Cleopatra was briefly coregent with her father until his death in 51 BCE. His administration
then passed to Cleopatra, then eighteen years old, and her brotherhusband Ptolemy XIII, then twelve years old. Her two older sisters and one younger sister soon vanished from the political scene. Her brothers Ptolemy XIII and Ptolemy XIV would be heard of later.

In a celebrated case of palace intrigue, it is said that Cleopatra was brought to Julius Caesar (q.v.) wrapped in a rolled carpet and lured him away from supporting Ptolemy XIII. Caesar may have had a different understanding of this relationship, but promptly Ptolemy XIII realized that his options were limited. He turned to a hopeless military effort to attack Alexandria, occupied by his sister and her new lover. The brief Alexandrian war resulted in some urban destruction, including part of the great Ptolemaic library, organized by Callimachus and Eratosthenes (qq.v.).

In this atmosphere, Cleopatra and Caesar took a two-month Nile cruise to Upper Egypt, but it is not clear whether she reached Aswan (q.v.). But when Caesar declared himself emperor for life, this was more than the Roman ruling circles could tolerate, and the dictator Caesar was assassinated on the Ides of March in 44 BCE. Fleeing Rome for her safety, Cleopatra sailed back to Egypt, but amidst this new power vacuum, she needed a new ally in Rome. Her next famous tryst sought the favor and love of Mark Anthony, who represented Roman power in the eastern Mediterranean, while Octavian became Roman consul. Cleopatra invited Anthony to Egypt from 41 to 40 BCE, and he evidently fell in love with her, resulting in twin children from this union. From 40 to 34 BCE, Anthony saw extensive military action, from Spain to Armenia and Judaea. In 37 BCE, Anthony took a political risk with his declaration of Roman “Donations” that assigned Egypt to Cleopatra, a foreigner. In Rome, Octavian portrayed this act as treason against Rome.

This imperial rivalry was finally reached crisis point at the naval battle of Actium (q.v.) in 31 BCE, when the ships of Octavian easily defeated the navy of Cleopatra and Anthony, who withdrew to Alexandria for reasons that are still debated. In events much dramatized by Shakespeare, Anthony was misinformed that his lover and ally Cleopatra had killed herself, so he took his own life. This tragic news reached Cleopatra, who then committed suicide with a poisonous viper on August 12, 30 BCE. Her son Caesarian was soon assassinated. With no further rivals to crush, Octavian became the first Roman pre-
fect of Egypt. To commemorate this event, he changed his name to Augustus (q.v.). Roman republicanism was dead, as were three centuries of Ptolemaic rule of Egypt. The Roman Empire was on the rise.

The temple at Dendara still bears an image of this renowned queen and her son Caesarion (Ptolemy XV [q.v.]), who was born on July 23, 47 BCE, as a supposed product of her liaison with Julius Caesar. According to Plutarch (q.v.), polyglot Cleopatra was able to speak the languages of Egypt, Nubia, the Troglodytes (Blemmyes [q.v.]), and she may have spoken Hebrew. The famed geographer Strabo (q.v.) was a contemporary of Cleopatra. During her reign, Cleopatra generally had good relations with Nubia and Upper Egypt and with Egyptian Jews (q.v.), for whom she may have constructed a synagogue.

COBBE, KOBBE. Few maps show this old trading town of Darfur, as it has long since ceased to exist. Cobbe was situated at the southern end of the Darb al-Arba`in (Forty-Days Road), which went from the Kharga Oasis south to the Selima Oasis in the desert west of Wadi Halfa to Cobbe. This ancient route between Darfur and the Egyptian Nile was used for the export of gum arabic, slaves, and camels (q.v.). Cobbe markets were held twice weekly, and caravans as large as 2,000 camels and 1,000 slaves were known in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. At this time, its population of 6,000 was heterogeneous with Fellata migrants from the western Sahel, Fur, Kordofani Arabs, Egyptians, and Nubians. The site of Cobbe was ringed with mountains that offered a natural defense and brought water into its wells. However, one of the reasons to move the capital from Cobbe to El Fasher was because of a better water supply there. When El Fasher began to grow in the early 1700s, Cobbe became superfluous to the region, and it faded from existence.

CONSTANTINE I (“THE GREAT”) (306/307–337 CE). This Roman emperor represented a double watershed for Christianity in the world and in the Nile valley. His rise to power terminated the long and bloody history of Jewish and Christian persecution and instituted Christianity as the state religion of the western Roman Empire from 307 to 324 CE. In 312 CE, Constantine I had his visions of a cross in the sky when he defeated Heraclius at the battle of Mulvian Bridge. Interpreting his victory as a sign that he should convert to Christianity, he issued the Edict of
Milan in 313–314 CE, moving the Christian church from a pariah status to one that was favored through the return of confiscated property. With this act, Christianity became the religion of the Roman Empire, and it was Constantine who introduced the XP (chi rho) monogram, which became emblematic for most of Orthodox Christendom, including in Nubia. This Greek monogram indicated that “Christ [X] was the King [P].”

Constantine initially came to lead the eastern Roman Empire once it was divided during the reign of Diocletian (q.v.). He served in this capacity from 306 to 324 CE and then became the emperor of the entire empire from 324 to 337 CE. The brutality and persecution of Christians experienced under Diocletian had failed to achieve its objective, and by 311 CE, the Edict of Toleration, written by Emperor Galerius of the eastern empire, had begun to dampen the fires of hatred. Despite this move toward peace and reconciliation, the newly legitimated Christians soon turned to schismatic divisions that included the Donatist movement in North Africa and the Arian (q.v.) controversy in Egypt, which was to result in a lasting separation of Coptic and Orthodox Christians. Moreover, the persistent belief in an omnipotent Sun God weakened the acceptance of Christianity.

Many ancient temples in Egypt and Nubia were transformed from centers of Egyptian deities to those worshiping Mary and Jesus. For example, the Luxor temple was retrofitted with an altar shrine to Constantine. For reasons of theology and political nationalism, the new Egyptian diocese at Alexandria followed the Monophysite (q.v.) interpretation that was pursued by the medieval Nubian Copts and is still current in Egypt. They resisted the declarations of Constantine made at the Council of Nicaea in 325 CE that unsuccessfully tried to ignore or resolve these differences. Important church historians such as Eusebius maintained some sympathy for Arianism—he was at least opposed to the more extreme forms of anti-Arianism. Constantinople (today’s Istanbul) was named in his honor in 324 CE, and when it became the capital of the unified Roman Empire, it only undermined the position of Alexandria still further.

COPPER. Throughout Dynastic times, Nubia was much appreciated for its mineral and stone resources. Although gold was the most valued, copper was much sought after in the Old Kingdom, and thereafter Nubian copper was alloyed with tin to produce numerous
bronze (q.v.) implements and weapons. The main source of Nubian copper was in the Red Sea Hills through the Wadi al Allaqi. Generally, the period covered in this dictionary can be termed the Bronze Age, but since copper is the largest ingredient, it obscures its great role in metallurgy and ancient nomenclature. Only when the harder metal of iron came in Greco-Roman times was bronze replaced, and even then, its use for sculpture, although not for tools and weapons, continued for a long time.

**Copts.** The Copts of the Nile valley are the direct descendants of the ancient Egyptians who spoke a cognatic language and essentially never moved from their ancestral lands. Some believe that the term “Copt” descended from *Heka-Ptah*, roughly, “the place where the god Ptah rules.” The form *Heka-Ptah* was corrupted by the Greeks under Ptolemaic rule to become *Aigyptos*, from which “Copts” may have evolved. The closeness of the living and written forms of the Coptic language to ancient Egyptian was critical in the broader decipherment of ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Hieroglyphics, Coptic, and Old Nubian were among the most ancient of languages to be written in Nubia (q.v.) and provide the earliest texts about Nubia, whether told by ancient Egyptian record keepers or by 25th Dynasty Nubians ruling Egypt. Since the Coptic language evolved from Egyptian demotic and the morphology of demotic can be linked to some letters in Meroitic (q.v.), one can see still more ties to Nubia.

After their early conversion to Christianity (q.v.) by Saint Mark (q.v.), the Copts identified with their own Monophysite (q.v.) theology, ultimately excluding them from Roman papal authority and Trinitarianism. Copts were largely responsible for bringing Nubian Christianity, which usually existed under the authority of the Coptic pope of Alexandria. The Coptic language persists in some monasteries and for liturgical purposes. Like Old Nubian, the Coptic language made heavy use of the Greek alphabet, but all three languages otherwise belong to very different language families. In Old Nubian religious texts, the commentary and theology are essentially of the Coptic tradition, although they are written in a Nubian dialect. The Coptic calendar (q.v.) (AM, Year of the Martyrs) began on August 28, 284 CE, and is still observed for religious purposes.
CORNELIUS GALLUS (r. 30–26 BCE). Following the short and only visit to Egypt by Augustus (q.v.) in 30 BCE, Egypt was left under the authority of its prefect Cornelius Gallus. The self-confidence of the Roman Empire was so great at this juncture that it felt itself virtually unassailable. Promptly, the Romans jeopardized the careful political balance formerly struck between the Ptolemies and Meroë (qq.v.). Prefect Gallus declared that Aswan would be the legal boundary of Roman Egypt, but Meroë as a bordering client state would come under the practical authority of Rome as well. Prefect Gallus also stimulated a Theban tax revolt that he put down by force. In about 29 BCE, Gallus then sent Petronius to counterattack at Dakka and Qasr Ibrim (qq.v.). From there, he based his army to conduct a raid into Napata (q.v.). The Meroites attacked Qasr Ibrim but failed to dislodge the Romans, but Gallus proposed peace negotiations at the remote Aegean island of Samos, resetting the border at Maharraka (q.v.) and thus putting the Dodekaschoenos buffer region of Lower Nubia under Roman control but with Meroitic authority recognized upstream. While this left the valuable Wadi al-Allaqi gold mines in Roman hands, it is clear that the Romans were also stung by these military engagements, and later the Romans either kept to themselves or withdrew to Aswan. Gallus tried to extend his authority in Egypt by claiming these “victories” in his own name, but he was perceived as a threat to Augustus in Rome. According to Svetonius, Gallus was recalled to Rome, where, fearing execution, he killed himself in 26 BCE.

After the death of Gallus, Emperor Augustus sent Aelius Gallus as a new prefect to Egypt. Apprehension grew in Meroë, and after frustrating negotiations failed, a large Meroitic army, led either by Kandake (q.v.; Queen) Amanikhshete (q.v.) or by Amanirenas (q.v.), attacked the forces of Gallus at Aswan and Philae. In this raid, a bronze bust of Augustus was seized and taken back to Meroë. In response to this attack, Augustus sent the third prefect, Petronius, for a counterattack deep into Lower Nubia at least as far as Qasr Ibrim and perhaps briefly as far as Napata.

DABENARTI. Dabenarti island was located just upstream of the Second Cataract fortress complex of the Middle Kingdom at Mirgissa (q.v.) and just downstream from the contemporary fortresses at Shal-
fak and Askut (q.v.). Thus, it was part of the strong forward defense system of Egypt and also of the early warning system against possible attack by Nubians from Kerma (q.v.). It is now lost under the waters of Lake Nubia/Nasser.

**DABOD, DEBOD.** The original location of Dabod temple was about nine kilometers upstream of modern New Kalabsha on the western bank of the Nile, or about twenty kilometers from Philae Island. Its modern documentation begins with a site sketch done in 1737 by Frederik Norden. Dabod was visited in 1813 John Lewis Burckhardt (q.v.) and in 1815 by Giovanni Belzoni (q.v.). In 1819, the architect Franz Christian Gau (q.v.) published a sketch and site plan of Dabod. This shows the river’s edge and the causeway, which then led to the sanctuary after passing through three pylons surrounded by a mud-brick wall. Richard Lepsius (q.v.) visited Dabod in 1843 and added to the published documentation of the temple. Among the first photographs of Dabod are those by Maxime Duchamp from 1849 to 1851, by Antonio Béato in 1875, and by Gaston Maspero in 1906–1907, when the three pylons were still standing.

Apparently, the Meroitic king Adikhalamani (q.v.; ca. 200–190 BCE) began the Dabod temple to honor Amun and Isis. Since the Kushite capital was moved from Napata to Meroë, this was likely to have been an effort to assert his full territory. Adikhalamani is presented as the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, according to convention but not in contemporary political fact. Also following belief and convention, Adikhalamani was proclaimed the son of Ra and worshiper of Amun. The scribal god Thoth ritually purified this Meroitic king at Dabod temple. Other Egyptian and Nubian deities featured at Dabod in offering and praise reliefs include Amun’s consort Mut as well as Anuqet, Arensnuphis, Behedeti, Geb, Hathor, Horus (Ra-Harekhty, Harendotes, and Harpocrates), Isis, Khnum (Ra), Maat, Mahesa, Min, Nekhbet, Nephthys, Osiris, Ptah, Satet, Sekhmet, Shu, and Tefnut.

During the reigns of Ptolemy VII and Ptolemy XIII (q.q.v.) and Cleopatra III, additions were made to the exterior pylons, and the temple was devoted to the worship of the popular goddess Isis. The sacred altar of Dabod is attributed to Ptolemy XIII (q.v.), the brother of the famed Cleopatra VII (q.v.). Columns at Dabod were made in the popular Late period style with palmiform capitals. In Roman times, during the reigns of Augustus (q.v.) and Tiberius, the exterior pylon entrance received more attention. As a consequence of this
long history, the inscriptions at Dabod are in hieroglyphics, Meroitic (for Arkakamani), and some in Greek.

As a result of the High Dam project, Dabod temple was threatened and seasonally inundated in 1959 up to the interior chapel. In 1960, UNESCO decided to save Dabod temple by removing it. In 1961, the temple was dismantled, and the blocks were removed to Elephantine Island at Aswan in preparation for shipment. These building stones rested there until being shipped to Spain in 1968. The Spanish archaeologist Martin Almagro has described its renewal at the “Cuartel de la Montana” in Madrid, Spain, in 1968 and its reconstruction in 1970. It is now situated there with restoration of its altar, chapel sanctuary, *naos* (shrine), and two of the three original pylons, along with the rich theological reliefs.

**DAJU.** The precise origins of the Daju people are unknown, but they probably date back even to Dynastic Egyptian times. The Daju were among the earliest inhabitants of Darfur, with whom the Fur people share membership in the Eastern Sudanic language family along with Nilotic and Nubian languages. However, Fur speakers are distinguished from the Daju in some respects, and thus they qualify as unique in their language stock. The position of the Daju at the southern end of the Darb al-Arba‘in (Forty-Days Road) to the Selima Oasis is unquestionably ancient. This strategic position gave them considerable influence at the eastern end of the Sahel and its east–west trade. In the thirteenth or fourteenth century CE, the Daju dominance of trade in Darfur was replaced by the Tungur and Fur (Keira) dynasties.

**DAKKA, DAKKE, DAKKEH, ED-DAKKA** *(PR-SELKET, PSELQET, PSELCHIS).* The marvelous temple of Dakka was built mainly in Ptolemaic (Ptolemy IV, Philopator; Ptolemy VIII, Euergetes II) and Meroitic times to honor the deities Thoth (of Pnu bs), Anuqit, Selket, and Satet (q.v.), among others. Some Greek inscriptions may also date to Ptolemy II and Ptolemy III. Its Greek name is derived from its local worship of the scorpion goddess Selket. This temple was originally sited about forty kilometers north of its new location. It was not far from the Nile on the western edge of a flat plain. It was first excavated by Cecil Mallaby Firth. David Roberts (q.v.) drew Dakka temple and many other Nubian temples in their original locations.
Some scholars believed the Dakka temple to have been a condominium effort between Meroe and Ptolemaic Egypt, but no evidence to support this exists. This former interpretation emerged because both Ptolemaic pharaohs and the Meroitic king Arkamani II (q.v.) have their hieroglyphic cartouches at Dakka temple. Most likely, he was able to build there while Ptolemaic kings had temporarily withdrawn from the Dodekaschoenus (q.v.) region. Arkamani II made early additions to the Dakka temple in the late third century BCE as well as proclaiming himself the king of Upper and Lower Egypt. His constructions were dedicated mainly to Thoth but also to Amun, Hapy, Isis, Osiris, and Arensnuphis (qq.v.). The portions of the Dakka temple attributed to Arkamani II were built very early in the Meroitic period. The relatively few Meroitic inscriptions at this temple probably date to a later time, since he preferred to write in hieroglyphics.

During the dismantling of the Dakka temple, it was discovered that some of the stones had been reused from Middle Kingdom structures since Dakka was originally situated directly across from the 12th Dynasty fort at Quban (Baki) that protected the access to the famed gold mines in Wadi Al-Allaqi. Some early construction stones at Dakka are attributed to Amemehat of the 12th Dynasty. Other reused stones dated to the New Kingdom (18th Dynasty) constructions of Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis II and III and to Seti I, the father of Ramses II (qq.v.).

When the Ptolemies returned to Lower Nubia, the generic inscription to Per-Aa (pharaoh) was commonly made at Dakka and elsewhere since succession in the late Ptolemaic times was more rapid than stonemasons could handle. The Ptolemaic contribution to Dakka is the small but attractive first vestibule that is tied directly to the pronaos (shrine ante chamber) and sanctuary that had been built in Meroitic times. Ironically, the innermost chamber dates to the later times of Augustus (q.v.) rather than to Arkamani II by virtue of a rearward addition to the temple where a granite cult shrine was placed. The western pylon stairway now takes visitors to the roof for a splendid view of the entire complex, westward across the vast Libyan Desert, a wide expanse of Lake Nasser to the east, and a view down to the Maharraqa temple below.

During the time of Augustus, one side of the outer pylon was finished. Some reliefs were also added during the reign of Tiberius. The three styles of Meroitic, Ptolemaic, and Roman are clearly contrasted
at Dakka. It was likely that in this region that the Roman general Petronius defeated the forces of the Meroitic queen (Candace [q.v.]) in 23 CE. On this occasion, a small temple was built on an earlier foundation of a structure of Arkamani II. During the second century CE, the Romans built a castrum, or military camp, around the temple of Dakka.

The flood of Lake Nasser compelled the relocation of the temple between 1962 and 1968 to a new, higher location near the relocated temple of Wadi As-Sebua (q.v.). Today the large pylon is separate from the temple proper. Before reconstruction, many of the blocks had fallen down, thus it is now in much better condition than it had been for centuries.

DAL CATARACT. This section of the Third Cataract is a portion of the Butn al-Hajr (q.v.) and is in the vicinity of the village of Firka (q.v.).

DALION. Dalion was a Greek traveler who reached or even traveled beyond Meroë in about the fourth century BCE. His reports noted fanciful account of one-eyed people as well as “wild animal eaters” (Agriophagi), “everything eaters” (Panphagi), “man eaters” (Anthropophagi), “seed eaters” (Spermatophagi), “locust eaters” (Acridophagi), “elephant eaters” (Elephantophagi), “ostrich eaters” (Struthophagi), “dog milkers” (Cynamolgi), and other “ethnographic” references. His work is lost but was cited by Pliny the Elder (q.v.).

DANAGLA. See CHRISTIANITY; DONGOLA; DONGOLAWI.

DAO. See DOTAWO.

DARB AL-ARBA’IN. The Darb al-Arba’in (Forty-Days Road) connected ancient Nubia and the lands far to the south in northern Kordofan and Darfur with Upper and Middle Egypt by way of a desert route. The route was used for moving large numbers of livestock, especially camels, but also slaves and gum arabic and other savanna resources valued in Egypt. It is believed that Harkuf (q.v.) used this ancient desert track in his trading missions to Yam. Staying away from the more populated Nile valley enhanced the security of trade items to a certain extent. From the desert west of the Third Cataract, the Darb al-Arba’in headed to the
Selima Oasis for rewatering of the animals before going northeast to Kurkur and Dunqul Oases (qq.v.) on the way to Aswan. An alternative route stayed in the desert until reaching Kharga Oasis, from which one could rewater again before passing on to Assiut in Middle Egypt. This ancient route has long been favored for animal transport and smuggling. The desert-tracking Medjay (q.v.) have long been involved in patrolling and policing this desert route that passed by the Roman fort at Dush.

**DARFUR.** Darfur is the ancient homeland of the Fur and Daju (qq.v.) people. Its vast history is known archaeologically in prehistoric times and it had connections to Dynastic Egypt through Saharan trade routes. Wavy-line and dotted wavy-line pottery typical of the Khar-toum Mesolithic (q.v.) has also been found in northern Darfur, perhaps reaching that area through the Wadi Howar (q.v.). Probably later, black and red paintings are found in cave shelters in southern Darfur in the Dajo Hills. These images depict wild animals as well as domestic horses and riders. The precise dates have not been determined for these works. After the collapse of Meroë in the fourth century CE, parts of Darfur may have received refugees of the royal family escaping from the Axumites. In medieval times of Christian Nubia, areas of northern Darfur were opened to some cultivation with the introduction of water-conserving terracing.

**DAVID, KING (of Dotawo).** King David (Daud) was one of a number of known kings of the late Christian small kingdom of Dotawo (q.v.). King David probably ruled in the late thirteenth century, and his associated bishop may have been Shenoute. Dotawo is thought to be based at Jebel Adda (q.v.) in Lower Nubia and may have been a surviving outpost of Christian Nubians into the fifteenth century CE.

**DAVID, KING (of Makurra).** King David (Daud) was a king of the Christian kingdom of Makurra at least by 1268. William Adams reported that King David is known from messages he sent to Egyptian Muslim King Baybars seeking his recognition. Evidently, his *bagr* payments were substantially in arrears, and Baybars wanted to restore that before further political negotiations. Indeed, King David
responded in 1272 by attacking a Red Sea commercial port of Mameluke Egypt. Taking advantage of these poor relations, a Nubian claimant to the throne, Prince Shekenda sought Egyptian support in 1275 to oust his cousin King David.

By 1276, the insurgent Beni Kanz (q.v.) forces occupied Dotawo to the north and Meinarti (q.v.) and pressed on to Dongola by April of that year. King David fled south to Alwa (q.v.), and many of his family members were captured. By June 1276, King David was himself captured and sent to Cairo as a prisoner, never heard from again. At that time, the Egyptian Mamelukes installed the new king Shekenda as their presumed puppet king of Dongola.

DAW. See DOTAWO.

DEBEIRA, DIBEIRA (EAST). Debeira East is located just downstream of Wadi Halfa. Scandinavian excavation discovered unusual house sites and grain storage of C-Group occupation. Rock inscriptions nearby show Egyptian-style boats carrying cattle that presumably were traded by C-Group people to Egypt. Inscribed foot patterns are also noted at this site as well as many others. It is believed that they mark a spot of pilgrimage or spiritual invocation.

This now flooded site also held the rock-cut tomb of Djehutihotep, probably serving Queen Hatshepsut (q.v.) as the prince of the local region of Tehkhet. This tomb has been removed to the garden area at the Sudan National Museum. Debeira East also has cemeteries of other notables in the New Kingdom. Debeira East was also occupied in much later X-Group times.

DEBEIRA, DIBEIRA (WEST). Debeira West is just across from Debeira East (q.v.) and held the rock-cut shaft tomb chapel of Amenemhet, an 18th Dynasty prince of the Tehkhet region. Tehkhet or Debeira was upstream of Miam or Aniba (q.v.), which is roughly between Toshka and Semna (q.v.). Debeira also has early Christian horizons that were excavated by archaeologists from the University of Ghana. A fresco showing the story of Noah’s Ark was unearthed at a small church at Debeira West. This tomb is under Lake Nubia today.

DEDUN, DEDAN, DEDWAN, TETUN. This very ancient Nubian god was depicted as either a ram-headed or more often as an anthropo-
morphic god. Dedun seems to have been especially important to the Medjay (q.v.) on the Eastern Desert, even more than riverine Nubians. In the earliest mention of Dedun in the Pyramid Texts of 2300 BCE, he is termed “the youth who came out of Nubia.” Dedun was also considered “the Lord of Punt” (q.v.).

Senusoret III (q.v.) erected a stela dedicated to Dedun at the Middle Kingdom forts at Semna and Uronarti. Apparently, this stela was provided to honor this deity of his Medjay (q.v.) border guards. During the New Kingdom, Tuthmosis III (q.v.) renewed the shrines to Dedun (and Senusoret III) at Semna and Uronarti (q.v.). L. V. Zabkar states that the Ptolemies considered Dedun ancestral to Arensnuphis (q.v.). Dedun was very popular in Greco-Roman times, especially in Nubian temples and chapels, such as those at El-Lessiya, Semna, Kalabsha, and Jebel Barkal (q.v.). He is depicted throughout Egypt all the way to the delta, and he is reported even in Siwa Oasis in Ptolemaic times.

Martin Bernal offers the idea that Dedun even entered Greek theology in the form of the poorly known oracle god Dedona, popular in northern Greece. His universality in the Nile valley was also demonstrated by his being termed “the god of four directions.” Dedun was also known as a bringer or protector of frankincense (a Nubian commodity highly valued in religious services). In the Old Testament Bible (Genesis 10:7), Dedan is noted as a “Son of Cush.” [R. Lobban with k. rhodes]

DEFFINARTI. Deffinarti, literally “the island of the ruins;” is the small site of an early fortified Christian village. The famed eastern and westerns deffufas (q.v.) of Kerma (q.v.) are derived from the same Nubian linguistic concept.

DEFFUFA (WESTERN AND EASTERN). This generic Nubian word refers to “ancient ruins,” but it is usually applied to the great mud-brick structures at Kerma (q.v.). While the mud bricks appear to be of Egyptian inspiration, the style and function of the deffufas at Kerma appear to be uniquely Nubian. Most likely, they were built during the Classical or Late times of Kerma. Pottery and sealings are dated especially to the Middle Kingdom and to the Hyksos period, when the Kerma kings had strong military and political ties to the Asian kings of the delta. A few seals found at Kerma date to Pepi I at the end of the Old Kingdom. A great deal of speculation has been made about their exact uses, but they can be differentiated by their location and architecture.
The Lower, or Western, Deffufa is situated adjacent to a royal residence and a huge circular African-style reception hall. It is about 2.5 kilometers from the river in the fertile Kerma basin. Although some thought it had a defensive or commercial application, the tiny interior spaces suggest otherwise, and recent thinking has been more inclined to accept it as a massive religious shrine of some sort. Clearly, it was a central part of the royal town site of Kerma and now consists only of a simple-chambered unfired mud-brick ruin. It is still of impressive size—some 20 meters high, 52.3 meters long, and 26.7 meters wide—but it likely was larger when in use. In Egyptian measures, its length comes very close to 150 cubits, the standard of the time. The forward portion bears some similarity to an Egyptian temple pylon, and the whole structure may have been fully faced with stone or painted mud stucco.

Attached to the Western Deffufa was another smaller mud-brick building of later date that had two small rooms. One of the rooms had six interior (structural?) columns that have a parallel with the Eastern Deffufa. These structures were sometimes altered, and additions were made. The last change likely was made late in the Classical period just prior to New Kingdom conquest. From side stairs, it appears that one could enter the rather small interior and, by way of an interior stairway, reach the roof with its commanding view. The small size of the interior chamber does not suggest a storage function. The huge amount of labor required and the proximity to the royal “audience chamber,” “palace,” or “reception pavilion” suggest that it had a formal political, religious, or ritualistic function. The round, un-Egyptian palace was rebuilt many times, judging from the series of postholes. It likely had a large thatch roof, similar to those of the Shilluk of southern Sudan or the Buganda of the Great Lakes region.

The Upper, or Eastern, Deffufas lie about three kilometers farther east. They are situated amidst an extensive cemetery field of tremendous circular graves for the Classical Kerma kings. One was probably rebuilt or added to on at least three occasions. That the two Eastern Deffufas are surrounded by so many major graves suggests that they were used repeatedly for a funerary function. A hint of interior stairs exists, and two narrow chambers with four interior columns each indicates a supported ceiling. One of the smaller Eastern Deffufas measures forty meters in length and twenty meters in width. The
other was about fifty meters long and about thirty meters wide. Their
original height could only be estimated, and they seem to have been
built on similar plans. They had interior painting in red, black, and
yellow, and some animal motifs are known from their doorjambs.

Without further investigation or texts, the precise function is not
known, but it has been suggested that they could be mortuary temples
(George Reisner), a cemetery watchtower (William Adams), or a reli-
gious sanctuary (John Taylor). The lack of major storage capacity for
goods or troops and the connection with royal residential structures has
tipped the consensus toward a politicoreligious or mortuary function.

DEGHEIM. Degheim town is located in the Kenzi (q.v.) area of Nubia.
A church fresco at Degheim West has a Nubian ruler with a stemmed
crescent on an eparch’s crown.

DEIR AL-MEDINA. This famed workers’ village was located in the
hills of western Thebes. It was the residence of the skilled craftsmen
who designed, carved, and decorated the splendid tombs for New
Kingdom pharaohs. It is certain that some Nubian (Kushite) crafts-
men were among the population of Deir al-Medina. For example, ev-
idence exists of a Nubian mason named Trky, who lived there while
he applied his skills at nearby Deir al-Bahri during the 18th Dynasty.
This would be parallel to the unique case of the burial in the Valley
of the Kings of the ranking Nubian servant Maiherpri (q.v.).

During the time of Ramses II in the 19th Dynasty, the scribe
Amen-em-opet of this village had a father who had been a w3b
priest in the Amun temple at Napata (q.v.) in Nubia. During the civil strife
at the end of the 20th Dynasty between the viceroy Piankhy (q.v.) and
the Theban priests, an effort was taken to recruit soldiers for this con-
flict from Deir al-Medina. One chapel shows the worship of the Nu-
bian deities Khnum, Anuket, and Satis (qq.v.), at least suggesting that
the deceased had worked or traveled to Elephantine (q.v.) at the First
Cataract, where these Nubian deities are especially celebrated.

DEMITIC: HIEROGLYPHIC. The demotic form of hieroglyphics
was the successor to the very early hieratic form. Both were increas-
ingly cursive writing systems used in everyday recordkeeping, unlike
the more cumbersome Middle Egyptian hieroglyphs, which were
used for formal records and monumental inscriptions. All three systems have clearly successive lexical and morphological links to each other. Demotic emerged either at the time of the Nubian occupation of Egypt in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) or in the 26th Dynasty for reasons that are not fully understood. A demotic inscription is known for Taharka. One may speculate that the Nubians needed an easy, rapid system of record keeping in Egypt and that they did not arrive with a writing system of their own at the time. Hieroglyphic writing had certainly been known in Nubia before the New Kingdom’s occupation of that land, but except for some Nubian deities and place names, it seems that Nubian languages were never recorded in hieroglyphics. In Nubia, contemporary with the Third Intermediate period in Egypt, hardly any inscrip tional evidence has been uncovered.

Thus, when the Nubians emerged in the eighth century BCE to become the new rulers of a reunited Egypt, they may well have had need of a writing system that was both familiar to Egyptian scribes and easier for them to operate. Demotic remained in place in Egypt after the Nubians withdrew, and it continued to be used through Greco-Roman times up to the last dated instance in the mid-fifth century CE at Philae, about the last time for Meroitic in the case of Kalabsha (q.v.). By about this time, Egyptians were writing in Greek or Coptic, and Nubians were starting to record their language in Old Nubian. Coptic and Old Nubian used mainly Greek (i.e., Phoenician-derived) letters for their unique sound systems. Clearly, the most important demotic inscription was the bilingual and tritextual Rosetta Stone, which allowed decipherment of hieroglyphs in the early nineteenth century.

Demotic was horizontally written from right to left like other Semitic languages. It is highly cursive, with numerous stylized ligatures. Thousands of examples of demotic exist on papyrus, ostraca, and stone. The record is especially rich for commercial and legal transactions as well as memorial tributes, proclamations, and scientific and religious themes.

DEMOTIC: MEROITIC. The Meroitic (q.v.) language has two written forms. Both are essentially alphabetic with the exception of a few syllabic glyphs, word spacers, and some determinatives. Often the common form of Meroitic is termed “cursive” (running, flowing) but it is really a demotic form. Because it has no ligatures or connections
between the letters or the glyphs, the term “cursive” is really a mis-
nomer, and it should be called “demotic Meroitic” to be consistent
with the term and with its use in Egyptian hieroglyphs. The appendix
provides a table of Meroitic demotic letters and sounds as deciphered
by Francis L.l. Griffith (q.v.).

DENDUR (TUTZIS). The relatively small temple of Dendur in Lower
Nubia was probably started in late Ptolemaic times but was probably
not fully inscribed. These turbulent times are implied by the use of car-
touches that contain only the generic Per-Aa reference to “pharaoh”
without a specific Ptolemy noted, since the one who started the work
may have been dethroned before the project was completed. The stan-
dard motif of white and red crowns is common to this temple. Horus
(of Buhen and Miam [qq.v.]) is also much celebrated at Dendur temple
along with his divine mother, Isis, who was very popular at this time.

Caesar Augustus (q.v.; 30 BCE–14 CE) completed the construction and
inscription of Dendur in early Roman times. This was part of his Nu-
bian temple construction program that included nearby Kalabsha (q.v.)
Temple. On the eastern end of the top register on the exterior northern
wall, a double-crowned Augustus is depicted making an offering on the
exterior northern wall to a seated Amun and Mut. In the center, Augus-
tus is wearing the khepresh blue war crown, and the remaining upper-
register inscription is severely damaged and difficult to make out.

On the bottom register of the same side, Augustus is offering two ves-
sels to Horus and Isis. Another scene shows him offering to a Nubian de-
ity, and the western scene on the northern wall shows him offering to
Osiris in front of Isis. On the interior western wall, Augustus is offering
a jug to Khnum (q.v.). Khnum is holding a w3st and ankh and has both
the curved Amon horns and an atef crown with horizontal horns. He is
described as the Lord of Bigga (of the First Cataract), who presides over
the first nome of Egypt. In another scene on the rear of the southern gate-
way doorjamb, Augustus, wearing his atef crown, is pouring milk into a
vessel on an offering table in front of Osiris. Behind Osiris is his sister-
consort Isis. Another interior scene on the south jamb of the pronaos
shows Augustus wearing the white crown, offering the cobra deity Wad-
jet to Horus, who is holding a w3st and ankh. Nearby on the interior
southern wall of the pronaos is Augustus, wearing the double crown, of-
fering incense to Isis seated on her throne with an ankh and lotus staff.
The temple was built according to a standard plan with an outer pylon, pronaos, hallway, and inner sanctum (perhaps of the 26th Dynasty) to honor the memory of the sons of Quper (Kuper), brother Princes Peteese and Pihor (Petessis/Pedesi and Pahor), and local holy men who may have drowned in this area, perhaps during the invasion of Gallus (q.v.). These two figures are shown in a relief on the interior southern wall of the pronaos. Both are seated and hold the ankh and w3st scepters. Peteese and Pihor were buried in a small rock-cut tomb behind the Dendur temple. Some Meroitic graffiti inscriptions are attributed to this temple as well as depictions of the Nubian deities Arensnuphis and Mandulis (qq.v.).

The remaining ceiling blocks are cut with repeated images of the vulture goddess along with stars of the night sky. Lion reliefs were carved into the base of the doorway for protection. In 577 CE, the Dendur temple, like most of the Nubian temples, was converted into a church under the rule of Bishop Theodorus of Philae (q.v.). Dendur was visited by a number of notable Egyptologists and travelers, including Robert Hay in about 1830, David Roberts (q.v.) in 1838, Félix Teynard in 1853, Amelia Edwards in 1874, Howard Carter 1901, and Caroline Ransom Williams in about 1910.

With the rising waters of Lake Nasser, well over 600 remaining blocks of Dendur temple were removed in 1963 from its location on the western bank of the Nile downstream of Gerf Hussein (q.v.), or some sixty kilometers from the First Cataract. In 1968, the 800 tons of blocks were removed to the Sackler Gallery in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, where it has been reconstructed and handsomely displayed since 1980.

DEPUTY OF KUSH. See KUSH.

DEPUTY OF WAWAT. See WAWAT.

DERR, ED-DERR. (Adere, or Dor in Meroitic). This mainly rock-cut temple was built by Ramses II (q.v.) and was originally located on the eastern bank of the Nile about eleven kilometers upstream of Amada (q.v.). The temple is not considered to exhibit the best craftsmanship, an example of which is the curved, poorly planned architrave, but it is still interesting. Jean-François Champollion and James Henry
Breasted surveyed the site. Derr is unusual since it is actually on the eastern bank of the Nile. However, the river curves southeasterly so much at that point that the eastern bank is more westerly than the western bank. Usually, the western bank of the Nile was favored for such structures. As at Abu Simbel (q.v.), the Derr temple has Ramses II deified with the gods Re-Harakhty, Amon-Re, Khnum, and Ptah, so it is assumed that it was constructed relatively late in his reign at about the same time as Abu Simbel. Unlike at Abu Simbel, no seated colossi exist at Derr. The outer court shows four Osiride columns and eight square columns that are heavily damaged, but it is evident that a battle scene was depicted. The middle interior hall of six heavy columns is less damaged, with two scenes of the pharaoh making offerings. Another scene shows the name of Ramses II being recorded on the leaves of the Persea tree. Some of the colors are strong because of their absorption into the stone. The innermost section of the temple consists of three chambers somewhat reminiscent of Abu Simbel, especially because the central chamber has the same four seated deities of Ptah, Amun-Re, deified Ramses II, and Re-Horakhty.

In the Christian era, the Derr temple began to be used as a church. Just prior to the region’s being flooded by the Aswan Dam, the temple was excavated from the solid rock into which it had been carved and was reconstructed at a new site on the western bank between the tomb of Pennit (q.v.) and the relocated temple of Amada (q.v.). Its overall condition is not good; portions had been subject to defacement and flooding of the Nile before it was moved in 1964.

**D-GROUP.** George Reisner (q.v.) gave the name D-Group to sites and remains in Nubia dating after 1500 BCE, during the period of Egyptian New Kingdom control of the region. As the chronology of ancient Nubia was being developed, the series of A-, C-, D-, and X-Groups was established and continued since no local or original names were established for the peoples of these times and places. However, today the reference to D-Group is no longer in use among archaeologists, while the other references are still current.

**DIOCLETIAN** (r. 284–305/306 CE, d. 316 CE). This military ruler of the eastern Roman Empire, including Egypt, had great ambitions to restructure the administration, army, and economy in order to produce
more wealth for Rome. He was the last of the Roman emperors to have actually visited Egypt. He also sought to control the lands of the Nobadae and Blemmyes (qq.v.) with a system of indirect rule in which these local chiefs would become paid agents of Rome. However, the harsh administration of Diocletian stimulated regional revolts that compelled him to withdraw his garrisoned troops from most of Lower Nubia very early in his reign. In his withdrawal, he placed the Nile limits of the Roman Empire at Philae (q.v.), where he built a gateway at the northeastern end of the island. He also strengthened his defenses with a fort at Elephantine (q.v.) Island. His brutal suppression of early Christians and Christianity (q.v.) was infamous in their liturgical literature. Diocletian abdicated in 305–306 CE but retired from his position to live at Split in former Yugoslavia, where he died, rather than being murdered, as was frequently the case with emperors.

DIODORUS SICULUS. The Greek Diodorus of Sicily was a world historian during the early Roman period (first century BCE) and thus was a contemporary of Socrates. He contributed to the narratives on Nubia drawn from Dalion, Pliny, and Strabo (qq.v.). He was known to have lived until at least 21 BCE, and his book Biblioteca Historica reports on the history of the world from early times to Julius Caesar’s (q.v.) conquest of Gaul. In the tenth century CE, Constantine VII reproduced some fragments of the work of Diodorus.

In Book I, Diodorus laid out the geography of Egypt and “Ethiopia” (Meroë [q.v.]). He repeated the length of the Nile at 12,000 stadia. He also spoke of the seasonal floods and cataracts of the Nile and the mineral resources in the adjacent land. The many islands in the Ethiopian Nile were described as overrun with snakes and baboons. Meroë (q.v.) was referred to as the “Island of Meroë.” Book I provides some details on the functioning of the Apis bull cult in Egypt as well as the contemporary worship of other animal deities.

In Book II, Diodorus noted the unusual burial practice of Meroë to pour “a heavy coat of glass over the body of the deceased” or a statue of the dead to preserve it. Perhaps this was a Meroitic innovation in mummification and burial practices, or was this just shiny bitumen? Book II makes mention of the legendary Babylonian queen Semiramis, who, after visiting all of Egypt and the Amun cult there, also visited “Ethiopia.” She is said to have visited there in the 700s BCE, according to Herodotus.
In Book III, Diodorus reported that the “Ethiopians” were not immigrants to their land but had lived there since the most ancient of times. The phenotype of the “Ethiopians” was black in color with flat noses and woolly hair. Diodorus reported that King Ergamenes (q.v.) received a Greek education and had studied philosophy. Sources for Diodorus’s information on Meroë included Agatharchides and Artemidorus.

In Book III, Diodorus also said that Meroitic writing was far more widespread than was hieroglyphics in Egypt, which had been reserved largely for the scribal and priestly classes. He also reported that the “Ethiopians” were the first to honor gods and that they employed purification rituals. Insight is also provided by Diodorus on the nature and stability of the Kushite monarchy, and he provides details on the practice of regicide in Kush (q.v.). Information on ancient Meroë regarding gold mining, quarrying stone, military topics, wildlife, and especially elephant hunting and shipping from Meroë by Ptolemy II and Ptolemy III (qq.v.) is also found in this book.

The description of ethnic diversity in Meroë included remarks on foods, clothing, and shelters of various peoples. Diodorus used the contemporary references to the Troglodytes of the Red Sea Hills, the Nubae of the Bayuda (q.v.) steppe, the Megabari of the land between Qasr Ibrim and the Fifth Cataract, the Ichthyophagi (fish eaters and their fishing techniques), the Rhizophagi (root eaters) on the upper Astaboras River (Atbara), the Spermatophagi (seed eaters), the Acridophagi (locust eaters), the Struthophagi (ostrich eaters), and the Elephantophagi (elephant eaters).

**DIORITE.** This sometimes finely grained, dark, and very hard igneous stone was highly valued by Egyptians for royal sculpture. A major source of diorite for Egyptians was at a quarry deep in the desert west of Toshka (q.v.) in Lower Nubia.

**DJEHUTY-HOTEP.** This Nubian chief was the son of Ruu, a Nubian who ruled the principedom of Tehkhet during the 18th Dynasty. As such, he was considered an Egyptianized Nubian prince. Djehuty-Hotep had a rock-cut tomb created at Debeira East (q.v.). The tomb paintings illustrate typical Egyptian scenes of hunting and feasting. Plantation scenes in the tomb of Djehutyhotep suggest that Lower
Nubia's economy was active in the production and exporting of dates. [by P. Saucier]

**Djer, Jer** (ca. 3042–2995 BCE). This pharaoh, son of Aha, ruled from Memphis as the third pharaoh of the 1st Dynasty in the Archaic period before the Old Kingdom (q.v.). His importance to Nubia especially rests on his inscription showing his ships coming to Nubia to bind and slay A-Group (q.v.) Nubians and take others back hanging from the prow of his boats. Djer’s throne is shown on one vessel. This inscription was found on a rock at Jebel Sheikh Suleiman (q.v.) near the Second Cataract. It is the first historically attested instance, among very many to come, to illustrate a riverine attack against Nubia and the resulting Nubian leaders slain and captured by Egyptians. This is perhaps the earliest of such records, thus presaging millennia of periodically hostile relations between these two Nile valley peoples. This inscription was saved and removed to the Sudan National Museum in Khartoum.

Djer ruled for as long as fifty years. The products he acquired in Nubia, such as slaves, livestock, oils, resins, mica, feldspar, copper, ivory, gold, ebony, copper, amethyst, and carnelian, brought great wealth to this early pharaoh of Egyptian Dynastic history. Djer was buried at tomb O in Abydos, where his hieroglyphs are known from wood and ivory labels. One shows his name in a simple serekh that relates to a trip he took to Buto and Sais in the delta. Inscriptions to Djer are also known in Sinai.

As with Kerma (q.v.), human sacrifice of retainers or servants was practiced in Egypt at this time, but he may have been one of the last Egyptian pharaohs to do so. Although Djer’s remains are not known, some 300 of Djer’s servants were found, as were about 100 private stelae, of which the majority were women who were presumed to be his wives. Djer’s wife Merneith is known for her remaining arm and its lovely bracelets. It is possible that she ruled briefly after his death. Old Kingdom Kings Djet and Den followed Djer.

**Djoser, Zoser** (2668–2649 BCE). This 3rd Dynasty pharaoh of the Old Kingdom is most famed for launching the pyramid era with the construction of his stepped pyramid of Sakkara, the royal burial ground of Memphis. Djoser sought to expand the Old Kingdom and
control the region in Lower Nubia that had only been marginally brought under Egyptian authority under the previous pharaohs. Apparently accomplishing this objective, Djoser declared that Khnum (q.v.), the ancient Nubian ram god of the First Cataract, was invoked to control not only the region of Elephantine, where he was believed to reside, but also from there to Maharraqa (q.v.), about 130 kilometers farther south. The reference to Djoser’s invocation to the Nubian triad is noted in a famed “Famine Stela” at Seheil Island (q.v.) that was inscribed by the Ptolemies, who were seeking relief from a seven-year famine caused by lower Nile floods. The Ptolemies thought that by invoking Khnum (q.v.) and Imhotep, the deified architect of Djoser, they would relieve this ecological problem. Thus, this early declaration of Egyptian control of Nubia was a theme to be repeated or resisted often in the coming centuries.

**DODEKASCHOENOS.** Literally, the Dodekaschoenos region means the stretch of Lower Nubia that is twelve schoenos in length, that is, the region of about 125 kilometers from Aswan (q.v.) to Maharraqa (q.v.) in the south. From early Ptolemaic times, the region was under Greek control until the region was returned to Meroitic authority, allowing these Nubians to construct temples at Dakka and Dabod (qq.v.). In later Ptolemaic times, the Greeks returned to the region. When the Romans arrived with Caesar Augustus (q.v.), the Meroitic queen was so concerned about this threat to her territory that she and her large forces attacked Roman Aswan in 23 BCE. A counterpunitive raid led by Petronius (q.v.) temporarily returned the region to Romans garrisoned at Philae, Kertassi, Dakka, and Qasr Ibrim (qq.v.) and sought to negotiate a peace treaty negotiation on the Greek island of Samos to agree on a border at Maharraqa (then termed Takomposo). The permanent and effective boundary of Roman Egypt was usually at Aswan. Only in 67 CE did the Romans take any heightened interest in the region, when Nero (q.v.) sent an expedition to Nubia, possibly interested in a future raid there.

In 297 CE, the Romans withdrew totally from their exposed points in the Dodekaschoenos to the security of Aswan. Not being central to the rule of either Nile power, the region was most often a commilitium, or free buffer zone, rather than a place of Roman–Kushite conflict. At best, the Romans used this region as a periodic military and
political check against Nubians, much as the ancient Egyptians had done long before. One of the main interests there was to secure the Nubian quarries for construction and sculptural stone and, above all, to control access to the Wadi al Allaqi (q.v.) gold mines across from Dakka. In Roman times, agreements were made with Medjay (q.v.) soldiers and Roman officers in the Eastern and Western Deserts to try to control Nubian access to Egypt by land routes as well. Such was the case of Hadrian and Trajan at Philae and the Roman desert temple fort at Dush on the Forty-Days Road (Darb al-Arba'in [q.v.]) entering on the south of Kharga Oasis.

After the third century CE, the Romans withdrew fully from the Dodekaschoenos, and the region fell under Blemmye control as Meroë itself went into serious decline. The prohibition of Nubian worship of the Isis cult at Philae in 453 CE deepened the break between Roman Egypt and Meroë, furthering the occupation of the Dodekaschoenos by the X-Group (q.v.). They remained there until being evicted by the rise of Christianity, as evidenced in the King Silko (q.v.) inscription of about 536 CE. The loss of river and Red Sea trade between Roman Egypt and Meroë likely was one of the factors for Meroë’s decline.

DOGS. It is generally agreed that African dogs evolved from the wolf. In the ancient Middle East, dogs are known to be among the earliest domesticated animals and to have coexisted with the beginnings of agriculture. The first domestication was about 12,000 BCE, and the small, domesticated wolf Canis lupus sp. gradually transformed to Canis familiaris. From their western Asian origin, they spread into the Nile valley but advanced more slowly into sub-Saharan Africa. As is always the case in studying early domestication, domestic species must be sorted out from feral, or wild, Canis, which may have been consumed as food.

In ancient Nubia, dog burials appear in A-Group, Kadero, and Kadada (qq.v.) sites along with infant pot burials, thus suggesting the widespread extent of domestic dogs along the Nubian Nile in these early times, although such dog burials are not yet known elsewhere in the region in this period. Animal burials do appear in concurrent Egyptian and Nubian sites, apparently indicating the same degree of reverence for dogs in a funerary application. A Kadada case shows
both sacrificed dogs and dog burials, but dogs did not have their own cemeteries and were buried among humans. Egyptian animal burials can include a greater diversity of animals, whereas the Nubians seem to focus on dogs and goats in these early times while burying other animals, such as sheep, cattle, and horses, at later times. A very early case of domestic dogs in Nubia is found in about 3300 BCE at Esh-Shaheinab (q.v.) near modern Khartoum.

In Naqada I (Amratian) times in Egypt, a Predynastic bowl is known with an image of a bow hunter with four leashed dogs. Instances of dog burials are known by the time of Naqada III at the important site of Hierakonpolis. Predynastic dog burials with humans are known in Lower Egypt at Ma’adi and Digla and at Heliopolis. The role of dogs was at first devoted to hunting, but one may also presume a defensive role at these early times as well. Precisely when dog “races” got differentiated is not clear, but an increasing diversity of dog types appears in the Dynastic era, as certain forms were preferred for certain tasks. Something like a mastiff, a saluki greyhound, and a basset hound can be detected rather early, while being grouped under the general word tjesem, aasha or ash, uahr or uber, or the onomatopoeic auau. A more specific term was abiakur (Libyan greyhound).

A greyhound hunting gazelles is depicted in the tomb of Hemaka in the 1st Dynasty. Also in the 1st Dynasty is the case of a pet dog buried with his owner at Abydos. The dog’s name was carved on a stone. This type is reckoned to be the basenji, which still exists in Sudan. The basenji has a desert-colored coat with some white points and a curled tail. These dogs do not bark.

The saluki (selugi), or gazelle hound, is a tall, long-limbed, long-nosed dog from Egypt and western Asia. It can have long hair around its ears and legs. In the 5th Dynasty, in the mastaba tomb of Pehenuka at Sakkara an image of a dog grasps a jackal. Another instance is known at Giza, where the dog Abuwtiyuw has his name carved into the rock. Even more, he was provided with his own coffin, linen, and incense for the trip to the afterlife.

Deliberate dog burials are known for C-Group and Kerma cemeteries, and dogs are known in the contemporary Middle Kingdom. One of the best-known monuments to dogs in ancient Egypt is the stela of King Wahanakh Inyotef II in the First Intermediate period just prior to
the formation of the 11th Dynasty of the Middle Kingdom (q.v.). In this case, the stela shows this king with five of his dogs (ca. 2053 BCE). Perhaps by this time, the position of dogs in ancient Egypt was heading toward its peak, but generally dogs were appreciated for hunting and security while occupying a social position that was substantially less than cats. Perhaps the dogs of Inyotef II were valued as police dogs for his guards. His dogs were given names of Berber or Libyan origin, suggesting the source of these greyhounds. Paton (1925:20) gives the dog such names as Behuka (the oryx, or gazelle), Abiakur (the greyhound), Pehtes (Black[ie]), and Tekeru (the inseparable).

In the 12th Dynasty, the Middle Egyptian nomarch Senbi is shown behind a blind hunting gazelles, sheep, oryx, and other animals with his bow and arrow and his Nubian servant carrying water and arrows while his several dogs pursued the wounded game animals. A similar scene for the nomarch Ukhhotep (I) is known, with his dogs grasping felled animals; remarkably one includes a giraffe that must have been close to extinction by this time (Houlihan 1996: 44–45). Still at the same period, the tomb of Khuw at Assiut depicts a fast-looking gracile dog held by a leash (Houlihan 1996:80).

In Hyksos (q.v.) times, dogs appear on polychrome frescos, and buried puppies are known from Tel Haror. Most had their necks broken to join the burial of their masters. The subsequent New Kingdom images show hunting a lion with a spear, and a dog is known from the Valley of the Kings, probably in Rameside times. At the same location, the burial of the Nubian servant Maiherperi (q.v.) was with two lovely dog collars that, one may presume, were his charges when he was alive, although the remains of the dogs were not found, the dogs presumably being spared.

In the New Kingdom, the preferred hunting dog was the saluki, or selugi, type, which was featured in hunting scenes or as a companion to royalty. Dogs apparently were sufficiently valued that breeds from Asian, the Western Desert, and Nubia were imported for the behaviors that they were believed to have had. The site of greyhound kennels has been identified for Amarna. An inscription attributed to Tuthmosis III (twenty-third year of his reign) at Wadi Halfa indicates that his “rulers of great houses” (i.e., his followers) are “like dogs at his heels.” Dogs functioned in warfare at this time, if not before, and Tutankhamen (18th Dynasty) is shown using dogs as well as his war chariot and bow and arrows against his Nubian and Asiatic foes.
Dogs appear in Late times in the practice of pet dog burial for King Psusennes I of the 21st Dynasty at Tanis in the delta, where his favorite canine companion went into the burial chamber with the king. In the Nubian Piankhly stela, he considers that those he has conquered in Egypt are like “dogs at his feet.” The practice of dog burials continued into Meroitic times.

In Greco-Roman times, a great variety of animals were commonly mummified. Dogs were processed in bundles that were carefully cross bandaged to create geometric patterns while keeping the head exposed to reveal their canine nature. The association of dogs with the jackal god Anubis may account for the large number of dog burials. Dogs apparently were honored at Cynopolis (“Dog-Town”), but even there they were not transformed into deities. Some scholarship has tried to elevate or merge dogs with the very important desert jackal deity Anubis, but this clearly is in error. The species of dogs and jackals are always contrasted in Nubia and Egypt. In the same regard, the wolf was venerated at Lycopolis (Asyut), but these ancient peoples easily recognized the differences between wolves, jackals, foxes, and dogs.

DOMESTICATED FOWL. The three primary domesticated fowl in Egypt and Nubia were ducks, geese, and chickens. As depicted in art and in funerary offerings from Old Kingdom Egypt and Kerma (q.v.) on, ducks and geese dominate this realm of animal husbandry. Evidence that these two birds were domesticated early on and formed a staple of the ancient diet is overwhelming. However, similar evidence of domesticated chickens has been curiously absent until recent discoveries. One of the most notable signatures of Meroitic (q.v.) ceramic art is the rooster motif. Perhaps the most recognizable example of this motif is a cup excavated by the Coxe Expedition of 1907 from the Meroitic site of Shablul. Dated from 100 BCE to 250 CE, the cup depicts a rooster pecking for grains in the sand. The motif is an unusual one, for it depicts an animal rarely found in the region. Although the exact origins of the domesticated chicken are unknown, it is generally believed that it was introduced to Egypt from the Mediterranean in the Persian period (27th Dynasty, ca. 525 BCE). However, “we have no definite osteological evidence for the presence of domesticated fowl in Egypt until the beginning of the Greco-Roman period (ca. 332 BCE)” (MacDonald and Edwards
1993:587). This evidence, from the site of Tell Maskhuta in the eastern delta, provides proof of the existence of the bird in Lower Egypt during the Greco-Roman period.

The earliest pictorial evidence of the bird comes from a New Kingdom painted limestone fragment of a cock. In Nubia, archaeozoological research at Kerma and Meroë has so far provided no osteological evidence of this domesticated fowl. The earliest pictorial evidence occurs on a single ivory plaque from the tomb of Iretirou (25th Dynasty) at Nuri, dated to the mid-seventh century BCE. In the Ptolemaic period (332–30 BCE), depictions of the bird, mostly roosters, increase but are still relatively rare. It is believed that these rare finds depict the rooster as “exotic” rather than as a locally domesticated resource. Chicken skeletons are known for most of sub-Saharan Africa after 800 CE.

More concrete evidence of the domesticated chicken has recently been excavated at Qasr Ibrim (q.v.), where the remains of a small hen have been positively identified as those of the domesticated species (*Gallus gallus*). Dated to the late fifth or early sixth century CE, the importance of this find is threefold. First, it is the earliest known osteological evidence of the domesticated chicken south of Egypt. Second, it provides evidence for continuing contact between Egypt and Sudan during the post-Meroitic period. Finally, and most important, the remains suggest that domesticated chickens (*Gallus gallus*) were introduced into sub-Saharan Africa through Nubia during the period from the time of Christ to 550 CE (cf. MacDonald and Edwards 1993). [by k. rhodes]
DONGOLA, KINGDOM OF. Dongola was already in existence in the seventh century since it gave a heroic resistance to the Islamic military forces of ‘Amr Ibn al-As, who conquered Egypt in 638–640 CE. Indeed, his confidence was much shaken by the skilled archers and cavalry of Christian Nubia (q.v.) who defeated the Arabs near Dongola. Another attack in 651–652 CE was also blocked or else fought to an unstable truce, or *baqt*, as long as the Nubians produced 360 slaves for the Islamic Egyptians each year.

Thus, by about 690–710 CE, in the wake of these repulsed attacks, the Christian (probably Dyophysite) kingdom of Dongola was formed through the unification of the earlier Monophysite (q.v.) Christian states of Nobatia and Makuria (qq.v.). The earlier existence of Makuria makes this transition to a unified state rather murky. The town of (Old) Dongola had been the capital of Makuria, and Faras was the capital of Nobatia. In the face of continued Muslim pressure from Egypt, the fractious Nubian states managed to unify their kingdom and fortify their resistance to Islamic Egypt. Dongola’s first prominent Monophysite (q.v.) king was Merkurios (697–707 CE), known from his proclamation at Taifa.

The Dongola kings may have succeeded in invading Egypt as far as Fustat (Old Cairo) in about 740 CE under the Dongola king Cyriacus. A few years later, in 758 CE, and even into the early ninth century, the Egyptians complained that the Nubians were years behind in their slave payments. Another Christian Nubian invasion of Egypt reached Akhmin in 862 CE, and attacks were reported in Upper Egypt on Kom Ombo and Edfu by the Christian Nubian armies on occasion. These attacks probably did not result in actual control, but they continue until at least 935 CE, during the tumultuous Late period of Abbassid rule of Egypt. The Christian armies of Nubia also were militarily engaged with the Blemmyes or Beja (qq.v.) on some occasions. It should be recalled that much of Upper Egypt was still sympathetic with Coptic Christianity, and even by 962 CE, substantial portions of Upper Egypt temporarily fell under the authority of the kingdom of Dongola. From the tenth to the fourteenth centuries, the kingdom of Dongola occupied mainly a territory from the First to the Fourth Cataracts on the Nubian Nile.
Following the collapse of the Fatimid dynasty in Egypt in 1171, the Ayyubids were in power, and Turanshah (q.v.), the brother of Sultan Saladin al-Ayyubi al-Tikriti, attacked Nubia and seized Qasr Ibrim (q.v.) in 1173 CE. There he slaughtered pigs and looted the cotton stores. In 1175 CE, he sent his ambassador to Dongola and reported that the king there was modestly dressed, that only the palace of the king was reported as a substantial structure, and that the rest of the houses were just “huts of straw.” This was the height of Fatimid penetration, and a few years later the Egyptians were driven out of Qasr Ibrim, which was restored to Nubian control for about a century.

After seizing power from the Ayyubids in 1250 CE, the Mameluke rulers of Egypt renewed their military interest in Nubia. The Ayyubids saw internal divisions in Dongola either to their military advantage or as presenting a threat to regional stability. Such was the complex condition of the succession struggle in Dongola between Prince Shekanda and King David (q.v.). The last known Christian king of Dongola was Kudanbes, who ruled from 1310 to 1323 CE, when the Mamelukes finally defeated him. This apparently ended Christianity in Nubia (q.v.), although small Christian enclaves, such as Dotawo (q.v.), remained in Lower Nubia, and the kingdom of Alwa at Soba lasted until 1504. The confusing rise of Christianity in Dongola matched its rather cloudy decline. This was because the Beni Kanz (q.v.) Nubians were early Muslims but also had close kin relations to the leaders of Christian Dongola.

**Dongola (New).** It would be easy to confuse Old Dongola on the eastern bank of the Nile with New Dongola on the western bank. Old Dongola of the Christian and Funj eras is essentially an archaeological site at the center of ancient Nubia. On the eastern bank are the ruins of the Kawa (more ancient Gem-Aton) temple of Taharka. To the north, one finds the earlier archaeological site of Kerma. Refugee Mamelukes fleeing Muhammad Ali in Egypt largely founded (New) Dongola in 1811 CE. Dongola’s most famous figure is Muhammad Ahmed El Mahdi, son of a Dongolawi boat builder and founder of the Mahdist movement in 1883 CE.

**Dongolawi, Danagla, Dunqulawi.** These are Arabized people having many Nubian elements from the region of Dongola (q.v.). They have had a long interaction with the Ja’aliyin, as both
have migrated throughout Sudan as merchants and traders (Jellaba) from at least the days of the Funj. In earlier times, they often had *shillukh* (scarification, body decoration [q.v.]) on their cheeks consisting of three vertical cuts. This practice is rapidly disappearing but persists for some older women.

**DORGINARTI ISLAND.** Dorginarti is the site of a New Kingdom or Late period fort at the Second Cataract just upstream of old Wadi Halfa.

**DOTAWO, DAW, DAO, DO.** Dotawo ("below Do") was a small, late Christian kingdom located in Lower Nubia near the Second Cataract. It is known from textual references in Old Nubian. Its domain ranged from Qasr Ibrim to Jebel Adda (qq.v.) or possibly farther south into the Butn al-Hajr (q.v.). According to William Adams, some eight minor kings—George, Basil, Paul, Simon, David (q.v.), Siti, Elteeit, and Joel (q.v.)—are known from Dotawo from the mid-twelfth century until its record fades three centuries later. Based on linguistic and geographic evidence, it is probable that Dotawo may be the same as Jebel Adda. Evidently, they often were tributary to the king of Mukurra at Dongola (q.v.). The closing chapter for Christian Dotawo is with the proclamation of the Muslim leader Kanz al-Dawla as king in 1323. His Beni Kanz followers probably were subdued in 1365 as Egyptian Muslims swept into the region and the ruling king of Dongola (Mukurra) took up residence at Dotawo.

After the arrival of Islam in the early fourteenth century, the kingdom of Dotawo was much weakened, but it survived along with that of Alwa (q.v.) until about the late fifteenth century. That it was trapped between expanding Islam in Egypt and declining Christianity in Nubia probably explains the confusion about the extent and allegiance of Dotawo. Dotawo possibly was a refuge for Christians fleeing from Islamic excesses in Egypt, as is supposedly the case for Atiri Island (q.v.).

**DUNGEIL, DANGEL.** This substantial Meroitic (q.v.) walled town site and perhaps market center lies eight kilometers north of the modern town of Berber on the eastern bank of the Nile (q.v.). Nearby on the western bank is Jebel Nakheru, which sports a stone fortress and drystone buildings that were used in post-Meroitic times and reused
in Islamic times. The recent salvage excavation by the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto has begun to change our views of the scope and nature of Meroitic times in Upper Nubia (q.v.) that have generally focused on Napata and Meroë (q.v.) as the royal capitals. So far, extensive red brick ruins are known, including walls or fortification, temple sites, and a rare stone stela inscription in Meroitic demotic (q.v.). Future research will fill in important missing information.

DUNQUL OASIS. Dunqul Oasis lies on the wide-ranging Western Desert route probably taken by the ancient trading expeditions by Harkuf (q.v.). The route starts on the western shore of Aswan, probably just north of the Qubat al Howa, and then stretches west-southwest into the Libyan Desert to Kurkur Oasis and along a region known as Sinn el Kaddab to near Dunqul Oasis. From Dunqul, the route continues in a wide sweep of Lower Nubia some eighty to ninety kilometers away from the river and finally on to Selima Oasis. Both Dunqul and Selima Oases have northbound tracks that connect to the southern end of Kharga Oasis. This complex network of desert tracks had multiple purposes in the most remote times of human settlement. They provided routes for livestock shipments, security networks for desert patrols, perhaps some use for access to quarrying sites, and smugglers’ shortcuts away from the Nile. From Selima, one may proceed back to the Nile at Kerma or downstream or farther south to Kordofan.

DUWEISHAT. The Duweishat region is situated close to the Nile, south of Semna (q.v.), and is known for its productive gold mines. Much of the gold of Kush came from the mines of Duweishat. However, mining in this region apparently was done on an intermittent basis, such as when the treasury was low or perhaps in cooler, winter weather.

– E –

EBONY. Ebony (Diospyros ebenum) designates the family of Ebenaceae, order Ebenales, of dicotyledonous tropical fruit-bearing trees, such as the persimmon. It is native to Africa. Its taxonomic and common name is derived from the ancient Egyptian word *hbny* for the same tree. A luxury item imported into the Nile valley, its hard, heavy, dark (black)
and durable wood was used for furniture and decorative woodwork. As a tropical wood, ebony was available to Egypt and the Mediterranean primarily through trade with the different peoples occupying Upper Nubia, who in turn traded for the product with interior Africa. It was also available from the land of Punt (q.v.) and later through the Axumite port of Adulis (q.v.). It is generally believed that the earliest trade in ebony occurred between Neolithic Upper Nubia and A-Group (q.v.) of Lower Nubia (ca. 4000 BCE). However, the earliest definitive evidence of an organized trade in ebony occurs between Predynastic Upper Egypt and the Lower Nubian A-Group that in turn likely procured the product from pre-Kerma and Kerma (q.v.) peoples in Upper Nubia. According to Trigger (1989), the growing wealth and prosperity of Predynastic Gerzean culture presumably created a market for exotic goods from sub-Saharan Africa, demand for which increased sharply with the development of Dynastic culture. Records from the 6th Egyptian dynasty (ca. 2300–2100 BCE) chronicle several expeditions to the Land of Yam, generally believed to lay in the Dongola (q.v.) reach, with its capital at

Kushite porters carrying ebony logs in the New Kingdom at Baet al Wali temple from Ramses II.
Kerma, in order to procure ebony and other luxury goods. Indeed, throughout Dynastic history, ebony is frequently found depicted as tribute received from the southern lands of Kush and Wawat (q.v.). A scene from the Theban tomb of Rekhmire (1450 BCE) depicts Nubians presenting ebony logs as tribute. The importance of ebony as a luxury good is also evidenced at the Meroitic site of Wad ben Naqa, where ebony was found stockpiled in a storeroom of the site’s palace. After the fall of the Meroitic Kingdom around 350 CE, and the consequent collapse of lower Nile valley trade routes with interior Africa, ebony appears to have been acquired primarily from Adulis. Indeed, by the Christian period (q.v.), ebony goods found in Sudan were imported entirely from Egypt. [by k. rhodes]

18th DYNASTY. See AHMOSE I; AHMOSE-NEFERTARI; AKHENATON; AMENHOTEP I, II, AND III; HATSHEPSUT; HOREMHEB; KING’S SON OF KUSH; MAIHERPRI; TUTHMOSIS I, II, III, AND IV; TUTANKHAMEN; VICE-ROY’S OF KUSH.

ELEPHANTINE ISLAND (YEB, IEBEW, ABU). Elephantine Island is located at the northern end of the First Cataract at Aswan. It was the capital of the first nome of Upper Egypt. It has an amazingly long and complex history, with significant military, religious, and human occupation for virtually all periods of Egypto-Nubian history. Its strategic position offered military security at the frontier trade post of Swenet or Syene (Aswan). Predynastic black and red pottery attests to the earliest occupation at Elephantine. It was from Elephantine that the famed expedition to Yam (q.v.) was led by the trader/governor Harkuf (q.v.). Its position was also such that it was the first place on the Egyptian Nile to detect the annual flood. Accordingly, it was a Predynastic center for the worship of the fertility god of primordial waters, or Nun, as well as Hapy the Nile god, who lived in the rocks of Bigeh Island just upstream. The fertility god Min was also celebrated from Predynastic times at Elephantine as well as the holy trinity of the ram god Khnum and his two consorts Satet and Anqet (q.q.v.). The antiquity of these fertility shrines also accounted for the construction of a Nilometer in Dynastic times that was renewed in Islamic times. It was also a strategic political location for regional administration under the hekaibs (“brave-hearted rulers”), who ruled for the central govern-
ment or, when the central authority collapsed, ruled in their own names.

Its access to alabaster and granite quarries was also important for the trade and transport around Elephantine.

The very complex stratification of Elephantine is exemplified in the following list of temples that were either newly constructed or rebuilt starting in the Old Kingdom (6th Dynasty, Satet Temple for the “Keepers of the Southern Gate”); Middle Kingdom (Funerary Chapels to the Hekaibs; a chapel of Mentuhotep II of the 11th Dynasty and other structures for Senusret I of the 22nd Dynasty); New Kingdom (18th Dynasty, Satis Temple of Amenhotep II and Hatshepsut, 19th Dynasty, Ramses II); Late period Khnum temple of Nectanebo II and inscriptions of Psamtik II of the 26th Dynasty; and Greco-Roman times (Satet Temple, Khnum Temple, and newly sited temple from Kalabsha). The tombs of Harkuf and many hekaibs (such as Pepinakht, Mekhu, Sebni, Sirenput I, and Sirenput II) are carved into the sandstone high above on the western banks known as the Qubbat el-Howa (Tombs of the Winds).

In Persian times, Herodotus noted that Elephantine was half Egyptian and half Nubian. As early as the sixth century and certainly in the fifth century BCE, it was the base for a group of Jewish and other mercenary soldiers who were stationed there to guard the southern gateway to Egypt. During the period from 587 to 515 BCE, the Jewish temple may have been the only place where Jewish rituals could be freely observed. The Jewish temple worshiped Jehovah and recognized the other local deities of Satet and Anqet (qq.v.). However, the Jews’ relationship with a foreign occupying power (Persians or Greeks) did not serve their ties with the occupied Egyptians. Elephantine, in Nubia, has produced the some of the oldest Greek papyri known in Egypt, but the Jewish records there were kept largely in Aramaic. They include a wide variety of documents relating to marriage, property, legal disputes, and divorce.

The marginality of Jews at this time and place was worsened because they had effectively lost control of Jerusalem and the Jewish community was entering its great diaspora. This socioreligious isolation and political marginality made the Jews of Elephantine vulnerable. This finally came to a head when the Jewish practices, including sheep sacrifice, were seen as an outrage to the local beliefs that were built on the holy reverence of the ram god Khnum,
whose central cult was on the same island. According to J. M. Modrzejewski, in about 410 BCE, Egyptian nationalist rebels used this practice as a pretext for attacking and destroying the Jewish temple at Elephantine. An application and permission to rebuild was granted sometime between 406 and 401 BCE, and it likely was rebuilt, only to be closed and destroyed in the early fourth century. It was located on a major street in southern Elephantine, but its precise building foundation or building stones have not been located. In Islamic times, Elephantine remained significant, and Khedive Isma‘il renewed the Nilometer in 1870. German and Swiss archaeologists have done an impressive job of reconstructing the history of Elephantine, and the two museums there as well as the restored archaeological site should be visited along with the Nubian Museum, which has a number of objects from Elephantine.

**ELEPHANTS.** The history of elephants in prehistoric Nubia begins at least 65 million years ago, long before human evolution, but later climatic shifts and human hunting pressure in the late Pleistocene caused only two elephant genera to survive in Africa: *Loxodonta africana* and *Elephas iolensis*. Today, now only *Loxodonta* sp. remain. In about 25,000 BCE, nomadic human bands occupied both Egypt and Nubia and depended for their survival on hunting wild animals and fishing in the abundantly stocked river. The material remains of these early inhabitants include their stone tools and numerous drawings on the rocks along the Nile valley, showing them hunting giraffes, antelopes, elephants, and gazelles. Objects from 4000 BCE show that Nubians and Egyptians used ivory (q.v.) for jewelry, inlays, tools, needles, and awls. Based on ethnographic parallels, bone, hair, and the foot callus probably had special uses for bracelets, anklets, and necklaces. Hides were likely used as shields, bags, and drumheads. The word “elephant” comes from the Greek word *elephas*, meaning “ivory” (q.v.), but where they got this name is not known.

Drawings of giraffes, antelopes, elephants, and gazelles appeared as petroglyphs and on A-Group pottery from 3500 to 3000 BCE, when Nubian and Egyptian craftsmen were already working ivory and ebony to produce figurines, amulets, ornamental containers, and furniture fittings. However, by early Dynastic times, the elephant and gi-
Raffe had disappeared from Egypt and Lower Nubia while they were still present in Upper Nubia at this time. During the 6th Dynasty, Harkhuf (q.v.) brought back ebony, incense, oil, leopard skins, elephant tusks, and throwing sticks from his expeditions to Kerma (q.v.), but after this time imported ivory and ebony became rare in Egyptian graves.

Clearly, the Meroites were familiar with the art of taming African elephants, and they used these animals in military campaigns. Especially at Musawwarat es Sufra (q.v.), the elephant was frequently represented in relief and sculpture (Wenig 1978:i.89). In the temple of Musawwarat is a relief of a king wearing the crowns of both Upper and Lower Egypt and riding bareback on an elephant. In this unique representation of an elephant being ridden, one may see some possible Indian influence. By this time, Meroë was indirectly in touch with India through the kingdom of Axum, which traded with India (Arkell 1961:166). At Musawwarat es-Sufra, on the western wall, Apedemak (q.v.) appears standing on two caparisoned elephants. A line is attached to the trunk of the first elephant and is then tied around the necks of the kneeling prisoners (Zabkar 1975:6). On the northwestern wall of the Lion Temple, a file of elephants leads prisoners on ropes. Another relief found on the inner walls of the temple is one of a lion and elephant leashed together, the leash held by the right hand of Apedemak, who is seated in the upper register above the two animals (Zabkar 1975:8).

The elephant was also featured as an architectural element in temple design, sculptured elephants functioning as column bases (Wenig 1978:i.89). The bases in the form of lions and elephants in Musawwarat es Sufra appeared at a time when the Kushite art of Napata (q.v.) was still flourishing. A god riding an elephant appears on a column in the Temple of Apedemak at Musawwarat es Sufra (Wenig 1978:ii.68). The unique architectural detail of the Central Temple at Musawwarat es Sufra of a wall projection in the form of an elephant and other numerous representations of elephants at the same site suggest that this animal was the object of local cult worship (Wenig 1978:ii.77). Or perhaps the center was used for the trading or training of war and ceremonial elephants, the ramps allowing the movement of the beasts through the complex. Another theory is that enclosures were used to house the animals required for the cult ceremonies (Welsby 1996:146).
The Ptolemaic period was the “Golden Age” of war elephants. They functioned like massive bowling balls to mow down enemy lines, whether for the Persians against Alexander or at Pyrrhus in southern Italy. A typical war elephant would be furnished with five plates of iron joined together by rings and fastened around the elephant’s ears and head by a complex of chains. The wooden castle on its back housed a number of archers and spearmen. The armies of the Ptolemies used the small African elephants from Meroë to match the Indian elephants of the Seleucids. An inscription from the Red Sea port of Adulis set up by Ptolemy III indicates that the Ptolemies also procured their own war elephants. “The paramount King Ptolemaios . . . went to war with Asia accompanied by Troglodytic and Ethiopian elephants which his father and he himself, as the first ones, have captured from those countries” (Welsby 1996:175–76).

Ptolemy II’s (q.v.) campaign in the 270s BCE was followed by almost three-quarters of a century of sustained diplomatic and quasi-military contact between Egypt and the kingdom of Meroë. Elephant-hunting expeditions, sometimes numbering hundreds of men, often visited Upper Nubia either from the north via the Nile valley or from the east via the Red Sea port of “Ptolemaïs of the Hunts” (Burstein 1995:108–9). Active Ptolemaic interest in Nubian elephants ended in the last decade of the third century BCE because of the unpredictable performance of Ptolemy IV’s elephant corps at the battle of Raphia (Burstein 1995:108–9). After the extinction of the North African elephant at the end of the third century CE or early fourth century CE, attempts to domesticate the African elephant stopped. [by Valerie G. de Liedekerke and R. Lobban]

11th DYNASTY. See MENTUHOTEP II.

EMERY, WALTER BRYAN (1903–1971). English-born Emery was considered one of the great twentieth-century archaeologists, as he was the director of the archaeological survey of Lower Nubia during 1929–1934, due to the construction of the Low Dam at Aswan. He was also a colonel in British military intelligence as well as a diplomat and professor with almost fifty years of experience in Egypt.

His excavations, often with L. P. Kirwan, included major excavations at al-Amarna, Armant, Wadi es-Sebua, and the rich X-Group
tumulae at Ballana and Qustul from the fourth to sixth centuries CE. Much of this collection is displayed in Rooms 40, 44, and 45 of the Egyptian National Museum. His pioneering work at the fortresses and towns at Buhen (in 1957), Ikkur, and Kuban (q.v.) was significant. From 1935 on, he was famed for his discovery of the tombs of the Apis bull mothers at Saqqara in Egypt. Emery published a popular book in 1967 titled *Lost Land Emerging*, which made his work accessible to the public.

**ENEMIES.** Naturally, the concept of enemies or rebels is highly relative to those in power or those contesting that power. From the time of Djer’s inscription of bound and executed Nubians, the pattern of rivals along the Nile was well established. Kerma was projected and described by Old or Middle Kingdom Egyptians as their enemy. No doubt the feeling was mutual. Nubians were projected as vile rebels in numerous references and images in the New Kingdom. Egyptians of this time conducted endless raids into Nubia, given the great human, natural, and animal wealth of that land. Naturally, Nubians did not want to lose control of their resources. Generally, one may say that when Egypt was strong, it was not an auspicious time for Nubia and that when Egypt was weak, this represented a relaxation of Egyptian control in the lands to the south. Thus, the history between these ancient lands is one of rivalry at times, cooperation at others, and domination over Nubia by Egyptians in the New Kingdom and domination of Egypt by Nubians in the 25th Dynasty. At other times, raids and punitive missions seemed endless, particularly in the buffer or battle zone of Lower Nubia. While a comprehensive list of such engagements may never be completed, many conflict and raids are documented.

In the Archaic period, Egyptians occupied Elephantine, and once control of Egypt was consolidated, the Old Kingdom pharaohs, starting with Djer, Sneferu, and Pepi I, did have military operations in Lower Nubia and perhaps were among the first Egyptians to travel to Punt on the Red Sea coast. Other *hekaibs* of Aswan, such as Harkuf, traveled to Nubia for peaceful trade in the First Intermediate period.

In the Middle Kingdom’s 11th Dynasty, Mentuhotep II (q.v.) attacked Lower Nubia but did not manage to consolidate his control. A maritime trip to Punt led by Hanenu was recorded in the 11th Dynasty.
The active control of Lower Nubia was achieved by the Egyptian pharaohs Amenemhat I, I, and III (qq.v.) and Senusoret I and III (qq.v.) in the 12th Dynasty of the Middle Kingdom. Indeed, Senusoret III had himself deified in Nubia for added legitimacy. During the height of the Old and Middle Kingdoms, major mud-brick fortresses were constructed by Egyptians to secure their Nubian claims.

It was in the imperial days of the New Kingdom that raids were especially persistent in Lower and Upper Nubia after breaking the Kerma–Hyksos (qq.v.) alliance that curtailed Egyptian power in the Second Intermediate period. Raids into Nubia in the 18th Dynasty are known for Amenhotep II, III, and IV; for Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis I, III, and IV; and for Tutankhamen. In the 19th Dynasty, Seti I, Merneptah, and the audacious Ramses II (q.v.) all conducted raids into Nubia. In the 20th Dynasty, most of the early Rameside pharaohs or their viceroys of Nubia waged war and raids in Nubia.

Finally, when it came time for Nubians to rule Egypt in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), it is striking that Egyptians were almost never depicted as enemies. Certainly their chief concern was with Assyrians as enemies. While numerous Assyrian images show that Nubians are their Egyptian rivals, one is hard pressed to find such images of Assyrians drawn by Nubians, although perhaps such existed and were removed. At the Kawa temple, Taharka does depict Libyans as his enemies. In Napata and Meroitic times, the ethnic names of enemies are listed and images show them hog-tied, and at Naqa images of a regnant king and queen are shown smiting enemies that one may presume to be Blemmyes. In post-Meroitic times, such as in inscriptions by Kings Karamadoye and Silko (qq.v.), Blemmyes are described as being defeated once and for all. The Islamo–Christian rivalry on the Nile in medieval times produces abundant textual examples of the enemy status that was held by both, while the historic baqt was a serious, long-lasting effort to come to terms with this potentially conflict-prone relationship.

ERATOSTHENES OF CYRENE. Eratosthenes was of Greek origin and probably born in the Greek colony of Cyrene in neighboring Libya. He studied under Zeno and Arcesilaus. However, his fame rests on his notable achievements in Alexandria, where he served as the head of its famed library from about 246 to 225 BCE. In this capacity, he became one of the earliest scientific geographers and math-
 mathematicians. He was a classic court scholar who also wrote poetry, and he had eclectic interests in cultural diversity, climatology, astronomy, and chronology.

Of special relevance to Meroë was his measurement of the inclination of the noon sun that he arranged to be taken in that ancient town as well as in Aswan and Alexandria, which are approximately equidistant. These three towns were considered geodetic stations on his first meridian. On the basis of these observations, he was able to determine that the world was round, and he was the first to calculate the circumference of the earth almost exactly. He also considered that the mountains in equatorial Africa were the source of the Nile. Eratosthenes noted the “Megabari,” or the Blemmyes (q.v.), as occupying the eastern bank of the Nile between Egypt and Meroë.

ERGAMENES. See ARKAMANI I, II.

ESARHADDON (680–669 BCE). Following a palace murder plot, the elite of Nineveh in Assyria regrouped, and Esarhaddon was placed on the throne. This Assyrian king descended from the Sargonid dynasty of Assyria while it also ruled as the 9th Dynasty of Babylon. His relevance to Nubia is that he ruled Assyria while it was expanding westward into the Levant, into Israel, and ultimately into Egypt, which was then under the control of the Nubian 25th Dynasty (q.v.). The Assyrians were a central foreign policy concern to the Nubian rulers of Egypt at a time of an ancient regional “world war.”

Taharka (q.v.) already had considerable personal, practical, and military experience in resisting the Assyrian expansion. From fomenting revolts in Phoenicia, leading cavalry charges in Palestine, and building political alliances in Israel, he knew that the Assyrians were a formidable foe. Following the death of Sennacherib in 680 BCE, it was now Esarhaddon who had to be confronted.

Esarhaddon gained the Assyrian throne in about 680 BCE with the active council of his mother, Naqia. She had been a young wife of Sennacherib, first known as the queen consort of Sennacherib, and later as the queen mother of Esarhaddon. Naqia was of Babylonian origin, and she endorsed the idea of reconstructing Babylon after it had been razed in the earlier campaign of her husband. The tactic of creating subservient vassal kings had long been an objective in Assyrian conquests.
Esarhaddon applied this technique against the vassal king Ba’alu of Tyre in Phoenicia, who was prohibited from even opening a letter without a Qipu (Assyrian official) present. Since Ba’alu had been given support by Taharka, Esarhaddon formulated plans to attack Egypt itself. Esarhaddon also made an object lesson of King Asukhili when he was brought to Nineveh humiliatingly bound to a bear, a dog, and a pig. The king of Sidon, Abdimilkutte, was not so lucky. He was overthrown and beheaded by Esarhaddon in 677 BCE.

In Judaea, Esarhaddon threatened King Manasseh (696–641 BCE) with arrest and transformed him into another vassal king. Deportation of troublesome populations was also a tactic used, such as in the case of Sidonites after the execution of their king. Many Israelites were deported after the capture of Samaria. Yet tolerance and syncretism of religious belief of the conquered presented no special problem for the Assyrians, who used the gods of vassals to threaten restive populations. For example, Esarhaddon informed the king of Tyre that if he resisted, the forces of his gods Bethel and Ba’al would sink his ships. Despite such techniques, his attempt to control Egypt dangerously overextended his empire, which was already beset with internal intrigue and rebellions in Persia and Babylon.

Annoyed by the fact that Taharka had supported these Phoenicians, Esarhaddon then began to address the “problem Nubian” rulers of Egypt. In 674–673 BCE, he attacked the eastern Egyptian delta to punish Taharka’s continued diversionary support of the forces in Judaea and Sidon. Taharka’s forces were temporarily driven back to Memphis. However, sometime thereafter, Esarhaddon also withdrew, having been repulsed farther up the coast at the Philistine frontier town of Ashkelon in 673 BCE. This was not far from where Taharka had fought the forces of Sennacherib as a youth in about 701 BCE. This withdrawal allowed Taharka to return to his frontline capital at Tanis in the eastern delta.

This unstable seesaw pattern of military and political clashes continued. In his tenth regnal year (671–670 BCE), Esarhaddon again crossed the Sinai to return to the delta and to drive Taharka out in a second, renewed campaign. Wanting to make his point even more convincing, Esarhaddon advanced farther to attack Memphis, where he actually captured some of Taharka’s unlucky family members. Taharka’s son Ushanahuru was taken as a prisoner back to Assyria, where he was portrayed on the Zinjirli stela in northern Syria. Like
the victories over Lachish by Sennacherib, Esarhaddon carved images of his “Ethiopian” captives into the stone plaques of his palace.

With the capture of Memphis, Esarhaddon carried off much loot and property from the 25th Dynasty administration. Taharka was reported as wounded, but he managed to escape and probably established his capital at Thebes, where he was still welcomed by the local priests. The presence of Esarhaddon in Memphis and the Egyptian delta was also long enough for him to appoint subservient local officials, including Necho I, as the puppet king of Sais and Memphis. This was to plant a seed that later grew into the Saite 26th Dynasty.

Angered by this insult to his authority and pained by the loss of his son, Taharka again sought to return to the delta in 671–670 BCE. Taharka may have believed that the second withdrawal of Esarhaddon was based on an Assyrian fear of being politically and militarily overextended. Moreover, Taharka may have thought that Esarhaddon would be content to celebrate the Memphis victory at Nimrud and in time tire of remote Egyptian campaigns. The now familiar drama quickly resumed, and in 669–668 BCE, Esarhaddon returned to Egypt with his army for the third frustrating time.

But this time, a new twist arose. Unexpectedly, Esarhaddon died on the way in his twelfth regnal year (669 BCE) in the month of Aras-sammu (October–November) on the tenth day. His twelve years as the king of Assyria were over. His son Shamash-shumukin was already appointed as the king of occupied Babylon, so another son, Ashurbanipal, became the new king of Assyria. His first task was to continue his father’s military campaign in Egypt. Any satisfaction that the news of Esarhaddon’s death may have had for Taharka was short lived. Immediately, Ashurbanipal (q.v.; 668–626 BCE), the fourth king in the Sargonid dynasty, restored the momentum of the struggle against Taharka. This time, however, Ashurbanipal went further than only expelling Taharka from Memphis. Ashurbanipal reinstalled Necho I as puppet king of Memphis and Sais, where his father, Esarhaddon, had originally set him up. More boldly still, Ashurbanipal’s cavalry advanced to the holy city of Thebes, which was looted by his forces in 667 BCE.

ETHIOPIA, AETHIOPIA. The ancient reference to Ethiopia is drawn from the Greek term for “Land of the Burnt Faces.” Essentially, it was their word for “Nubia” or, more generally, for the lands lying to
the south of (above) Egypt. Lands to the west were glossed by the referent “Libya.” The term “Africa” was not used at this time except for perhaps a small portion of northeastern Tunisia. This ancient word “Ethiopia” did not mean the modern nation of the same name. To the extent that modern Ethiopia was known, it was either Punt or a variant of Abyssinia. The shifting territorial application of these ancient terms has complicated the study of Nubia. One intriguing issue relates to the Greek storytelling slave Aesop (q.v.), who appears to have been so-called as a corruption of his name “Ethiopi,” thus raising the possibility that he was of Nubian origin.

EXECRATION TEXTS. In the psychological preparation for war or conflict, it was popular to write insulting texts about one’s enemies. These texts could be inscribed on clay effigies or on potsherds. Sometimes they were buried and/or broken to have a positive magical control over the despised enemies. The execrated text figures are often found in Egyptian forts in Nubia.

EZANA, AEZANAS. See AXUM.

FADICHA (FADIJA). This Nubian culture and language is most closely related to Sukkot among the several Nubian dialectics of Kenzi, Mahas, and Donagla. It is the language of Nubians mostly in the region around Wadi Halfa or the ancient Second Cataract border region. Interestingly, the Nubian dialectics of Fadicha, Sukkot, and Mahas are more closely related and are geographically contiguous, while the northernmost Kenzi and southernmost Danagla (q.q.v.) are closer to each other in lexical lists. This reveals that the Fadicha and their linguistic relatives may have been more isolated, while the Kenuz and Beni Kanz (q.q.v.) were an intrusive group bringing Islam and their Nubian dialect through the Fadicha area but directly on to (Old) Dongola.

FARAS (BUKHARAS, PACHORAS). Faras West was the site of a great cathedral in medieval times. One noted twelfth-century painting at Faras West shows a Nubian prince seated in the lap of Christ.
The prince is wearing a crown with a crescent as a version of the Nubian eparch’s crown. See also Christianity in Nubia.

**Feddan.** A feddan is a Sudanese unit of land area equal to 1.038 acres. It is measured by “ropes” of a standard length and has been the practice in Egypt and Nubia from ancient times.

**Female Circumcision.** See Circumcision, Female.

**Ferlini, Giuseppe** (ca. 1800–1876). This Italian military doctor, traveler, and reckless “archaeologist” officially served the Turco-Egyptian occupation of Sudan from about 1830 to about 1837. He and an Albanian businessman “excavated” the royal pyramid burial field at Meroë, but looting might be a better description since he sold the objects he removed at great profit to the German museums in Munich and Berlin, where they still reside. Perhaps most notable of his “work” was the discovery of the famed jewels of Queen Amanishakete (q.v.) found in the superstructure of her pyramid (Bejrawiya north 6), which was thereby destroyed in the process in about 1837. His quest for loot took him throughout the region of Meroë and probably Ben Naqa (qq.v.).

**Firka.** This Lower Nubian settlement was on the eastern bank of the Nile just downstream of Sai Island (q.v.), or about 160 kilometers south of Wadi Halfa (q.v.) in the Butn al-Hajr (q.v.) region. Some C-Group (q.v.) graves exist near the northern cemetery, with the largest tumuli and a southern cemetery with smaller tumuli that neighbors a much later Christian graveyard. Firka was the site of an administrative center or a very wealthy family whose remains are still obscure, but they may be intrusive Nobatae. No Meroitic (q.v.) inscriptions or funerary ba statues (q.v.) have been found, so this site is considered of very late Merotic or post-Meroitic X-Group times of the Ballana or Tangasi cultures (qq.v.; ca. 400–600 CE). This assemblage includes painted pottery, bronze lamps, bowls, ewers, ladles, and strainers and a silver goblet, bowl, and anklet.

A carnelian signet ring of Commodus (d. 192 CE), if contemporary, suggests an earlier date. It has substantial tumulus tombs (8 to 10 meters high) of noble and smaller tumuli for ordinary citizens, including evidence of some human and common animal sacrifice during burials.
that are reminiscent of those of previous nobles at Kurru (q.v.). That Firka was linked to the Red Sea is shown by the presence of red coral beads, but its ties to the past endure with Isis (q.v.) symbolism. The latest graves at Firka are dated to early Christianity in Nubia (q.v.). Especially the steep island of Firkinarti was used at this last period. L. P. Kirwan of Oxford University excavated Firka from 1934 to 1935.

**FIRST INTERMEDIATE PERIOD** (2181–2040 BCE). The First Intermediate period of Egypt falls between the collapse of the 6th Dynasty of the Old Kingdom and the start of the 11th Dynasty of the Middle Kingdom. Since archaeologists recognize that Nubian strength is often at periods of Egyptian weakness, this gave Nubians some chance to recover lost territory and economic sovereignty. More specifically, this relaxed Egyptian control of Nubia and allowed for the expansion of its oldest state of Yam/Kerma (q.v.) and the intrusion of C-Group people into Lower Nubia, thereby launching the recurrent theme of rivals on the Nile.

**FUNJ SULTANATES OF SENNAR.** Following the collapse of the last Christian kingdom of Alwa (q.v.) at Soba in 1504, a new locus of power in Sudan was formed. At first, the capital shifted from village to village, but by the mid-seventeenth century, it became sited permanently at Sennar on the Blue Nile.

The precise ethnic origin of the Funj people is still undetermined, but they likely were derived from Hamaj peoples along the Blue Nile in association with early Nubian Muslim teachers. The initial Unsab ruling lineage practiced matrilineal descent, which was more common in ancient Nubia. This continued until the first decades of the eighteenth century, when it was replaced by Arabic record keeping and patrilineal inheritance. The Funj were blocked from eastward expansion by Christian Ethiopia while they tolerated the presence of Christian communities stranded in northern Sudan, such as Dotawo (q.v.). To the south, Nilotic and Azande populations were pushing northward and thereby blocked further Funj expansion southward. To the west was the sultanate of Darfur. Limited in these ways, the Funj existed under the shadow of the Ottoman rule in Egypt that began in 1517 under Sultan Selim I, who had defeated the Mamelukes. See also **ALWA; CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA.**
FUR. Darfur is the westernmost province of modern Sudan and the ancient home of the Fur people. The Fur and their ancestors have long occupied the territory at the southern end of the trans-Saharan trail from the Selima Oasis in Egypt. This strategic position gave them considerable influence at the eastern end of the Sahel and its east–west trade.

Among the earliest inhabitants of Darfur were the Daju (q.v.), who, with the Fur, have membership in the (Eastern) Sudanic language (q.v.) family. However, the Fur people are sufficiently distinguished in some grammatical and lexical respects that they qualify as the solitary members of a unique Furian language that is a distinct branch of the larger Eastern Sudanic language group.

Although their history goes back to relations with Dynastic Egyptians and Nubians, today the Fur are syncretic Muslims. The written record begins with their rule over the Daju in the fifteenth century. Arabic probably reached them at about this time through contact with Arabized Nubians known as Tungur, who established their sultanate in Darfur. In the seventeenth century, the sultanate of Darfur (1650–1916) was contemporaneous with the Funj sultanate in central Sudan. At this time, the Kunjara branch of the Fur controlled Darfur. Like the Funj, the Fur people are a composite group, historically comprised of northern Nubians, southern “Negroes,” and Arab-speaking groups from the north and west. The first great ruler was Suleiman Sul-long (ca. 1640), who established the Fur sultanate in a territory next to Jebel Marra. Under Suleiman’s brother Mussabba, Kordofan became a client state, but this later fell to the Funj in the early nineteenth century. The last sultan of Darfur, ‘Ali Dinar (1898–1916), capitulated to the British militarily after territorial conflicts erupted over regions under British, French, and Darfur control.

GABATI. The Meroitic, post-Meroitic/medieval Christian (q.v.) cemetery site at Gabati is found between Meroë (q.v.) and Atbara on the eastern bank of the Nile on the northwestern corner of the Butana (q.v.) plain. This was excavated in 1994–1995 on a salvage project led by David Edwards and his colleagues. While this is not a major monumental site, it
fills in important gaps in our knowledge in terms of the rural hinterland and nonelite funerary practices. This heavily robbed site reveals important continuities and changes in burial practices that extended over these periods. The work examined some seventy-four Meroitic graves, including one large one, and fifty-five post-Meroitic tumulae. Most graves were heavily disturbed, but abundant painted pottery sherds and other grave goods, especially beads, still allow some reconstruction of these times. The larger Meroitic graves, dated to about the second and first centuries BCE, show use of mud bricks in blocking stones and superstructure and as slightly stepped mastabas or perhaps pyramids. Only a few examples of glass, iron, faience, scarabs, signet rings, and graffiti were found in these cases.

The later, post-Meroitic graves were dated to the fifth and sixth centuries CE and were more heavily endowed with textiles, mats, and leather burial goods. Elements of bed burials were common, but perhaps more a way to carry the deceased to the cemetery than a proper bed burial known in earlier periods. Other grave goods included oil bottles, khol pots, jars, painted pottery (both wheel made and hand thrown), combs, shells, ivory, some iron (arrowheads), plentiful beads, baskets, and a grinding stone. Among the more interesting findings was the contrast in burial orientations that could be generally concluded from those burials that were more or less intact. In the case of the Meroitic burials, the majority of the grave shafts were oriented on an east–west axis but often with a north–south orientation of the extended and contracted burials themselves. Heads were often but not always southerly and facing west, looking away from the tomb opening, resting on the left side as in Egyptian styles. By contrast, the post-Meroitic grave tumulae restored contracted burials to some extent. Bodies were commonly in a north–south orientation, with heads to the south, but they were facing east while lying on their right sides. Numerous exceptions indicating substantial variation and the lack of comparable evidence have raised many questions for further investigation in this second-generation archaeology.

GALLUS, CORNELIUS. See AUGUSTUS (OCTAVIAN); CORNELIUS GALLUS.

GARSTANG, JOHN (1876–1956). This noted English archaeologist was a professor of ancient Near Eastern archaeology at the Univer-
sity of Liverpool. He excavated widely, including sites in Palestine and Turkey, but was much engaged in Egypt at Beni Hassan, Hierakonpolis, and Beit Khalaf. His work at Meroë (1909–1914) was the first substantial, modern excavation at that site, although many of his field notes were left unpublished until recently. His work produced the first extensive collection of material remains of Meroë, now in Khartoum and Liverpool, and provided us with a basic understanding of the royal city and some of the main features of the site.

**GAU, FRANZ CHRISTIAN** (1790–1853). This German architect traveled in Egypt and Nubia from 1818 to 1819. His education and professional life was mainly in France. Gau published his *Antiquités de la Nubie* in a series, from 1821 to 1827, that he envisaged as an expansion of the great *Description de l’Égypte* done by the huge team of French scientists under the Napoleonic occupation of Egypt and Nubia. His travels between the First and the Second Cataract in Lower Nubia expanded the early knowledge of the region, and it was in his works that the first four lines in Meroitic (q.v.) from the pylon at Dakka (q.v.) were recorded.

Gau’s importance to ancient Nubian studies also rests with his discovery and transcription of the poor Greek inscription of King Silko (q.v.) at the Kalabsha (q.v.) temple, widely considered to be the first to proclaim Nubian Christianity (q.v.) in the military conquest over the regional Blemmyes (q.v.).

**GAUTIER, HENRI LOUIS MARIE ALEXANDRE** (1877–1950). This French Egyptologist studied at the Faculté des Lettres at Lyons (1877–1900). Gauthier occupied many senior posts in Egyptology. Relative to Nubian studies, he undertook the copying of the inscriptions in the delta and of at least three Nubian temples: Amada, Kalabsha, and Wadi Sebua (qq.v.). His works include *Le Temple de Kalabchah* (4 vols., 1911, 1914, 1927) and *Le Temple de Ouadi Es-Seboua* (2 vols., 1912).

**GAWEISES, GAWERSES.** This is a tributary district noted in Upper Nubia in New Kingdom (q.v.) tributary texts, but its precise territory is not determined.

**GEMAI, GEMMAL.** George A. Reisner (q.v.) excavated Gemai in 1915–1916. This irrigated plain is located north of Semna (q.v.).
Excavations revealed a Meroitic settlement and cemeteries of well-to-do families in post-Meroitic times that associate it with Ballana (q.v.) culture. It was of lesser significance than the huge burials known from Qustul and Ballana, but it suggests that lesser wealth of this short period was rather broadly distributed throughout the land under X-Group control.

**GEORGE I (QURGI, GIRGA, GIRGIS, JIRGA), KING (816–920? CE).** King George was crowned king of Mukkura at Dongola (qq.v.) in 835 CE, but few literary sources exist for King George I except that he traveled to Baghdad, in the name of his father Zacharias, to renegotiate the *baqt* between the Christian king of Nubia and the Abbasid or Tulunid caliph. The son of George I was Zacharias III. [by P. Saucier]

**GEORGE II, KING.** King George II was the son of King Zacharia III, and he reigned over Makurra (q.v.) under the Alexandrian patriarch Philotheos (979–1002 CE). Like his grandfather, little is known of this king. The dates of his birth, accession, and death are not known. What is certain is that he was on the throne at Dongola (q.v.) when the Fatimid armies under Jawhar as-Siqulli conquered Egypt in 969 CE. The Fatimids began the development of medieval Cairo, moving this Islamic capital from nearby Fustat. Many Nubians were broadly exposed to Islam while in military service to Fatimid armies. The Fatimids also began the university of Al-Azhar, the oldest continuous institution of higher learning on earth, and thousands of Nubians have received Islamic training there over the centuries. [by P. Saucier with R. Lobban]

**GEORGE IV, KING (1106–1158 CE).** King George IV ascended the throne of Mukkura at Dongola (qq.v.) in 1131 CE. He is known from a tombstone in the Church of the Virgin in Deir-es-Surian at Wadi Natrun in Egypt. The tombstone was inscribed in Greek and Old Nubian. George IV is thought to have become a monk in Egypt in his elder years. Notices exist of two dates dealing with Nubian–Fatimid relations during the life of George IV. See also **GEORGE II.** [by P. Saucier]
GERF HUSSEIN. This temple was located eighty-seven kilometers south of Aswan (q.v.) near the later Dakka (q.v.) temple. Setau, the viceroy of Nubia, constructed this temple for Ramses II (q.v.) sometime between the thirty-fifth and fiftieth years of his reign. It was similar to his temples at Derr (q.v.) or Abu Simbel (q.v.) insofar as Ramses II was deified along with other gods, such as Ptah and Hathor. In front of the temple hall were Osiride pillars. Originally, it was partially rock cut and partially freestanding like the others.

It was not of the best workmanship, as the figures of Ramses II were rather squat in proportion, nor was it in the best of condition, being crafted of Nubian sandstone. As a result, the effort to save or transport this monument was deemed not worthwhile, and this New Kingdom monument lies in its original location but is buried under the waters of Lake Nasser. In 1964, some temple reliefs and an Osiride statue were luckily saved for the Nubian Museum in Aswan.

GEZIRA. Literally, “the Gezira” means “the island” in Arabic, but today it refers to the extensive peninsula between the White and Blue Niles. The precise southern extent of the kingdom of Meroë is not clearly known, but it certainly included parts of the eastern bank of the Blue Nile along the Gezira. The ancient “Island of Meroë” should not be confused with the modern Gezira even though they are on opposite sides of the Blue Nile. The ancient “Island of Meroë” is the territory known today as the Butana.

At the north end of the modern Gezira is Khartoum, the wholly modern capital of Sudan, although certainly it was occupied by various ancient horizons, such as the Khartoum Mesolithic (q.v.). The Gezira today is the agricultural heartland of Sudan, and it is a spiritual home of the Nubian-born Mahdi, who made a temporary home on Abba Island in the White Nile on the western side of the Gezira.

GIRAFFES. As in later periods, giraffes were hunted in the Khartoum Neolithic. Throughout all time periods, the giraffe is depicted in ancient Sudanese art. From the Neolithic, giraffes are represented in rock art found at the site of Abka (7000–4000 BCE) (q.v.). A remarkable A-Group (q.v.) find depicts a giraffe on the gold handle of a mace. At Kerma (q.v.), a winged giraffe is portrayed in ivory (q.v.)
inlay on a funerary bed. Joyce Haynes (1995) proposed that this fantastical representation attests to the giraffe as a local deity. However, no other archaeological evidence supports this claim, and its depiction on utilitarian items suggests that the animal was used merely as an artistic motif. By the Meroitic period, giraffes are frequently found on painted pottery, such as this vessel from Karanog.

Aside from its obvious value as a source of meat, the giraffe presumably provided secondary products. The thick and colorful hide of the animal must have been utilized in some fashion, perhaps for shields. We do know that giraffe tails were used as flyswatters. The animal was also prized as an export product. By late Predynastic times, overhunting and ecological shift had caused the giraffe to disappear from the deserts and floodplains of Egypt, and they survived only in less populated areas in Nubia. The Egyptians may have desired exotic giraffes as a simple curiosity in addition to its other uses. From the New Kingdom Theban tomb of Huy is the depiction of a baby giraffe given as tribute to Egypt from Kush.

GODS AND GODDESSES OF NUBIA. The subject of Nubian deities is remarkably complex. On the one hand, both ancient Nubia and Egypt were polytheistic, but on the other, certain gods grew or fell in prominence over the very long period of their known history. Moreover, local and national gods and goddesses are known, as are deities that were borrowed and incorporated from Egypt, such as Amun, Isis, Osiris, Anubis, Hathor, and Mut. In addition, some deities were absorbed by Egyptians but had Nubian origins, such as Bes, Khnum, Satis, and Anuket. The tendency to view the
region from Egyptian perspectives has often obscured or minimized the role or origin of Nubian deities.

In any case, those gods and goddesses associated particularly with Nubia include Ahs, Amun, Anqet, Apedemek, Arensnuphis, Bes, Beset, Breith, Dedun, Khnum, Mandulis, Mash, Neith, Nekhbet, Satis, Seb, and Sebiumeker (q.v.). Dedun and Mandulis (or Merul) appear to have been especially important or related to the Medjay (q.v.). The Nubian goddess Satis is associated with hunting, as was Neith. It is not possible to say with certainty that Neith was of Nubian origin, but her icon was two crossed arrows and a shield. These certainly are attributes of Nubia, “the land of the bow” (q.v.). Neith was popular in all Dynastic periods and especially during Greco-Roman times. The Greeks assimilated Neith as their goddess Artemis, as did the Romans in the form of their hunting deity Diana. Martin Bernal believes that Neith became Athena.

Finally, special roles for the land of Nubia appear for the Egyptian deities of Anhur, Hathor, Sekhmet, and Tefnut (q.v.), who fled to Nubia at times of mythological crisis. Such tales may mirror the actual flight to Nubia of some Hyksos after their defeat by Ahmose or of Nectanebo II, who fled to Nubia from Persian and Greek mercenaries.

GOD’S WIFE OF AMUN OR DIVINE ADORATRICE OF AMUN. This high-ranking Theban title was exclusively held by women and was known in various dynasties from the New Kingdom to the Late period (qq.v) or from the 18th through the 26th Dynasties. As far as is known, the first woman to hold this position was Ahmose Nofertari, who served as God’s Wife of Amun under her husband, Pharaoh Ahmose (q.v.), and the last God’s Wife of Amun was Ankhnesneferibre of the 26th Dynasty.

The God’s Wife of Amun helped legitimate the politicoreligious ties of the pharaoh to the Amun cult in the major religious center at Thebes. The position probably first emerged (or was elevated) in the early New Kingdom, when the relations between the Theban priestly establishment and the royal family were very strong. Several female members of the ruling Nubian family held this title when they ruled Egypt in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). These include Shepenwepet I (from
the 24th Dynasty), Amenirdis I (sister of Piankhy), Shepenwepet II (sister of Taharka), Amenirdis II (daughter of Taharka), and Nitocris (to the 26th Dynasty) (qq.v.). It is often stated that the female connection to Thebes gave the dynasty more stability. Perhaps this was true since when dynastic transfer took place, some considerable effort was made to have the former God’s Wife of Amun formally adopt the incoming God’s Wife of Amun as her “daughter” to provide for continued legitimacy. A prime example of such a transition is the case of Nitocris, who was the daughter of Psamtik I (q.v.) of the 26th Dynasty, who was adopted by Amenirdis II of the 25th Dynasty. This tradition continued in the following appointment of Ankhnesneferibre as God’s Wife of Amun by Psamtik II (q.v.), also in the 26th Dynasty. A lovely statue of Ankhnesneferibre as Isis protecting Osiris is now displayed at the Nubia Museum in Aswan. Her chief steward was known as Sheshonk.

The exact personal and political dynamics of this transition need further explanation. Proof of the importance of the God’s Wife of Amun is also seen in the fact that at least two had funerary chapels in the forecourt of the great temple of Ramses III (q.v.) in Medinat Habu. Furthermore, at least one (and probably all) of the God’s Wife of Amun had Egyptian stewards to look after their daily practical concerns and manage the endowments and tributes to the God’s Wife of Amun. The case of Harwa (q.v.) is especially well known in this respect.

Another parallel title reserved for men, the High Priest of Amun (q.v.), offered still another link to Theban legitimacy. Nubians such as Horemakhet (q.v.; son of Shabaka) and Harkebi (q.v.; grandson of Shabaka) occupied this position. In this way, the king, princes, and regional governors drawn from Nubian kinsfolk all had ties to the God’s Wife of Amun and the High Priest of Amun. [R. Lobban with M. Ayad]

GOLD. To some great extent, gold is the very essence of Nubia. The name “Nubia” is likely derived from “nb,” meaning “gold” in ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs and in Meroitic, modern Coptic, and modern Nubian dialects. The presence of gold in Nubia was recognized from the very earliest Predynastic times. Those who controlled this resource in the many mines of the Eastern Desert had an asset of great importance. Certainly it was highly regarded, much coveted, and protected by aggressive military actions and by strategic placement of
fortifications and treasuries. Major expenditure to construct wells and tracks to the gold mines of Kush can be documented, and it is not surprising that one of the oldest maps known to the world is one from the New Kingdom showing Egyptian routes to the gold mines of Nubia, such as those along Wadi al-Allaqi and Wadi Gabgaba (qq.v.).

The well-known qualities of gold—of being malleable and forever shiny, having a low melting point, and being endowed with symbolic and protective significance—made it heavily sought after for jewelry and as a means of storing and displaying wealth. Agatharchides (q.v.) tells us that gold was extracted from the quartzite veins in which it was found by subjecting it to heat to break the stone away from the ore. The resulting gold dust was amalgamated into ingots and useful shapes. In Predynastic A-Group times, it was sometimes rendered into gold necklace beads. Gold was especially evident in New Kingdom tribute panels to the viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) where it is heaped up in nugget piles and presented as large gold rings, but at all Dynastic periods gold is eternally of great interest. This is not less the case in the Late period, when Assyrians looted vast amounts of gold from Karnak and Thebes or when Greek and Roman occupation also quickly adopted the parallel interest in Nubian gold to fill their treasuries in Athens and Rome. Highly sophisticated gold jewelry is found from this period, especially in the Egyptian New Kingdom and in Meroitic times.

GOVERNOR OF SOUTHERN LANDS. See NEW KINGDOM.

GREAT ENCLOSURE. See MUSAWWARAT ES-SUFRA.

GREEK INFLUENCES IN NUBIA (332–330 BCE). The classical Greek writer Herodotus (q.v.; ca. 485–ca. 425 BCE) was personally familiar with the Nile only as far as Aswan. But from reports by Psamatik II (q.v.; who reached the Third Cataract in 590 BCE) and by Cambyses II (q.v.; who may have penetrated to the Fourth Cataract in 524 BCE), Herodotus was able to identify a “City of Ethiopians” at Meroë without actually having seen it.

Following the conquest of Egypt in 332 BCE by Alexander, the reigning Kushitic pharaoh became even more apprehensive of his own security. Kush had been repeatedly violated, especially by
Psamtik II, and no doubt the potential Ptolemaic Greek threat was ultimately a contributing factor in the decision by King Nastasen to move the Kushitic capital from Napata to Meroë, deep in the Butana plains of southern Nubia. Nastasen was probably the last to rule from more northerly Napata. Alexander soon sent expeditions into Lower Nubia, and subsequent kings of Kush typically ruled from Meroë farther south and upstream of Napata.

Rather quickly, the Greek language and culture were introduced, at least to the Kushitic ruling classes. Perhaps this created an additional incentive to create an alphabetic Meroitic cursive writing, which evolved during this period. Greek cultural and scientific influences were expanded by 305 BCE, when Ptolemy I ruled from Alexandria and established the most famous library in antiquity. It was common both to Ptolemaic Greeks and to their Meroitic contemporaries to have an extremely high regard for the goddess Isis. Both the Ptolemies and the Meroites worshiped Isis with great reverence. Other influences could be noted in art styles, such as the lovely bronze oil lamps then popular.

During the reign of Ptolemy II (284–247 BCE), frequent raids were made in Nubia for captives, livestock, and elephants (q.v.). Elephants were probably raised at or traded from Meroë in the Butana center at Musawwarat es-Sufra for trade with the Greeks and possibly the Carthaginians. Meroitic king Arkamani II (218–200 BCE), the first to be buried at the Meroitic cemetery at Bejrawiya, reportedly studied the Greek language from Greek tutors brought to his court for this purpose.

During the time of Ptolemy IV (222–205 BCE), apparently good relations were maintained with Meroë, but the reign of Ptolemy V (205–180 BCE) reported several suppressed rebellions in Upper Egypt. In 200 BCE, during the reign of Ptolemy V, the Greek geographer Eratosthenes described Nubia (perhaps as military intelligence?). Under Ptolemy Euergetes, an expedition by Eudoxus was reported in 130 BCE. In about 50 BCE, the Greek Diodorus (q.v.) showed his respect by terming Nubia “the home of Egyptians” and of civilization itself.

The 300 years of Greek occupation was brief by Egyptian standards, and deep in ancient Nubia, its lasting effect would be hard to measure. In any case, by 30 BCE, Greek influences slowly withered in Nubia following the death of Cleopatra VII in Egypt and her replacement by Roman rulers who continued to use the Greek language for their record.
keeping. On the other hand, small, self-reliant communities of Christian Greek traders persisted throughout Sudan to the present.

GRIFFITH, FRANCES LLEWELLYN (1862–1934). This professor of Egyptology from Oxford, Manchester, and London Universities was one of the towering figures in ancient Nubian studies, both in archaeological fieldwork and especially in Meroitic (q.v.) epigraphy, but he was also very skilled in demotic and Old Coptic. He also worked extensively in Egypt, including important work in the delta, at Naucratis. His work sometimes was with the noted Egyptologist William Matthew Flinders Petrie.

In 1906–1907, Griffith traveled extensively in the region of Meroë and in the Butana. He was probably the first European in modern times to reach the poorly known sites of Basa, Geili, Um Soda, and Wadi Hawad (qq.v.). At Basa, he found the five large stone lions and stone frog that are now in the Sudan National Museum. He also located a limestone sundial dated to Roman times. His search for Meroitic writing at Basa and Musawwarat es-Sufra was only slightly rewarded.

In 1909, Griffith returned to Sudan with the University of Pennsylvania Nubia Expedition, led by the British archaeologists Leonard Woolley and David Randall MacIver (qq.v.). On this occasion, he discovered the many stelae and offering tablets with Meroitic demotic (q.v.) inscriptions that are now in the University Museum in Philadelphia.

From the discovery of the bilingual bark stand in Wad Ben Naqa (q.v.) by Richard Lepsius (q.v.), Griffith was the first to determine the correlations between Egyptian and Meroitic hieroglyphs, and the correlation of Meroitic demotic and hieroglyphic. Thus, he revealed the phonetic values of Meroitic demotic and thereby made the first transliteration of the twenty-three demotic and hieroglyphic signs of this otherwise lost language. Although his goal of translation of Meroitic was not fully achieved, the work of Griffith laid the main foundation in transliteration for further Meroitic-language studies. Given the very slow progress with Meroitic decipherment, the early publications by Griffith are still a common benchmark. These include his Meroitic Inscriptions of Shablul and Karanog (1911) and Meroitic Inscriptions (2 vols., 1911, 1912). The Griffith Institute continues at Oxford in his honor. The appendix of this book provides
some of the latest thinking about the meanings of Meroitic words, as this research continues still without a substantial bilingual source or even full agreement about the linguistic relationship of Meroitic to cognate languages.

– H –

HADENDOWA. See ABABDA; BLEMMYES.

HADRIAN, PUBLIUS AELIUS (76–138 CE). This Roman emperor of Spanish origin ruled from 117 to 138 CE. In 130 CE, he was among the few Roman emperors who actually visited Egypt. Hadrian’s name appears on one of the “Colossi of Memnon” (Amenhotep III [q.v.]) in western Thebes. He was also known for hunting lions in the Western Desert of Egypt and for his scholarly debates in the Alexandrian Museum, which was still partially extant. After his close friend and lover Antinous drowned while on his trip to Egypt, in 130 CE, Hadrian constructed a temple at Antinopolis in Middle Egypt in his memory. Other Roman emperors who visited Egypt included Augustus (q.v.), Caracalla (q.v.), Claudius, Diocletian (q.v.), Julius Caesar (q.v.), Septimius Severus, Trajan (q.v.), and Vespasian (q.v.).

Demarcation of Hadrian’s territory was symbolized in Nubia on the western side of Philae Island, where he constructed a gateway. Some of the very latest hieroglyphic and Meroitic graffiti inscriptions are found on the walls of this gateway. Reversing the policy of expansion of the Roman Empire by his predecessor, Trajan, Hadrian sought to maintain the defenses of the empire just as he did so dramatically with Hadrian’s Wall in northern England (in 120 CE) to keep out the Scots. Hadrian was famed for his huge, luxurious villa with gardens and baths at Tivoli near Rome, the incorporated features reminiscent of his trip to Egypt and other parts of his empire. Hadrian was much involved in crushing the Jews (q.v.) during the Bar Kochba revolt of 133–135 CE.

HARKEBI. This High Priest of Amun was the grandson of Shabaka (q.v.). He served in this prominent position during the 25th Dynasty and continued as a ranking priest during the subsequent 26th
Dynasty. Despite his kinship with Nubians, his religious position was such that he gave legitimacy to the following dynasty. Statuettes of Harkebi from Karnak are at the British Museum and the Egyptian National Museum. Other 25th Dynasty priests of Thebes who may have continued into the 26th Dynasty included Nesikhonsu (known from a Theban stela), Tjanenwast, and Djedkhonsuefankh (known from Theban block statues), and perhaps Ankhmtenenet (known from a block statue fragment). See also GOD’S WIFE OF AMUN; HOREMAKHET.

HARKUF, HARKAF. This official of the 6th Dynasty served under Pharaoh Pepi II (q.v.) and Merenre. His titled office is rendered as “Governor of the South,” and he is most famous for heading as many as four trading expeditions to Yam (q.v.) in Nubia in the twenty-second century BCE. Unlike in the heyday of the Old Kingdom domination of Lower Nubia, his trips were peaceful and did not involve conquest. At this time, late in the Old Kingdom, the military penetration of Nubia had been weakened or withdrawn, especially beyond the Second Cataract, so peaceful commerce became the only way economic relations would function. On Harkuf’s missions, he took scores of donkeys loaded with Egyptian export goods across the desert via the Selima Oasis to the west of the Nile. He returned with a variety of valued Nubian products, such as incense, ebony, grain, gold, ivory, gum, leopard skins, and throwing sticks. On his well-known fourth expedition, he returned with a dancing dwarf or, alternatively, a pygmy. Pepi II asked him to spare no measure to ensure that the dwarf would be safe and well cared for on the return journey, since the pharaoh would be much amused by this unusual gift. Evidently, Harkuf was specially rewarded for this successful mission, and he became the regional governor of Elephantine (q.v.) at Aswan (q.v.). At his death, he was placed in a rock-cut pillared hall tomb among the First Intermediate tombs on the western cliffs above the modern city of Aswan. It is in this tomb that his four trips to Yam are recorded.

HARSIESE. Harsiese, presumably Nubian, was a top adviser and prominent sem priest for Taharka (q.v.) during the 25th Dynasty rule of Egypt. It appears that he was in charge of the delta, perhaps from Heliopolis, at a time of intense rivalries and military engagements with the
Assyrian kings Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal (q.v.). He descended from a Theban priest of the same name who had served Osorkon II in the 22nd Dynasty. He clearly is not the same Harsiese who led a later Upper Egyptian revolt against Ptolemy VIII (q.v.), but perhaps the second Harsiese was inspired to take his name from the earlier one.

HARSIYOTEF, HARSIOTEF (404–369 BCE). Harsiyotef was the son of Queen Atasamalo, who is buried in Nuri (q.v.) pyramid 61. His father’s identity is not clearly known. This ambitious Napatan (q.v.) king made additions to the temple at Kawa (q.v.), and he rebuilt temples at Jebel Barkal (q.v.) to show his devotion to Amun (q.v.). The memory of the glories of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) and the painful intrusion of Psamtik II into Nubia apparently was still alive with Harsiyotef (“The Mighty Bull Who Appears in Napata”), who featured himself as a legitimate king of Egypt.

Harsiyotef controlled as far as Mirgissa (q.v.), and he attacked Aswan (q.v.) in an effort to push farther into Egypt during the weak and waning days of its last dynasty (the 30th). Harsiyotef ruled for a long period of about thirty-five years, during which time he conducted a number of military operations against the Rhrh (Libyans; second, eighteenth, and twenty-third regnal years), Meroë (third, fifty, and sixth regnal years), and the Mddt (Medjay [q.v.]; sixteenth and thirty-fifth regnal years). His sixty-one-line stela in the Egyptian Museum records his military victory over certain peoples of Nubia (q.v.) at the end of the fifth century BCE. It is believed that Harsiyotef traveled to Napata for his coronation and reasons of religious legitimacy. Thus, he is considered a Napatan king, although he resided in the south at Meroë (q.v.). His control extended through Lower Nubia and perhaps as far as Aswan in the north. As with the glorious 25th Dynasty and Napatan kings, Harsiyotef was buried in pyramid 13 of the royal Nuri cemetery, where one of his wives, Queen Batalhaliye, was also buried in pyramid 44. An offering tablet (MFA 21.3231) is known for Queen Batalhaliye, featuring Isis with Osiris (qq.v.). Other temple inscriptions at Jebel Barkal tell of his observance of festivals to Isis and Osiris throughout the kingdom.

HARWA. This chubby figure was the chief steward (or overseer) of the God’s Wife of Amun Amenirdis I (q.v.) during the 25th Dynasty. In
the eight known statuettes of Harwa, he is always depicted as a squat, fat, pleasant-faced Egyptian man. He was the son of Padimut, who had been a holder of high office in Thebes. Evidently, he gave long and loyal service to the kings and the God’s Wife of Amun of the 25th Dynasty. Texts associated with Harwa celebrate his virtues, and he was given a large tomb in the western necropolis. Despite his numerous titles and prominent tomb in western Thebes, his position was essentially secular, and he was not directly linked to the Amun priesthood. His statuettes are in the Egyptian Museum and the British Museum.

HATHOR. This central goddess for Egypt and Nubia was commonly associated with love, nurturing, motherhood, and tenderness. As Hathor, she was depicted either with the ears of a cow, with the head of a cow, or as a cow itself. Hathor-headed columns were featured in the Amun Temple of Jebel Barkal. In Meroitic and Greco-Roman times, Hathor was often conflated with Isis, who had similar virtues. At times, they can be distinguished only by inscriptive notation. These deities were of great and enduring importance to Nubia. As nurturing deities, Hathor and Isis were associated with the milk rituals that remain a part of Nubian folk traditions even today.

HATSHEPSUT (1503–1482 BCE). This famed New Kingdom (28th Dynasty) queen had several relationships to Nubia. Not least of these was her central role among the Tuthmoside kings who had Nubian conquests and colonial control. Hatshepsut’s military activities in Nubia were mainly defensive, but she certainly maintained a strong Egyptian presence there, and one military attack is known during her reign. A temple at Semna (q.v.) dated to the second year of the reign of Tuthmosis III shows Hatshepsut in an officially subordinate role, but since the king was only a child at the time, she emerged as the effective sovereign even though sometimes she was indicated as a coregent. Her precise kinship is debated, but most agree that she was the daughter of Tuthmos I (q.v.) and Queen Ahmose, was coregent with Tuthmosis II (q.v.), and was finally succeeded by her (stepson, brother, stepbrother?) Tuthmosis III (q.v.).

At Seheil Island (q.v.) in Lower Nubia (q.v.), Hatshepsut’s official Ti suggested that she was personally present at one Nubian military campaign. At Seheil, she also quarried granite for two obelisks she
commissioned for the Sed festival of renewal held in her fifteenth regnal year. At Elephantine Island in Aswan (q.v.), it is now known that she was celebrated at the Satet (q.v.) temple. At the tomb of her architect and perhaps consort Senenmut, in western Thebes, the assertion is that Hatshepsut had a direct military role in Nubian campaigns. At Deir al Bahri, adjacent to the tomb of Mentuhotep II (q.v.), Hatshepsut built her impressive funerary temple. At this temple is a depiction of the Nubian god Dedun (q.v.) leading captives from southern (i.e., Nubian) towns to her highness. This majestic temple is built adjacent to the first major work on the site, that is, the temple tomb of Mentuhotep II (q.v.), founder of the Middle Kingdom. This funerary temple may have contributed some building stones for Hatshesut’s adjacent temple.

Her temple also offers her famed inscriptions describing the rich details of the trading voyage to Punt (q.v.) undertaken during her reign under the guidance of her chancellor Neshi. Like most New Kingdom pharaohs, Hatshepsut was shown to be of divine birth, but she had special reverence to the goddess Hathor (q.v.), who suckled her and in whose honor she built a number of shrines. At Karnak, Hatshepsut is well known for her huge obelisk, which was quarried in Aswan, erected amidst an existing temple structure, and later obscured by Tuthmosis III. Hatshepsut died in February 1482 BCE.

HEKANEFER. Hekanefer was a significant Nubian prince of Aniba (q.v.) in the 18th Dynasty of the New Kingdom. This is evidenced in the Theban tomb of Huy (q.v.), who served as the viceroy of Nubia under Tutankhamen (q.v.). In that tomb, Hekanefer is mentioned by name and is shown as a Nubian. Hekanefer was buried in an Egyptian-style tomb at Toshka (q.v.) that suggests the high degree of Egyptianization of this Nubian official. In hieroglyphics, his name means “beautiful ruler,” and from an Egyptian point of view, Hekanefer was abundantly rewarded for his loyalty to Egypt.

HEPZEFA, HAPZEFI, HAPZEFA. Hepzefa was the Egyptian governor for Amenemhat I and Senusret I (q.v.) at the start of the 12th Dynasty of the Middle Kingdom. According to Walter Emery, Hepzefa was of Middle Egyptian origins, and he had an unfinished tomb built at Assiut in his honor. However, his service to his pharaoh took
him to an Egyptian fortress near the Third Cataract, where he may have served and died. In the fortress was a typically Middle Kingdom sculpture of Hepzefa and his wife Senuwy. After Egyptian control was lost, the sculptures were removed to Kerma (q.v.), for reasons that are obscure, and were placed inside the central section of the huge tumulus III. This raises the question whether he may have been of Nubian origin since his burial was in association with some sacrificial slaves, and this was not the normal Egyptian practice by this time. Some archaeologists wonder whether some unnamed Kerma king brought these statues back to Nubia to symbolize Hepzefa’s return. This ambiguous circumstance allowed George Reisner (q.v.) to falsely imagine that Kerma was a mere Egyptian outpost in Nubia.

HERIHOR. Herihor emerged as a complex figure in a major transitional time in the closing years of the New Kingdom (q.v.). Apparently, he rose to influence through the military and by marriage into a ranking family of the Theban priesthood. Sometime between the middle to late reign of Ramses XI (q.v.; ca. 1100–1070 BCE), Herihor achieved the powerful position as the viceroy of Nubia. His further access to power was as the High Priest of Amun (q.v.) at Thebes, a result of the remote and weak administration of Ramses XI, who had ruled from Memphis or Tanis in his declining years. Ramses XI was the last pharaoh to be buried in tomb KV4 in the Valley of the Kings at Thebes. His death brought further erosion of central authority of the New Kingdom.

With no clear successor, Panehesi became the officially appointed King’s Son of Kush or viceroy of Nubia, asserting that he was the highest member of the former government. The historical record is not precise, but possibly Panehesi (q.v.) (re)appointed Herihor as the High Priest of Amun to resolve a succession dispute. Alternatively, perhaps Herihor was appointed the viceroy of Nubia in the closing years of Ramses XI.

Whatever the specifics, the relation between Panehesi and Herihor was one of jealousy and a conflicting search for legitimacy. When Panehesi asked Herihor to relinquish power, Herihor resisted and sought to become an influential kingmaker or even a pharaoh in his own right. Some sources assert that he was a founding pharaoh of the 21st Dynasty, as he began to build at Thebes and used the cartouche
reserved for the pharaoh himself. Still more confusion in chronology exists since some believe that Herihor died before Ramses XI, but others think that his use of the “Repetition of Birth” or renaissance themes made it appear that Ramses XI was still living when Herihor simply usurped this royal identity.

In this simmering dispute, Herihor appointed his son (in-law?) Piankhy to the position of viceroy of Nubia, while Herihor continued to rule from Thebes. However, Panehesi continued to rule in Nubia and resisted the claim that Herihor or Piankhy was a legitimate descendant of Egyptian authority. Thus, the political unity of Upper Egypt and Nubia was fractured.

Thus, the Lower Egyptian capital of Ramses XI was managed by Smendes I (q.v.) under these strained conditions. Fundamentally diverted by these politics in Nubia, High Priest Herihor occupied the religious capital of Thebes from about 1080 to 1074 BCE, and he accepted Smendes I as his “coregent” for the political capital of Lower Egypt; Panehesi ruled Nubia. Thus, it is Smendes who is considered the founder of the weak and divided 21st Dynasty. This confusion of the Third Intermediate period also represents something of a Nubian “Dark Age” since Egyptian written records grow mute and inscriptions by Nubian are unknown until the eighth century BCE. But this chaos gave Nubians an opportunity to recover from five centuries of Egyptian colonialism and ultimately to spring forth from Napata as the 25th Dynasty.

HERODOTUS. This Greek historian and commentator traveled to Egypt during Persian times. He probably reached as far south as Aswan. His writings are highly valued firsthand commentaries, so he is sometimes called the father of history. Others are inclined to treat Herodotus with a great deal of skepticism because of an uncritical use of sources that are presented with inadequate verification. Nonetheless, his work is among the very first to describe ancient Egypt and Nubia in firsthand accounts that can, in many but not all cases, be substantiated by archaeological research.

Although he never journeyed beyond Aswan, Herodotus gave detailed accounts of the kingdom of Meroë, earlier events and princes of the 25th Dynasty, and the invasion of Nubia in the 26th Dynasty under Psamtik II (q.v.) against the forces of Aspelta (q.v.). Such an
account is ignored in Nubian chronologies. Among the tantalizing and sometimes unsubstantiated claims of Herodotus is that 330 kings ruled Egypt after Menes (Narmer). Among these rulers were eighteen Ethiopian kings and one queen. One may clearly account for several in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) and perhaps a Nubian God’s Wife of Amun such as Amenirdis (qq.v.). The identity of the others remains mysterious but may lend credence to possible Nubian (“Ethiopian”) origins for figures such as Mentuhotep II (q.v.) or others.

HEZEKIAH. This king of Israel resided at his capital in Jerusalem. His principal foreign policy concern was with Assyrian expansion at the same time that the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) was controlling Egypt. The Nubian rulers of Egypt adopted various strategies to deal with this common enemy. These included fomenting a diversionary revolt in Sidon and Tyre in neighboring Phoenicia under Shabataka (q.v.; 701 BCE). During the time of Taharka (q.v.), the strategy rested on military means that kept the Assyrians under Sennacherib (q.v.; 704–681 BCE) and Esarhaddon (q.v.; 680–669 BCE) out of Egypt for a time between 671 and 664 BCE. At last, Egypt under the Nubians fell, and Hezekiah was reduced to a tributary status.

HIGH PRIEST OF AMUN. This high-ranking title of Thebes was an appointed official often drawn from the family of the dynastic ruling classes to ensure their legitimacy to the throne. The use of the High Priest of Amun priesthood and the God’s Wife of Amun (q.v.) were essential features for religious legitimization of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), among other dynasties. The High Priest of Amun was always a male figure but was joined by a female God’s Wife of Amun (or Divine Adoratrice of Amun) to complete the dominance of the powerful Theban priesthood. Both Horemakhet and Harkebi (qq.v) occupied the High Priest of Amun position during portions of the 25th Dynasty. See HERIHOR.

HOBAGI. Hobagi is a post-Meroitic (q.v.) site on the western bank of the Nile (q.v.) between modern Shendi and Naqa (q.v.). The archaeological excavation by Patrice Lenoble refers to this as the postpyramidal “imperial age.” The substantial burial mounds clearly suggest a military elite or regional kingdom since they include bows (q.v.)
and bronze arrowheads, battle-axes, large swords, quivers, and archer looses. The presence of incised bronze bowls, cups, and basins indicates some wealth and social differentiation. Images of Horus and Hathor (q.v.) and lotus motifs hint to a lingering memory of Egypt and Meroë in the fourth century CE. The debate and interpretation of post-Meroitic cultures in Nubia, whether at Ballana, Qustul, Tangasi, or Hobagi (qq.v.), continues, especially in the absence of textual evidence.

**HOREMAKHET, HARMAKHIS, HAREMAKHET.** Horemakhet, or “Horus of the Horizon,” was the son of Shabaka (q.v.), who served as the High Priest of Amun (q.v.) or the First Prophet of Amun during the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). He may have continued in the position during portions of the reigns of Taharka and Tanutamun (qq.v.), since he is believed to have been a half brother of Taharka. Horemakhet’s son Harkebi (q.v.) also served as the High Priest of Amun at the end of the 25th Dynasty.

Horemakhet is illustrated in a lovely sixty-six-centimeter red quartz sculpture at the Egyptian National Museum showing him in a standing position with his left foot forward. This was found in the Karnak cachette. While the dress style of kilt, ankh necklace and pectoral, and shaved head all follow a model found in the Egyptian Middle and New Kingdoms, his facial features are Nubian. The back, sides, and base of this statue are inscribed in hieroglyphs with the cartouches of Shabaka and Taharka. Scenes of King Taharka at Karnak making offerings to Horemakhet are also seen.

**HOREMHEB, HOREMHAB, DEJSERKHEPERURE.** Horemheb was the last king of the glorious 18th Dynasty of the New Kingdom. He was a rising military star during the reigns of Akhenaton (q.v.) and Semenkare, and he continued to serve as the head of the army under Tutankhamen (q.v.). Horemheb was able to marry into the royal family and assume power. The Theban Amun priests had never forgiven the “heresy” of the Aton cult of Akhenaton, and they wished to restore and revitalize the Amun cult of Thebes. Horemheb likely steered through this difficult course and broke with his earlier affiliation with the “heretical” Aton cult.
As the top and seasoned military commander of the young king Tutankhamen, Horemheb already wielded great influence and traveled with the king on a punitive military mission to Nubia. It is very possible that the early death of Tutankhamen (former Tutankhaton) may well have been as a result of a murder plot organized by Horemheb, but no firm proof of this exists. Horemheb rehabilitated or constructed many monuments, tombs, and monuments throughout the Nile valley from Thebes to Memphis and in Nubia. Coming from the military, he reconstituted the military administration and restored the Theban Amun priests to the positions they had occupied before the reign of Amenhotep III (q.v.). Simultaneously, he ordered the systematic destruction of the monumental vestiges of the Aton cult of Amarna, and he moved the capital back to Memphis. He built a tomb at its royal burial ground at Sakkara, but he was finally interred in a tomb in the Valley of the Kings in the western necropolis of Thebes. Dying twenty-eight years later without a clear successor, Horemheb paved the way for the 19th Dynasty with the appointment of a military commander from the delta named Ramses I (q.v.), the predecessor of the great era of Ramses II (q.v.).

HORSES. The arrival of the horse (Equidae sp.) in the Nile valley typically is dated to the Hyksos (q.v.) late Second Intermediate period in the sixteenth century BCE, just prior to the formation of the New Kingdom (q.v.). One case of a horse skeleton was found at Buhen (q.v.) fort of the Middle Kingdom, but this may well be of Hyksos origin. Immediately after the Hyksos, in the 18th Dynasty, horses begin to appear as a glyph, being used for royal riding and for fast war chariots by the New Kingdom Egyptian military. The horse-drawn chariots could carry both a driver and an archer to break up enemy infantry. Nubians were often the victims of such attacks, but when the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) took power in Egypt in the eighth century BCE, it is clear that horses played a central role. This is evident in the Piankhy (q.v.) stela and in Piankhy’s castigation of the rulers of Egypt for mistreating their horses. Throughout the 25th Dynasty into the Napatan and Meroitic periods and on to post-Meroitic times, horses were always highly valued by Nubians.

From the 25th Dynasty at the Kurru (q.v.) cemetery is a group of twenty-four horse burials dating from Piankhy to Tanutamun (q.v.). All
were buried standing, facing south, and were interred with full trapping and decorations befitting chariot horses. Meroitic and especially post-Meroitic tombs renew the practice of horse sacrifices to accompany the deceased. At Qustul and Ballana (qq.v.), pole-axed horses were again interred with full iron trappings along with other sacrificed animals and servants. In somewhat later times, during the transition to Christianity, King Silko (q.v.) is shown riding a caparisoned horse while lancing an enemy. As relations deteriorated in the early contact with Islam, Arabs attacked Lower Nubia with horses in mailed armor, as was typical in the medieval period. When peace was negotiated in the baqt (q.v.), it did provide, inter alia, that two fine breeding mares should be provided by the Nubian Christian kings to the Muslim king of Egypt. Late Christian times still had a prominent role for horses at Soba (q.v.), where they were both numerous and highly valued.

HORSESNEST, MERITATEN. This princess of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) is little known except for her mummy, which reveals her skull to have been trephined for some medical reason. A section of her skull was removed and, amazingly, the wound healed and she survived. The precise diagnosis and technique are not clear.

HOSKINS, GEORGE ALEXANDER (1802–1863). This Englishman traveled in Egypt and Nubia in the 1830s and 1860s, his most relevant work being *Travels in Ethiopia* (1835). His extensive high-quality drawings were an early part of the Oxford University Griffith Institute Collection.

HOUSES. See ARCHITECTURE.

HUY, HUY-AMENHOTEP. Huy occupied the position of viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) under the reign of Tutankhamen (q.v.; 1334–1325 BCE). His Nubian service to his pharaoh is abundantly manifest in his Theban tomb (No. 40) at Qurnat Murai, where one finds scenes of Huy’s family and investiture, his inspection of Nubian tribute, and travel from Nubia, as well as his appearance in front of Tutankhamen and adoration of Osiris, Anubis, and Ptah. Huy provided Tutankhamen with a steady flow of Nubian wealth that included not only the material goods of gold, livestock, wild animals, rare animal skins, and incense but also, and per-
haps more important, the obedient Nubians who made these payments. It is in the tomb of Huy that mention is made of Hekanefer (q.v.), the loyal Nubian prince of Aniba (q.v.). Huy may have been responsible for the construction for Tutankhamen’s Great Temple at Jebel Barkal (q.v.).

HYKSOS. The “Shepherd Kings,” “Foreign Kings,” or so-called Hyksos of the 15th Dynasty in the Second Intermediate period had excellent relations with the Nubians at Kerma (q.v.) since both sought to have a weak Egyptian state after the fall of the Middle Kingdom. In fact, in the 14th Dynasty, which preceded the Hyksos, one of the two obscure rulers was termed Nehesy (q.v.), or the Nubian (or “Negro”), in his cartouche. Once Egyptian authority had collapsed in this troubled time, apparently Nehesy and at least one other king ruled the eastern delta for about fifty-seven years that were partly concurrent with the 13th Dynasty.

Apophis (Apepi I), one of the Hyksos pharaohs in the 15th Dynasty, apparently drafted a letter to a king of Kush to make joint opposition to the efforts of Kamose to reunify the Egyptian Nile valley at the dawn of the New Kingdom. Kamose apparently intercepted this letter and then planned to attack the Hyksos first and wage war against Nubia afterward. His brother Ahmose (qq.v.) finally succeeded in their reunification drive. He overcame a possible and parallel revolt in Lower Nubia to divert the Egyptians from their military advances against the Hyksos in their eastern delta capital at Avaris. Given the eternal rivalries on the Nile, some defeated Hyksos who were isolated in Upper Egypt fled to a welcomed refuge in Nubia. After driving out the Hyksos, the Egyptians under Ahmose could turn their attention to Lower Nubia (q.v.), to return it to Egyptian control.

The Hyksos are also to be credited with introducing the much stronger and more powerful composite bow (q.v.) into Nile valley military hardware as well as body armor and horse-drawn war chariots, which became very important for New Kingdom cavalry. Horses were not much seen in the region until this time, although a few horses may have been in the Nile valley before. Since the textual documentation on the Hyksos and on Kerma has significant weaknesses, the archaeological record is especially important in formulating an understanding of each and the relations they may have had with each other.
For example, the apparently unique funerary chapels at the Kerma cemeteries are often projected as being specifically African, and certainly this is Africa’s most ancient state aside from Egypt. However, some architectural features, such as very heavy mud-brick walls with disproportionately small inner chambers and a limited use of columns in either small numbers or single rows, are held in common for the Kerma chapels and some Hyksos buildings. Since it is well known that the two traded and also conspired with each other, it is possible that some architectural features were shared as well. Meanwhile, other structures at Kerma, such as the huge Eastern and Western Def-fufas (q.v.), vast grave tumulae, and the royal reception chamber, are not found in Hyksos traditions.

IKEN. Iken is located on the western bank of the Nile near Jebel Sheikh Suleiman, or just downstream from the Second Cataract. Its cemetery was excavated but previously had been heavily looted. In the Middle Kingdom, it served as a point in break-of-bulk from larger to smaller vessels proceeding farther into Nubia above the Second Cataract. Especially during the 12th Dynasty, Senusoret III (q.v.) indicated that Iken would serve as a restrictive customs post for Nubians wishing to travel to Egypt. Iken likely is an early name for Mirgissa (q.v.).

IKKUR. The fortified town of Ikkur was located amidst C-Group (q.v.) populations in Lower Nubia (q.v.). It was one of many sites of the huge Middle Kingdom (q.v.) forts in the Egyptian defensive line against possible Nubian aggression. Its heavy mud-brick walls served this function well until the Middle Kingdom, which collapsed for internal reasons. Its defensive structures not only provided protection along the water but also faced the desert, with major fortifications anticipating landward attack as well. This site is lost under the waters of Lake Nasser/Nubia.

IKHMINDI. Ikhmindi town was located just upstream from Dakka (q.v.) temple in Lower Nubia (q.v.). The stone-fortified wall section was more than 100 meters long on three sides, with a cliff on the eastern side. Restrictive gates on the northern and southern sides pene-
trated walls of about three meters high. It served to protect this early Christian (q.v.) site from the sixth century CE on through much of medieval Christianity in Nubia. The remaining walls suggest both residential and storage structures as well as a small church in the center of the town. Local King Tokiloeton of the Noba (q.v.) has an inscription at Ikhmindi indicating his concern for security, perhaps against attacks of the Blemmyes (q.v.). Evidence of a winepress suggests some local production and regional export. The University of Milan investigated Ikhmindi during the Nubian salvage project.

INCENSE AND GUM ARABIC. “Incense” is a term generally used to describe a range of aromatic substances that produce a pleasant odor when burned. Used as a perfume for personal adornment as well as in ritual and medicines, incense can be derived from a variety of gums produced by trees of the *Bursera* family native to Africa and Asia. Frankincense is a gum resin obtained from various trees of the genus *Boswellia*. Myrrh is a gum resin extracted from any of several plants or small trees of the genus *Commiphora*, native to East Africa. Gum arabic is obtained from several species of African acacia, especially *Acacia senegal*.

Incense and gums played a prominent role in the religion, magic, and medicine of ancient Egypt. It was also used as a perfume in the form of waxed “incense cones,” shown in this New Kingdom scene from the Theban tomb of Nebamun. Unavailable locally, incense and gums were obtained from Nubia and other sources in
Africa. The oldest known record of trade in incense comes from the Egyptian Old Kingdom. Records from the 6th Dynasty chronicle an expedition to the “Land of Yam,” which lay in the Dongola reach with its capital at Kerma (q.v.). Apparently, the main goal of this expedition was to obtain incense and fragrant oils, among other goods. Throughout ancient Nubian history, the majority of incense was exported to Egypt. However, Punt (q.v.) was the chief source of a highly desired incense called ‘ntyw, used in Egyptian religious ritual. Indeed, “incense trees” were one of the commodities brought to Egypt by Hatshepsut (q.v.; 1473–1458 BCE) as a result of the expedition she sent to the land of Punt. The importance of this commodity is reflected in the deity Dedun (q.v.), whose primary role was that of “protector of precious southern commodities,” especially frankincense. [by k. rhodes]

INFIBULATION. See CIRCUMCISION (FEMALE).

INSCRIPTIONS. The study of inscriptions, writing, and graffiti in and on ancient Nubia is a vast area of epigraphy worthy of many volumes. In a concise fashion, this topic may be summarized by noting the nature of the inscribed texts and some of the inscriptions that are of greater importance.

The first inscriptions relating to ancient Nubia are those in Egyptian hieroglyphs from the earliest Dynastic or historic times. These Archaic and Old Kingdom hieroglyphic and hieratic inscriptions give us the first cases of ethnonyms (e.g., Ta-Seti, Ta-Nehesi [q.v.]) and toponyms (Irem, Yam, Yeb [q.q.v.]) for Nubia, but the Nubian A-Group is mute in inscriptional terms. As the inscriptions shift to the standardized Middle Egyptian forms, this vocabulary is repeated and expanded with the name “Kush” appearing at this period. Unfortunately, the contemporary Kerma and C-Group (q.q.v.) peoples are again mute in written forms of their own culture, but places such as Wawat and Irtet are known, in part from execration figures (q.v.) in Middle Kingdom forts and from tribute from Nubia to Egypt. In the Second Intermediate period, two hieroglyphic inscriptions are known that reflect this dynamic time. One is the intercepted text from the Hyksos king in the delta to the Kerma king encouraging a joint alliance against the isolated Theban Egyptians. The Sepedhor (q.v.) stela found at Buhen reveals loyalty to Kerma rather than to Egypt.
By the New Kingdom colonial times in Nubia, huge numbers of hieroglyphic texts are found that attest to the regular payment of various forms of tribute to the viceroys of Nubia (q.v.) as well as funerary and temple texts that verify the deep cultural and religious ties of this period. Hieroglyphic texts of the period also reveal the great frequency of punitive missions against Nubian revolts and resistance to Egyptian rule. Of special interest in this period are the inscriptions of Queen Hatshepsut (q.v.) in her voyages to Punt (q.v.).

The Third Intermediate period, or Nubian “Dark Age,” produces hardly any textual understanding of the dynamics in Nubia, except at the very beginning of this obscure period, with the rivalries of Herihor, Piankh, and Panehesi (qq.v.). At the very end of this period, rising from the tumulæ of Kurru (q.v.), the names of Kashta and Alara emerge to set the stage for the ambitious period of the 25th Dynasty, which has famed hieroglyphic inscriptions for Kings Piankh, Shabaka, Taharka, and Tanutamun. To date, the earliest known inscription in demotic is attributed to Taharka. Recalling that Egyptian hieroglyphs did not represent the native language of Nubia, one may project that demotic was created by Nubians to simplify this otherwise foreign and difficult language. Demotic carries forward and expands substantially in all later Dynastic and Greco-Roman periods.

Conceivably, the intellectual excitement of the Alexandrian library under the Ptolemies nudged Nubians to write their own language in their own script, which was modified from demotic and hieroglyphs. A long entry on Meroitic describes this important development and the status of this Nubian written language in more detail, but the work of Francis Griffith must be recognized for his great contribution in transliteration, and the work of the French in producing the REM (Repetoire Epigraphic de Meroitique) has been pioneering. Well over 1,000 texts are now known. They represent a great range of funerary, monumental, notational, and graffiti texts that are mostly untranslated. The presence of a short bilingual text in Meroitic and Egyptian allowed agreement on transliteration, but the absence of a clear cognatic language or a bilingual text has substantially slowed the advance on further decipherment.

As Roman paganism gave way to Egyptian Coptic Christianity, a new form of writing was introduced that rendered ancient Egyptian into mostly Greek letters. Then, as Christianity spread southward into Nubia,
a parallel process took place, with the Nubian language of the time also being rendered into largely Greek letters, now termed Old Nubian. At this transitional time, such famed texts as the King Silko (q.v.) inscription, in poor Greek, are accepted as the turning point to Nubian Christianity. Old Nubian was heavily used for religious and biblical transactions. It is tempting to see an association between Meroitic and Old Nubian languages, and some relationship certainly exists, but the lack of compatible texts or lexicons in the two forms of perhaps some common ancestral language has been as much of a frustration as it has been a solution to the problem of Meroitic. At Meroë itself, inscriptions are mostly in Meroitic, but short texts in Greek, Latin, and Axumite are known. With the arrival of Arabs and Islam in Egypt in 640 CE, Arabic rapidly replaced Coptic as the lingua franca, and Coptic fell into mainly liturgical functions. The same process took place more slowly in Christian Nubia, and by the fall of Soba (q.v.) in 1504 CE, Arabic inscriptions supplanted those in Old Nubian or Coptic except for some church uses.

IREM. See YAM.

IRIKE-AMANOTE (431–405 BCE). This Napatan (q.v.) king has a Horus and Nebty name similar to that of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) king Piankhy (q.v.), who was still much celebrated and remembered. It seems that Ireike-Amanote was much inspired with Taharka (q.v.) as well. Accordingly, he was crowned at Napata and inscribed his name to make donations at Kawa temple, which had long been of regional significance to Nubian rule. His queen mother attended one of these visits to Kawa. He was the immediate successor of (and perhaps brief coregent with) King Talakhamani, and he was the son of the former king Malowiebamani. Like his predecessor, Shabataka (q.v.), Irike-Amanote was styled as the “seizer and subduer of all lands.” He conducted war against the nomadic groups to the east, probably the Medjay, and perhaps he had hoped to take advantage of the confusion of Persian (q.v.) rule in Egypt to restore Kushite control of that land, as had been the case in the 25th Dynasty. Irike-Amanote was buried in the large pyramid 12 at the royal cemetery at Nuri (q.v.).

IRIPA-ANKH-KEN-KENEF. This Nubian prince was likely the son of Kashta (q.v) and potential rival to the Nubian crown of Piankhy
(q.v.). Limited textual reference provides the note that he brought his Nubian mother to the famed mortuary and pilgrimage center at Abydos for her burial once the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) was in power.

IRON. The long history of ancient iron technology is a vast subject. In Early Dynastic Egypt, iron was associated mythically with the god Seth, and meteoric iron was used for amulets. Iron ores were found plentifully in Nubia and Egypt, mostly as hematite and red and yellow ochre, found in Aswan (q.v.) and in the oases of the Western Desert. Hematite was made into beads and amulets from the Predynastic period, and the ochers were used as pigments.

Flinders Petrie discovered some iron tools from Thebes that dated to the Assyrian (q.v.) occupation in the seventh century BCE. Though these tools were of non-Egyptian manufacture, they provide the earliest evidence of iron tools in Egypt. By the 26th Dynasty, iron was common enough to be placed in foundation deposits and used for other general purposes. Thus, the appearance of Egyptian-made iron tools was not much earlier than the sixth century BCE, during Saite times at Naucratis, where Petrie discovered remains of smelting. Many archaeologists of ancient Nubia long believed that the introduction of iron working into Nubia was from Egypt. Arkell suggests that small-scale iron production may have been introduced to Napata (q.v.) during the retreat of King Taharka (q.v.) to Nubia. But the few items known from this period may be imports. To date, no Napatan site of iron smelting is known to exist before 400 BCE. While it is not clear precisely when iron technology arrived along the Nile, it is generally believed that it diffused from Phoenicians to Assyrians and then to Egyptians in the eighth or seventh century BCE and on to Ptolemaic Greeks who reached Meroë (q.v.) in the fourth or third century BCE.

King Harsiyoef (q.v.) apparently was the first Meroitic ruler to have had model iron tools in the foundation deposits of his tomb, but the large-scale slag heaps are rather late in Meroitic chronology. Meroitic iron objects remain generally small and most objects are badly oxidized and hardly identifiable as to function. Nevertheless, among the recognizable objects were tweezers, knives, jewelry, nails, hooks, hoes, spoons, rings, axes, spikes, blades, barbed points, spearheads, chisels, rods, bezels, a horse bit (?), and arrowheads.
Thus, the earliest precise date for the regular extraction of iron from its ores in the Nile valley is still uncertain, and the earliest dates for Egypt appear to be far earlier than those for Meroë. As more contemporaneous sub-Saharan iron smelting sites are found, we may have to rethink the primary Egyptocentric diffusionist model that has prevailed until now. Until the chemistry of the iron and slag from varying sequential strata of the slag heaps are further known, it will not be clear whether Meroitic slag heaps were long- or short-term accumulations or what may have caused fluctuations in production. Only relatively small parts of Meroë have been excavated, but here were found great piles of iron slag, the debris from Meroë’s famous iron working. Excavations in 1973 located two more iron furnaces, but it is not completely clear whether these were primary smelting furnaces or secondary smithing furnaces. The neat linear diffusion model of Meroë’s iron production as the “Birmingham of Africa,” proposed by A. H. Sayce, must now be rejected.

The classical historian Herodotus (1954:467) made a relevant comment about this when he noted in Book VII that the “Ethiopians” [Meroites] “carried long bows [q.v.] made of palm wood—as much as six feet long—which were used to shoot small cane arrows tipped not with iron but with stone worked to a fine point.” The small-quantity, low-quality objects and the large amounts of iron remaining in the fayalite slag suggest that the early iron production techniques of Meroë were relatively poor. In any case, the presence of fayalites (iron-rich waste slags) at Meroë would be more consistent with either an African iron smelting tradition or a lack of technology transfer from the Greeks or the supposedly better technology of the Romans. Some scholars have noted that some dates in sub-Saharan Africa iron technology are parallel to those in Meroë.

Modern smelters use fluxing to increase their yield of iron and decrease the amount of iron oxides wasted in the slag. The poor quality of Meroitic reduction indicates not only that fluxing was not used but also that the sometimes hostile military relations of the Meroites with the Romans in Egypt did not allow for this advantageous technology transfer in the ancient world. Indeed, for a substantial period of Roman rule in Egypt, the Meroites reoccupied Lower Nubia and expelled the Romans from that region. These poor relations may have been costly in the failure of the transfer of fluxing technology in the
first centuries CE. In the subsequent X-Group Ballana and Qustul (qq.v.) burials, iron objects such as spears, swords, hoes, saws, and axes appear to become more frequent. Once chemical seriation is more fully known, we may address the issues of the origins, scale, and evolution of Meroitic iron technology more precisely. [by C. B. Rhoades Jr., W. Bader, and R. Lobban, extracted from *Sudan Notes and Records* (1999)]

IRRIGATION. Several ancient types of irrigation techniques were used in the Nile valley. Since Lower Nubia and much of Upper Nubia are without rain, irrigation is essential. Land can also be irrigated by water-lifting devices, such as the animal-driven "endless bucket," or pot waterwheel (Arabic: *sakia*, *saqia*; Nubian: *essi-kalay*, *eskaylay*), and the human-powered water-lifting beam (Arabic: *shaduf*; Nubian: *keeyay*). Lifted water was canalized into individual fields.

Diversionary canals of some sort were present from very early times, as suggested by images of Narmer having the authority to regulate water flow. No major dams of the Nile were in regular usage, although some downstream ends of sandbars might be blocked to store water. In areas of grasslands with periodic rainfall, the use of *hafirs* was known. These very long, low dams across shallow basins, or wadis, could hold large amounts of water for livestock.

Naturally occurring basin land normally lies between the natural levees of a river and the desert. At the high, or peak, of a river, the floodwater is directed into a basin, where the water is then drained after the land has been carefully drenched. In Egypt, basins normally are large, whereas between Khartoum and Kerma (q.v.), basins are rather small and simple. Basins in Nubia feature a single feeder canal and one or two drains. The Kerma basin and Letti basin (Old Dongola) are two of the few places in Nubia where natural basin irrigation takes place. Although highly effective, basin lands require cooperation and a large number of farmers; thus, basin land normally is passed over as the system of irrigation for farmers.

*Seluka* land is named after the digging stick used to plant the crops (rather than the crops being broadcast sown) and is found in the arable portion, *gerf* floodplains, of Nubia. This type of land consists of banks and islands on the river that receive adequate water during the annual Nile flood. Irrigation of this type requires nominal labor
and little money and produces a wide variety of crops. Seluka land is available for only a single growing season.

Sakia and shaduf lands are irrigated by mechanical devices that feed land otherwise not arable. The introduction of the sakia was apparently during Ptolemaic times in the second century BCE, but the actual origin of the sakia is debated, with many saying that it was a Persian invention. This device was originally built from wood, although today metals are used. The device consists of a large cogged wheel placed horizontally on a vertical shaft to which one or two of the animals are yoked. A series of clay jars (qadus) are attached to a vertical wooden wheel. Such jars were found extensively in the remains of Kulubnarti (q.v.). The oxen then rotate the vertical beam, sending each of the clay jars into the water to be filled. The water is then emptied into a trough that carries the water by furrows into the cultivated field.

Sakia land can support heavy cropping and yields up to 350 bushels of wheat per feddan (1.1 acres). However, the area irrigated depends on the height of the water and the distance it must be lifted. For example, at the height of the Nile flood, a lift of two meters can water from four to five feddans. Inefficiencies are realized with sakias since some water is lost when raised. Such inefficiency, however, did not stop it from being a revolutionary device in Nubia. No longer was horticulture restricted to land lying less than ten meters above the river surface. Many Meroitic settlements are linked to the introduction of the sakia. The “land rush” into ancient Lower Nubia (q.v.) was due in part to the introduction of the sakia. Nearly half the crop grown was used for livestock fodder, boosting valuable livestock production.

Unlike sakia land, shaduf land usually is employed when watering small vegetable patches during the flood season. The shaduf features a counterbalanced lever with a bucket at one end that is submerged into the water and then transferred. A shaduf can water lift up to three meters. This device is easy to construct and is worked by hand. It was first recorded in Egypt during the New Kingdom. [R. Lobban with P. Saucier]

IRTET, IRTJET, IRTHET. Irtet was an independent Nubian chiefdom or small kingdom in the third millennium BCE. It likely was upstream
of Wawat (q.v.). Together with Wawat and Setju (q.v.), Irtet formed a larger territory known to the Egyptians as the kingdom of Kush (q.v.). The land of Irtet contained many C-Group (q.v.) settlements. See also KERMA.

ISIS. This very ancient Egyptian and Nubian goddess figures prominently in the religion of the Nile, and she persists into Greco-Roman theology and even into Christianity. Isis was the daughter of Geb and Nut and the sister of Seth, Nephthys, and Osiris (q.v.), the last of whom was also her husband. Osiris and Isis were the parents of the falcon-headed Horus, whose role in protecting the pharaoh is legendary, as is his eternal combat against evil, usually represented by his sinister uncle Seth. Imagery of Isis extends throughout the Egyptian and Nubian Nile and into neighboring Asia and to the northern Mediterranean. Isis was even worshiped in Roman London. She is a female goddess presented in several postures, including standing, seated on her throne, or nursing her son Horus. She can have horns (like Hathor), and both can wear the vulture headdress as well. The deciding difference is that her hieroglyphic name should include her throne glyph and a determinative female.

In Greco-Roman times, Isis often is conflated with Hathor, with whom she shared many characteristics of motherhood, tenderness, and devotion. Later, Isis emerges in Greek theology as the goddess Aphrodite and in Roman theology as Venus. One of the most famous places where Isis is celebrated is at Philae temple at Aswan. Even after the establishment of Christianity, this shrine was still visited by Egyptians and Meroites, who are depicted in the “Ethiopian Chamber” at that temple. Isis figures very prominently in Nubian iconography from the 25th Dynasty, where she is supporting the king, and on through Napatan and Meroitic times on temple walls, funerary chapels, funerary stelae, and offering tablets.

ISLAM: EARLY HISTORY. Islam spread rapidly across North Africa in the seventh century CE immediately after its introduction in the Arabian Peninsula. Islam also moved very quickly from North Africa into Iberia and southern Europe, which was conquered and Islamized in the seventh and eighth centuries CE. Later, it reached the West African Sahel, with major Muslim kingdoms established there by the tenth century CE.
By contrast, the major penetration of Islam into Nubia does not occur until the fourteenth century CE, as it was effectively blocked by the presence of the Christian (q.v.) kingdoms of Nubia.

The spread of Islam up the Nile occurred over the period of a millennium, both by invasion and by assimilation of Muslim merchants and teachers who settled and married among the Nubians. The fall of Dongola, Mukkurra, and Nobatia (qq.v.) as Nubian Christian kingdoms in the fourteenth century CE permitted the Islamic religion to penetrate to Upper Nubia. By this time, West African Muslims sometimes crossed the Sudanese Sahel on their pilgrimages to Mecca, but they were not a main force for the Islamization of Nubia.

After the fall of Dongola (q.v.) in about 1320 CE, the spread of Islam and the Arabic language still took almost two centuries just to consolidate its position. This process was completed in central Sudan at the fall of Alwa (q.v.) in 1504, the establishment of the Funj sultanates at Sennar (q.v.), and the sultanate of Darfur (q.v.) at El Fasher. The southern regions of Sudan were generally beyond the influence of Islam at these times except as a source of slaves.

The Funj kingdom at Sennar in the Gezira became the first Muslim state in central Sudan, and it exerted its influence from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. The Funj sultans attracted and encouraged holy men from the Arabian Peninsula, Sudanese Nubians, and some Egyptians to introduce Islamic theology, Maliki jurisprudence, and Islamic religious and folk practices to central Sudan. See also ALWA; CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA; FUNJ SULTANATES; HISTORICAL DICTIONARY OF SUDAN (3RD EDITION).

**ITINERARIUM ANTONINI.** This Latin text of the third century CE is properly known as the *Itinerarium Provinciarum Anton(i)ni Augusti*, or, more simply, the *Itinerarium Antonini*. This work dates about to the time of Caracalla (q.v.). It served as a practical commercial guidebook within the Roman Empire by providing the location of rest house stations and the distance between them. Its precise toponyms are still very useful for historical and geographic reconstruction of Roman North Africa. This tradition of listing and locating places began with the Roman geographers Strabo and Claudius Ptolemaeus (qq.v.) and continued in the *Itinerarium* as an example of the Roman influences (q.v.) in the region. In Lower Nubia, the *Itinerarium* described
Roman settlements and roads, indicating that the biggest settlements or military camps were mostly on the western side of the Nile.

From north to south, the *Itinerarium* mentioned Contra Syene and Syene; Philae (q.v.) and Shellal (q.v.); Parenbole (Dabod [q.v.]); Tzitzis (Wadi Kamar); Qirtas (Kertassi [q.v.]); Taphis and Contra Taphis; Talmis (Kalabsha [q.v.]), and Contra Talmis; Aguala, Dendur (q.v.), Tutzi, Pselchis (Kuri), and Contra Pselchis (Kubban [q.v.]); Curta; and Takompso or Hiera Sykaminos (Maharraqa [q.v.]). This was the more common end of Roman control within Lower Nubia or the Dodekachoenos (q.v.), although periodic raiding parties did venture farther southward. As in Dynastic times, the posts at Pselchis and Contra Pselchis guarded the route into the Wadi al-Allaqi (q.v.) gold mines (the “doorway into Nubia”). Except for Contra Syene (western Aswan) and Shellal (east of Philae), all the place names preceded with “Contra” indicated only small eastern bank military and commercial control posts for the desert caravans and the river trade. [by E. Fantusati with R. Lobban]

**IVORY.** Elephant (q.v.) ivory was traded from Nubia to Egypt as early as the Neolithic (7000–4000 BCE). However, our earliest evidence of this trade comes from the A-Group (q.v.; ca. 3500–3000 BCE). Although it is unlikely that the small, scattered population of the A-Group was capable of large-scale trade organization, finds at Gerzean sites in Upper Egypt attest to at least an informal trade network. Ivory trade is indicated by artifacts from the tomb of King Jer (q.v.), a 1st Dynasty pharaoh (ca. 3000 BCE) of the Old Kingdom (q.v.). In this period, the ivory trade between Egypt and Nubia became more formalized and continued throughout ancient Nubian history. Records from the 6th Dynasty (ca. 2300–2100 BCE) chronicle several expeditions to the “Land of Yam” (q.v.) (generally understood to be Kerma [q.v.]) to procure ivory and other luxury goods.

During the First Intermediate period, the royal craftsmen of Kerma inlaid footboards and headboards of funerary beds with ivory carved in bird and animal shapes. The beds often had ivory legs carved to look like those of animals and were themselves superb examples of carpentry and joinery. The copper daggers of Kerma owe their characteristic large flat-topped ivory handles to the local ample supply of ivory. A lively ivory trade also existed between the Nubians and Hyksos at that time.
By the Colonial period (1550–1000 BCE), ivory is a familiar tribute paid by Kush, as known from a New Kingdom scene from the Theban tomb of Rekhmire. Ivory was also featured during the New Kingdom expeditions sent along the coast of the Red Sea by Queen Hatshepsut to Punt (qq.v.) to bring back tusks. Among the chief exports from Nubia to Egypt during the reign of Tuthmosis III (q.v.) were ivory, gold, rare woods, ostrich feathers and eggs, semiprecious stones, and incense. Many tomb paintings depict Nubian ivory being offered to the pharaoh by his viceroy of Nubia. A case is well known for Tutankhamen (q.v.) during the 18th Dynasty. At the Lower Nubian temple of Beit al-Wali (q.v.), built by Ramses II (qq.v.; 1304–1237 BCE) in the 19th Dynasty, painted mural scenes show elephants, ivory, gold, leopard skins, ebony logs, and ostrich eggs and feathers along with exotic animals such as lions, antelopes, ostriches, gazelles, giraffes, monkeys, and leopards.

In the Napatan period and in the time of Meroë (q.v.), ivory remained significant in Nubia. In addition, big-game hunting, as well as the capturing and exportation of the animals, was of great economic importance. Beside ivory exports and local consumption of meat, elephant hides were exported for making shields, and elephant hair was exported for making bracelets. In Room 15 of the badly fire-damaged “Treasury at Sanam” (q.v.), trade items of ebony and elephant ivory were found stockpiled. Whether these were for local utilization or for export is unknown.

The Persian king Darius (521–486 BCE) used ivory that was brought from Kush (Welsby 1996:175–76). Gifts of ivory and elephants were a custom for many sovereigns looking for favors or asking for peace. Kushites are shown with gifts of elephant tusks to the Persian king Xerxes (485–465 BCE). Herodotus tells how the “Ethiopians” sent twenty great elephant tusks every third year to the Persian court. Pliny notes that elephants were still to be found around Meroë in the 60s CE. In the later Meroitic era (second to third century CE), an oil lamp with heads of elephants made of bronze was found. Early Meroitic palaces contain elephant images, including one that shows a naked man (a Roman deity?) with a yoke across his shoulders, from each end of which a small elephant is suspended.

Concurrent with this increased demand, a competing trade in ivory was developed in Ethiopia by the kingdom of Axum. After the collapse of Meroë and its interior trade organization, ivory was exported
from Sudan to Egypt, which continued to acquire it from the port of Adulis (q.v.). The demand for ivory grew enormously as the Romans began to use it not only for statues and combs but also for chairs, tables, birdcages, and carriages as well as a host of other luxury items. Caligula (q.v.) gave his horse an ivory stable, while Seneca possessed 500 tripod tables with ivory legs.

During the Ballana (q.v.) period, the graves of kings of Nobatae contained ivory inlays on wooden chests. By the fifth century CE, the elephant had almost disappeared from the forests of Ethiopia, so in the Christian period, trade in ivory again returned to Nubia. According to Ibn Selim el-Aswani, an Arab geographer of the Middle Ages, a large number of Muslim merchants resident in the capital of Alwa (q.v.) were interested, at least partly, in the lucrative trade in ivory and slaves. [by k. rhodes, V. de Liedekerke, and R. Lobban]
“saintly” worship. Initially, they had offered broad support to the Mahdist movement in the nineteenth century, as they perceived economic advantages in lifting Turkish control. Under Khalifa ‘Abdul-lahi, the Ja’aliyin became disillusioned. Today, especially after independence, people of Ja’ali origin are frequently found at the centers of commerce and politics.

JEBEL ADDA, ADO. The region around this mountain was occupied in several periods. It was one of the main centers of power and authority from Meroitic times until the arrival of the Arabs in the thirteenth century CE. Jebel Adda served as a subcenter to Qasr Ibrim (q.v.) during the Meroitic period. During this time, it was a walled settlement that overlooked the eastern bank of the Nile. It featured pyramids covered with white plaster, a mortuary custom that differed from the usual red plaster. Cemeteries were located close to town and on the eastern bank; again this differed, since cemeteries normally were situated on the western bank.

Jebel Adda went through several building phases, the fourth phase being the most extensive. Stone-dressed walls replaced brick fortifications, temples were built, and sandstone statues were constructed. It is assumed that during this phase, Jebel Adda served as a military, administrative, and religious center; it may have served as the capital during the Ballana (q.v.) period. The Ballana culture may have destroyed many pyramids at Jebel Adda, opting for mound tumulae, a clear rejection of Meroitic culture. During the Middle Ages, Jebel Adda may have served several thousand inhabitants, explaining why the settlement extended beyond the citadel walls. By the fourteenth century CE, the small Nubian kingdom of Dotawo (q.v.) was established at Jebel Adda. Documents dated 1484 CE give evidence of a king Joel, thus giving evidence that Jebel Adda persisted until the fifteenth century. Extensive excavating has produced only one royal name, King Joel, within the fortification. X-Group (q.v.) cemeteries have been found there, as has a temple for Amun. This temple is considered the latest to have been built in Lower Nubia, thus proving that this deity was worshiped until the final downfall of pre-Christian Nubia. [R. Lobban with P. Saucier]

JEBEL AL-SHAMS. Jebel Al-Shams was located just upstream from Abahuda and Abu Simbel (qq.v.). It was associated with a stela and
small rock-cut chapel for Paser, who served as the viceroy of Nubia under Horemhab (q.v.) at the close of the 18th Dynasty. Elements were moved to Abu Simbel (q.v.) in the Nubian salvage project. Jebel al-Shams had also been occupied in Meroitic times, as evidenced by pyramidal tombs and a cemetery of that period.

**JEBEL BARKAL.** This flat-topped mountain rises just west of the modern town of Kerma, or across from the ancient town of Sanam (q.v.), which was at the site of the modern town of Merowe, which should not be confused with the ancient town and state of Meroë (q.v.). This is the highest promontory for many kilometers around, but it was also located below the Fourth Cataract, a natural boundary and barrier on the Nile. Located on the eastern bank of the Nile, where it makes its huge S-turn in Nubia, the land behind Jebel Barkal gave access to a land route and shortcut to Kerma (q.v.) just upstream of the Third Cataract. On the opposite, western bank was Sanam, which probably was the main commercial town and the northern terminus of the land route across the Bayuda steppe, a bypass for the much longer and more difficult river route, which had to pass through the Fourth and Fifth Cataracts.

In ancient times, Jebel Barkal was known in hieroglyphics as “The Pure Mountain,” and its modern Arabic name means the “Blessed Mountain.” A spiritual presence of Amun was believed to reside within the mountain itself. Jebel Barkal was also generally known as Napata, which served as a provincial capital of ancient Kush under New Kingdom colonization. It served as a capital of sovereign Nubia as early as the eighth century BCE, if not much earlier. It was still the regional capital of Nubia when Nubians took over all of Egypt in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). The kings of that dynasty were buried in the royal cemeteries of Kurru, Nuri, and Jebel Barkal, all of which are located in the vicinity of the mountain and the huge Amun temple and royal palaces. Even after the end of the 25th Dynasty’s control of Egypt, Nubians persisted to rule from Jebel Barkal until the third century BCE, when it seems that the political center of gravity shifted to Meroë, when royal burials began to take place there.

Its importance rests solidly on the fact that it was the home of Nubia’s largest temple to Amun, who resided in the form of a ram inside Jebel Barkal. Royal palaces for the 25th Dynasty and Napatan kings
existed, as did rock-cut temples and other major religious and political edifices. Both downstream and upstream of Jebel Barkal are royal and noble pyramid fields where Nubians began their own long tradition of pyramid construction, producing more pyramids (and over a longer period of time, albeit much later) than even those of Egypt itself. In short, Jebel Barkal has long retained great significance because of its deep religious symbolism, its inherent strategic value, and its service as a political capital and a place for royal residence and burial.

Although Jebel Barkal was visited by a number of serious nineteenth-century travelers, such as F. Cailliaud, G. Hoskins, R. Lepsius, and E. A. Budge (qq.v.), it was the work of G. Reisner that really put this site on the archaeological map. His numbering system for the main features of Jebel Barkal—such as the Mut Temple, B300; the Amun Temple, B500; the Napatan Temple of Senkamanisken and Atlanersa (qq.v.), B700; and the great palace, B1200—are still referenced today.

JEBEL DOSHA. Jebel Dosha is located between Soleb and Sedenga (qq.v.) on the western bank of the Nile above Sai Island (q.v.), where a small rock-cut temple was constructed by Tuthmosis III (q.v.).

JEBEL GEILI. See JEBEL QEILI.

JEBEL MEIDOB. This hill area far to the west of the Nile in northern Darfur (q.v.) is known to have a group of about 30,000 speakers of a Nubian dialect (i.e., a branch of Eastern Sudanic that is itself a subgroup of Nilo-Saharan). Although the linguistic distance between Meidobi Nubian and the Nubian dialects along the Nile is the greatest in this language group, it has raised some important questions. Were the ancient Nile Nubians refugees or migrants from this western region at an ancient time, or are the Meidobi speakers an isolated population of Nubian refugees from the Nile? This dispute is not resolved, but the prevailing view is that the Nile Nubians came from this western origin but then were heavily mixed with Egyptians from the north, Arabs from the east, and slave populations from the south. Precisely when this migration or series of migrations from Jebel Meidob may have taken place is another matter of dispute relative to the issue of migration to or from the Nile at some prehistoric time.
JEDEL MOKRAM. This area in eastern Sudan contains over fifty sites from the second millennium BCE. It coexisted with the Kassala phase but perhaps was represented by a seasonal group from the region of what is modern-day Eritrea. The site was approximately 10,000 square meters in size and characterized by herding and farming. It is generally known for its ceramic elements, such as thin-scraped ware and sand-tempered undecorated brown ware. Lugs and ceramic strainers are also elements of this group, as are stone polished bracelets. Obsidian has been found, suggesting contact with the Ethiopian highlands. The lug handles and different types of fabric found at Jebel Mokram also suggest that the Jebel Mokram group is part of the hereditary base from which some Pre-Axumite elements arose. [by P. Saucier]

JEDEL MOYA. The site of Jebel Moya is located about 300 kilometers south of Khartoum in the middle of the Gezira (q.v.) between the White and Blue Niles. As its name suggests, it has year-round water (moya) resources some distance from the Nile. Sophisticated survey research began there in 1910 by Henry Wellcome, but it was not continued in a regular way, and the first publication of the data was not until 1949. The Jebel Moya site represents a horizon well after the Shaheinab (q.v.) site, or Khartoum Neolithic, and may have first been occupied in the first millennium BCE and in the Napatan period.

The incomplete excavation is such that earlier material, as well as material from the Meroitic period, may be present. Since the archaeology of southern Sudan is poor and the southern extent of the northern kingdoms is not well known, it is important that this research continue in the future. Lip plugs and mace heads found in Jebel Moya burials suggest ties to Shaheinab, while removal of the lower incisors and general craniometry suggest ties to the “Negroid” Nilotic people of the south.

JEDEL QEILL. Jebel Qeili is so called from the red color (geili in Nubian) of this granite outcropping, which was known by the West since the time of Frédéric Cailliou (q.v.). It lies about 150 kilometers east of Khartoum along the track to Kassala in the mid-Butana (q.v.), southwest of Murabba. Jebel Qeili was the site of a crossroads settlement as well. In Meroitic times, one may surmise that this image was
drawn to establish a boundary or to warn local enemies, such as the Blemmyes (q.v).

It is especially known for its rock-inscribed human images (zol musawwar in colloquial Arabic). Meroitic hieroglyphs in two car-touches identify the monarch as King Shorkaror (q.v.; 20–30 CE), a full-face image of a sun god in a Greco-Roman style and some animal graffiti. This Meroitic king is shown in profile with his uraeus, Nubian-style head tie and ribbon, bow and arrow (q.v.), quiver, and spear. Shorkaror is standing on four bound prisoners. Details of at least four other dead victims are also depicted. This head of the sun god deity is surrounded by a disk with radiating sun rays. In one hand, the god assists Shorkaror by holding a rope attached to seven additional standing captives, while in the other, the god offers a bundle of durra (millet) stalks to the king.

This inscription contains the only known victory relief of King Shorkaror, receiving blessings from a sun god and triumphing over unnamed enemies who may be from Axum (q.v.), given the location of the stela. Its style apparently is influenced by Greco-Roman traditions, the last of any significance in the history of the Kushite Kingdom. This is the southernmost Meroitic monument known. Today the Batahin and Shukriya camel-herding Arabs (q.v.) occupy this region. [R. Lobban with P. Saucier]

JEBEL SAHABA. This late Paleolithic (or Epipaleolithic) site of the Qadan type (qq.v.) is just north of Wadi Halfa. It is unusual insofar as it is a cemetery for the oldest known case of mass violence, sometime between 12,000 and 10,000 BCE. Among the many dead, at least 40 percent were killed by wounds from microlithic points of stone, bone, or ivory (q.v.). One victim had over 100 points buried within his body. It seems that the “Negro” population was represented along with other multiethnic or multiracial peoples buried there. Precisely who killed whom and for what reasons is not clear, but certainly this was a transition period in a contact region, so it may offer evidence of an early raid or a violent attack between Egyptian and Nubian peoples early in Predynastic times.

JEBEL SHEIKH SULEIMAN. See SHEIKH SULEIMAN.

JER, KING. See DJER, KING.
JEWS. These ancient migrants from Mesopotamia, the sons of Abraham, may have first reached the Nile valley in some relationship with the Hyksos (q.v.), who were key allies of the Nubians. The Hyksos had certain ties to ancient Canaan and had Semitic names. It is believed that the famed Exodus led by Moses took place during the long reign of Ramses II (q.v.) or earlier. Apparently, the first reference in the Nile valley to Jews (Habiru) is on the temple of Ramses III (q.v.) at Medinat Habu in western Thebes, although scholars have wavered about this point.

The first, ancient kingdom of Jews was formed by King Saul’s unification of the wandering Judaic peoples and especially by the subsequent reign of his son, King David (1010–970 BCE). The third king in this dynasty was Solomon (970–930 BCE), who is credited with the construction of the temple at Jerusalem housing the famed Ark of the Covenant, which may have passed through Lower Nubia (q.v.) on its way to Axum (q.v.).

Later the Jewish state split into the two kingdoms of Judaea to the south and Israel (Samaria) to the north. In the eighth and seventh centuries BCE, the Assyrians (q.v.) attacked these two kingdoms. The Babylonians dispersed the Jews in the sixth century BCE. Jews then went in many directions, including up the Nile to Lower Nubia. It is well known that some of the Nubian pharaohs of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) had close political and military ties with the Judeans (q.v.). Both had common interests in resisting Assyrian aggression, but ultimately both failed. However, it appears that at some point in the seventh century BCE, some Jews and Canaanites moved to the Nile valley while still occupied by Nubian pharaohs. A Jewish temple was established at Aswan (q.v.) from that time until it was destroyed in the late fifth century. It is likely that Jewish mercenaries were part of the military forces of Psamtik II (q.v.) in his attacks on Napata (q.v.).

Under more liberal Persian rule, a number of Judeans returned to Jerusalem in 538 BCE, as authorized by King Cyrus, and an early Jewish community was formed in Egypt under the reign of Darius I in 494 BCE. By the time of the Ptolemies, the city of Alexandria (q.v.) was approximately one-quarter Jews, some of whom played a military role in the defense of Ptolemaic Egypt at Aswan as they had with the Persians. Jews also played an important scholarly role in the life of Alexandria, especially in the translation of the Septuagint from
Hebrew to Greek. Meroitic writing seems to have been stimulated by this library, and at least one Ptolemaic ruler spoke Nubian, while some Nubian kings could converse in Greek.

Roman expansion around the Mediterranean in the first century BCE brought Judaea under the authority of Pompey in 63 BCE. Roman Emperor Caligula (q.v.) first appointed Herod as king of Judaea in 37 BCE, and he continued to serve afterward under Augustus (q.v.). His Jewish subjects were much oppressed by Roman rule, and they certainly abhorred Herod. In this regard, Jews and Nubians, like the former Hyksos and Kerma leaders, were again of a common mind in their great dislike for the authority controlling Egypt. Passive and active resistance and compromised positions during this period characterize the Jewish–Roman and Nubian–Roman relationship in this and following centuries. See also CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA.

JULIAN, EMPEROR (361–363 CE). This nephew of Constantine (q.v.) briefly sought to restore the worship of the sun god and reverse the institutionalization of Christianity in the Roman Empire. His pagan revival movement quickly failed.

JULIAN, MISSIONARY. Julian was a Monophysite (q.v.) Christian missionary who was sent by the empress Theodora to Nubia in competition with Orthodox missionaries sent by Justinian (q.v.). In 543 CE, he managed to convert the rulers of Nobatia (q.v.) to Christianity. See CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA; MUKURIA.

JUSTIN I. Justin I was a Roman emperor of Byzantium from 518 to 527 CE, that is, just prior to Justinian I (q.v.). Among his main interests was balancing the theological differences between the Chalcedonians endorsed by Rome and the strategically important Monophysites of Nubia, Egypt, and elsewhere. He also developed a special interest in supporting the Christian (Monophysite) Axumites (q.v.) of Ethiopia in 523–525 CE to serve the Roman political and military interest of attacking Persian supporters in Yemen while gaining control of the valuable maritime trade to Asia.

JUSTINIAN I (ca. 482–565 CE). This emperor of Christian Byzantium ruled from 527 to 565 CE. He was the adviser to Justin I
Justinian I (ca. 482–565 CE), who preceded him. Justinian was driven by the objective to restore and expand the Roman Empire by recovering North Africa from the Vandals and Italy from the Ostrogoths. This he did in every way possible, including a complex administration, grand public events, patronage, foreign aid and lavish gifts, diplomacy, police and repression, murder and execution, opportunism, debate and philosophizing, strategic marriage, and all manner of political manipulation.

Relative to the Nile valley, this meant a major effort to build religious unity at a time of great theological divisions. He first pursued the mission of the Council of Chalcedon (q.v.) in 451 CE and continued to isolate the followers of Arianism (q.v.). His next task was to isolate or incorporate the followers of Monophysitism (q.v.), who were especially numerous and dedicated in Egypt and represented a politicoreligious threat to the unity of Byzantium. This work aimed at accommodation with Egyptian Christians as far as possible while taking care not to offend Rome by straying from orthodoxy.

By the same token, Justinian was not inclined to tolerate the continued use of the Isis temple at Philae (q.v.) by Nubians or Egyptians. This had persisted until his time. Justinian closed the temple and arrested the priests. Some of the temple’s statuary may have been removed to Constantinople.

The complex juggling grew more intense with the emergence on the scene of his future love and wife, Theodora, a humble bear-keeper’s daughter. Theodora might be reckoned as the Cleopatra VII (q.v.) of Christendom for her personal and profound engagement with the political affairs of the late remnants of the Roman Empire. This woman grew up in Byzantium under awkward social and political circumstances that conditioned her to use all her charms, which finally took her to Alexandria as the mistress of a government official. There, the impressionable but wily Theodora was exposed in strong terms to the same Monophysitism that Justinian was keen to blunt, incorporate, or destroy. Some suggest that she abandoned her previous lifestyle and was transformed to a life of religious service. Justinian’s love for Theodora was fulfilled in 525 CE, when they were married just before he became emperor.

It would be rare to discover a relationship built on such dubious foundations to function with such effectiveness. It is clear that the wit,
wisdom, charms, and power brokering of Theodora had much to do with this success. Her hosting a Monophysite monastery in Constantinople and his 533 CE effort to negotiate a truce between these religious schisms suggest the dilemma. In 541 CE, a bubonic plague originated in “Ethiopia,” and by 542 CE, this epidemic swept through Egypt and on to other parts of the Byzantine Empire, including Constantinople. By the time it was over, more than a quarter of a million people had perished. While Justinian was himself gravely ill, Theodora essentially took over the state during this critical period of widespread military activities.

Taking advantage of this circumstance, in 543 CE, Theodora arranged to have Theodosius, the exiled Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, consecrate the new bishop Jacob of Edessa, who quickly used the opportunity to arouse Monophysites in Syria and elsewhere. Theodora also formulated a secret plan to send the Monophysite missionary Julian to Nubia in the same year. By 546, the pro-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria had to flee for his life amidst the renewed faith in Monophysitism. This was typical of the complexities of their marriage. Justinian’s acceptance of Theodora’s Monophysitism has been taken to mean that he really was indifferent to religious matters while rebuilding an even greater Roman Empire. Their marriage was to symbolize that Monophysites and Chalcedonians could get along if they only tried.

When Theodora died of cancer on June 28, 548 CE, one cannot imagine the relief and grief of Justinian. Perhaps in some final symbolic tribute to Theodora, in January 565 CE, just before Justinian’s own death in November 565 CE, he still tried to reach some sort of compromise with Egyptian and Nubian Monophysites.

The huge, impressive efforts of Justinian to restore and expand the Roman Empire proved to be more the end of a “Golden Age” than the start of a new one. In fact, it was the start of a long period of decline. In 638–642 CE, Arabs entered Egypt to reduce the long-troubling Monophysites to the minority status that they have held ever since. Ironically, Nubian Monophysitism was to last for another millennium. Constantinople itself finally fell to Islam in 1453.

KADADA, KEDADA. This site is about ten kilometers downstream of modern Shendi on the eastern bank of the Nile on the western side of the Butana (q.v.). It is considered a late Neolithic site, dat-
ing from perhaps around 3500 BCE. While it begins to fill a gap in regional archaeology, the sites of Kadada and Kadero (q.v.) raise other questions. Where did these people come from? Are they refugees from Egyptian intervention in Lower Nubia? Did they come down the Blue Nile, or did they come from the White Nile? What happened to the populations of the Middle Nile after this occupation? Little human occupation is known again in this area until Meroitic times. At least one can say that the categorization of Kadada with late Neolithic agricultural traditions is reasoned by the rather numerous bones of cattle, sheep, and goats. Kadada is also known for rippled pottery, cosmetic palettes, and clay figurines that link ancient Nubia to Egypt and to the earlier A-Group (q.v.) assemblages. Red Sea shells also tie the inhabitants of Kadada to extensive regional trade.

**KADERO, KADERU.** Kadero is located about eighteen kilometers north of Khartoum North on the eastern bank of the Nile. It features the largest (30,000 square meters) Neolithic site in the area. This site produced bones of domestic cattle, sheep, goats, and dogs (but few fish) and pottery and microliths similar to those found at Shaheinab and Kedada (qq.v.), with which it was approximately contemporary. Hunting played a minor role in Kadero’s existence, and possibly millet was already being cultivated by this time. Among the fifty-five burials found, some social ranking is suggested, judging from the different quantity and quality of grave goods. Kadero was not a major center but may have had seasonal shifts in population concentration, as are still practiced by southern Sudanese Nilotes engaged in seasonally nomadic pastoralism.

**KADRUKA.** This Neolithic site near Kerma (q.v.) appears to have about the same cultural assemblage known in Kadada and Kadero (qq.v.). A wide range of foods was consumed, including domestic animals, sometime in the late fourth millennium. The relationship between the rather simple people of Kadruka to the earliest times of ancient Kerma is not understood, but one is tempted to see the Kadruka site as ancestral to the greater state that was to come.

**KALABSHA, TALMIS.** The original location of the Kalabsha temple was about fifty kilometers south of its present, new site, adjacent to the High Dam at Aswan (q.v.). This was neighboring the Bait al-Wali (q.v.) temple, which has rejoined it at the new location. Hector
Horeau painted the inner court of Kalabsha temple in watercolors in 1839. This painting shows the inner wall standing, but hundreds of other blocks tumbled into a heap. The portico of the temple was the subject of a David Roberts (q.v.) lithograph published in 1847. The 13,000 stone blocks of Kalabsha temple were relocated by the (West) German government, which has taken a gateway from this building to the Egyptian Museum in Berlin. The temple’s large size (seventy-four by thirty-three meters) and excellent condition make it the highlight of Lake Nasser, second in grandeur only to Abu Simbel.

This freestanding temple is associated with inscriptions to Tuthmose II and Amenhotep II (qq.v.) in the New Kingdom, but it was substantially redeveloped during Hellenic times and rebuilt during the periods of Augustus, Caligula, and Trajan (qq.v). Special interest at Kalabsha was shown to the Nubian god Mandulis (q.v.) in anthropomorphic form with Isis. Depictions of other deities popular in Greco-Roman times, such as Horus, Ptah, Amun, Khnum, and Thoth, are also found.

On the right side of the inner forecourt wall are three important later inscriptions. Probably the earliest is one attributed to Aurelius Besarion, commander of Ombos in about 250 CE, who inscribed his command that polluting pigs should be removed from Kalabsha. The second inscription, probably written in the late fourth century CE or later in the name of King Kharamadoye (q.v.), is an exceptionally long text in Meroitic demotic. Fragments have been translated, but it is not completely clear whether he was a regional late Meroitic king or possibly a Ballana (q.v.) king celebrating a victory over the Blemmyes or whether he was a descendant of the Blemmyes. One could imagine that either he or his associates were buried in the large Ballana grave tumulae, which unfortunately are not inscribed.

The latest inscription in crude Greek, by the Nubian king Silko (q.v.), proclaims himself the king of the “Ethiopians” after his defeat of the Blemmyes in about the first quarter of the sixth century. His thanks to a singular god is taken to indicate his acceptance of Christianity and thus the official introduction of Christianity into Nubia at this time. Later, the three inner sections of Kalabsha temple were used as a Christian church, and graffiti, defacements, and plastering of this time can be seen. Affected by the first raising of the Aswan Low Dam, this temple has long been exposed to water, but at last in 1962, the huge task of identifying, removing, and rebuilding its...
stones was started. A Mammisi “birth house,” a Nilometer, and a small collection of prehistoric rock carvings of animals are now located on the southern side of the temple.

KAMOSE STELA. This important stela was removed from Egypt to the British Museum, where it is known as the Carnarvon Tablet. It outlines the situation of Egypt during the time of Kamose in the 17th Dynasty at the end of the Second Intermediate period. This stela from Karnak is one of a pair of large historical stelae that apparently continue a single text. It describes the situation in Upper Egypt, which has a Middle Egyptian boundary with the Hyksos, whose control reached from there to all of Lower Egypt. It further describes the campaign waged by Kamose against the Hyksos near Beni Hassan. Egyptian rule was then limited to the Thebaid, while the princes of Kush or Kerma held the Nubian lands south of Elephantine.

The text then describes the arrest in the Bahariya Oasis of a messenger who had been sent by the Hyksos king Apophis (q.v.) to the independent Nubian kingdom of Kush. The messenger was secretly traveling through the western oases to forge a military and political alliance with the Nubians when he was stopped. The intention was to divide the Nile between the Hyksos based at Avaris and the Nubians based at Kerma. This plan was thwarted when the messenger was humiliatingly sent back to Hyksos territory. In the relatively short reign of Kamose, he clearly began to threaten his neighbors as they had been threatening him. The Kamose stela indicates that he organized one attack with his Medjay (q.v.) soldiers against Khent-Hen-Nofer or Kerma (q.v.) in his third regnal year, when he probably renewed his effort to rebuild the Middle Kingdom fortress at Buhen.

When Kamose died, his brother Ahmose completed Kamose’s dream to reunify all of Egypt under the 18th Dynasty of the New Kingdom, capture Avaris, and drive out the Hyksos from Lower Egypt. The twenty-five-year reign of Ahmose continued this offensive against Kerma, thus introducing five centuries of the Egyptian colonialism there.

KANJERAN. The Kanjeran people were distributed in southern Sudan and neighboring East African lands of Uganda in approximately 5000 BCE. This “Negro” people extended far to the north, but the precise
extent and varying degrees of admixture with northern Sudanese peoples is a matter that is both complex and even emotional. Certainly “Negro” people are at the foundation of Sudanese Nilotics, whose territory extended at least as far as modern Khartoum if not farther north. Indeed, the range of Kanjeran people begs the question of the reference to captive “Nubian” people in Egyptian Dynastic times who may in fact be descendants of the “Negro” populations rather than “Nubians” in the modern sense of the term. Thus, the present-day people of the Nuba Mountains could be the descendants of this ancient Kanjeran stock. Modern DNA analysis promises to readdress these issues of ancient raciation and affiliation.

**KANUZ, KENZI, KENUZ.** This group of northernmost Nubians occupies the region in Lower Nubia adjacent to Aswan. At times, they recovered political control of Aswan, such as in 1287 and 1366 CE. They were severely repressed as a result, but another revolt broke out in 1385 CE, when Kenuz Nubians seized Aswan. It was lost again in 1412. The Kenzi Nubians are essentially Arabized Nubians who descend from the Beni Kanz and the hereditary position of the Kanz al-Dawla (q.v.). Although all modern Nubians are followers of Islam, dialectical differences exist between the Nubian groups. Ranging from north to south, they are Kenzi, Fadicha (Halfawi), Sukkot, Mahas, and Danagla (qq.v.). However, because of the political and historical connections, the Kenzi dialect is closest to the southernmost Nubian dialects, and those of the Sukkot and Mahas are closer to each other. Virtually all Nubians in the area of Aswan are Kenzi-speakers, and with the relocation due to the Aswan Dam, they may be found in the resettlement villages north of Aswan and in their permanent settlements on Elephantine Island and in Seheil, West Seheil, and West Aswan communities. Like all Nubian dialects, Kenzi is a part of the Eastern Sudanic family of the Nilo-Saharan language group. Today it is heavily mixed with Arabic loan-words, and some linguists fear for the future of Kenzi.

**KANZ AL-DAWLA, KENZ AL DAWLA.** This term can reflect the general hereditary title Kanz al-Dawla, or “state treasurer,” or it can be a specific individual at a specific time carrying the title. All were from the Beni Kanz (q.v.) Arabs who came to Nubia to intermix, so closely
in fact that one Nubian dialect is called the Kenuz (q.v.). Among the 
more famous Kanz al-Dawlas was one who launched a revolt against 
Saladin from about 1171 to 1175 CE. This was finally crushed, and the 
Kanz al-Dawla was put to death by impaling, as a harsh lesson for oth-
ners to heed. The complex features of these leaders was derived from the 
fact that, as Muslims, they were religiously linked and under the au-
thority of the Islamic rulers of Egypt, but culturally and linguistically 
they were Nubians, thereby associated with the Nubian people and pol-
itics of contemporary Christian Nubia (q.v.).

KARAMAKOL GROUP. The Karamakol group represents a cluster of 
early Neolithic sites at the great southward bend of the Nile in Upper 
Nubia (q.v.) between the Fourth and Third Cataracts. The presence of 
grinding stones suggest small-scale agricultural settlements having 
some lithic industries as well as pottery. Domestic animals may be as-
sumed, but animal remains are not found. Perhaps the subsequent Ter-
gis tradition is linked directly to that represented by the Karamakol 
group, which is contemporary with the Egyptian Badarian horizons.

KARANOG. The University of Pennsylvania Museum team of David 
Randall-MacIver and Leonard Woolley (qq.v.) excavated this late 
Meroitic town site and cemetery in Lower Nubia from 1907 to 1910. 
Karanog (“Nalote” in Meroitic) had been a provincial capital, proba-
bly under its own peshto (provincial governor) of the kingdom of 
Meroë, in about the second and third centuries CE. It is likely that the 
former capital had been at Faras (q.v.) before its transfer farther 
downstream below Aniba (q.v.), as the Roman presence in the Egypt-
ian Dodekaschoenos (q.v.) began to weaken. Karanog was likely a 
part of the northern defense of Meroë near to the Roman frontier at 
Maharraka (q.v.). Thus, the site on the western bank of the Nile had 
strategic significance and was probably of rather large size.

Houses of notables and castle–palaces (more than 600 square me-
ters) of the peshtos are known. Other houses are poorly known, be-
ing made of mud brick. A degree of social stratification is seen in the 
distribution of grave goods, although the cemetery was much plun-
dered and disturbed. Apparently, the cemetery served the nearby set-
tlements of Akin, Nalote, and Shimale. At least Nalote/Karanog ap-
ppears to have had some defensive or privacy walls. The larger tombs
were filled with pottery jars and baskets for food, and it appears that some parts of the cemetery were socially favored over others. The better, unplundered graves have yielded luxury items of glass, modest jewelry, small bronze utensils, beads of stone and glass, iron arrowheads, carpentry tools, bronze bowls and lamps, cotton and linen textiles, wooden objects with ivory and ebony inlays, handsomely painted ceramic jars, and a few faience objects. At least 100 hetep offering altars and stela inscribed in Meroitic demotic (q.v.) are known from Karanog. One stela was written in Egyptian demotic and Meroitic, making it unique (?) for the cases of Egyptian demotic south of Maharraqa (q.v.). The town was occupied from early to late Meroitic times. Karanog lingered on into post-Meroitic (X-Group) times, known regionally as early Ballana (q.v.) culture, but then its traces vanish from the archaeological record. It now lies under the waters of Lake Nasser.

KARNAK, IPUT-ISUT, THEBES, LUXOR. This ancient religious capital of Egypt has had continuous occupation from Predynastic through all of Dynastic times. It is a hugely complicated site because of this antiquity and its great extent. The main monuments that remain today are mostly of the New Kingdom period, but elements from Greco-Roman, Christian, and Islamic times are present as well. More specifically, Karnak is the only northern religious complex on the eastern bank; it is centered on a great temple to Amun and other deities. Successive pharaohs added their monuments as they came and went. The annual Opet festival linked Karnak to Luxor temple by a column of sphinxes along the Nile. In turn, the eastern bank features are associated with the vast necropolis on the western bank, which includes the Valley of the Kings, the Valley of the Queens, the Tombs of the Nobles, the workers’ village of Deir al-Medina (q.v.), and the huge extant temple of Ramses III (q.v.) at Medinat Habu, at Deir al-Bahri for the tombs of Hatshepsut and Mentuhotep II (qq.v.), or the Assasif. This whole area can be termed broadly as “The Thebaid” or “Thebes.” In modern times, the central town is known simply as Luxor, a corruption of the Arabic al-Aqsar (palaces).

To ancient Nubians, the significance of Karnak and Thebes in general rested on its being their religious capital during the New Kingdom occupation of Nubia and that Nubians constructed a number of
monumental works in Karnak, Luxor, and the western bank. Inasmuch as the ram form of the god Amun is perhaps of Nubian origins, much of the Theban theogony also rests on Nubian roots.

At Karnak, the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) kings Shabaka and Taharka (qq.v.) built a small temple immediately adjacent to the Sacred Lake. The central forecourt was the site of a huge ten-pillared kiosk of Taharka. One of the original columns (over twenty-six meters tall) still remains, as does the immense altar stone it covered. To the north of the Great Temple but inside the enclosure wall, a temple was constructed by Shabaka (q.v.) but was usurped by Psamtik II (q.v.). Shabaka restored parts of the fourth pylon of the Great Temple. Just inside the northern side of the great enclosure wall, he built the second and probably the fourth gate of the Ptah temple. Nearby, just outside the great enclosure wall but within the northern enclosure, gates and small chapels were built to Amenirdis and Nitocris (qq.v.), who also have important Nubian associations. Farther to the northwest and beyond the northern enclosure, Taharka restored an Osiris temple dating to the 18th Dynasty. In the southern enclosure at the Temple of Mut are inscriptions and constructions attributed to Taharka.

At Luxor temple, little remains from the 25th Dynasty. However, construction is attested for Taharka in a chapel to Hathor to the eastern side in front of the great first pylon. Only foundation stones (five meters thick) are now present. Passing through this pylon of Ramses II are inscriptions in the passageway, attributed to Shabaka, invoking Amun and his consort Amunet according to adjustments of the Hermopolis theogony. In the first antechamber after the Luxor hypostyle hall, stones inscribed for Shabaka are also found. This section was converted into a church in the fourth century after the Edict of Constantine (q.v.), and the Shabaka stones were used to strengthen the floor. These stones likely were from a colonnade or kiosk of Shabaka built at Luxor temple.

On the western bank, the chief Nubian traces are found in the forecourt of the mortuary temple of Ramses III at Medinat Habu. Immediately after entering the forecourt are funerary tomb chapels to the Nubian God’s Wives of Amun Amenirdis I (q.v.), Shepenwepet I, and Shepenwepet II. Apparently, these chapels were popular for devotional pilgrimages. Some irony exists in their being in Medinat Habu since the walls of this temple show Ramses III
engaged in war against the Nubians. Another footnote to Nubians may also be found in the Valley of Kings, in the case of the burial of Maiherpri (q.v.), who was probably a ranking servant in the 18th Dynasty XVIII.

**KAROY.** Karoy is located between the Fourth and Fifth Cataracts and is the reference for the uppermost hinterland of Egyptian occupation of Nubia in the New Kingdom. It seems to be a broader reference to Jebel Barkal (q.v.) and above. As with Wadi al-Allaqi and Wadi Gabgaba, (qq.v.), Karoy was known for its gold production.

**KASHTA** (ca. 760–751 BCE). This king of Kush (q.v.) ruled from Napata (q.v.) or perhaps from nearby Kurru (q.v.) sometime in the middle of the eighth century BCE. He and his brother Alara were the first to be recognized by name after a series of Nubian kings had been ruling during the late Third Intermediate period. Kashta certainly consolidated his control of Lower Nubia by driving out Libyan rivals from that region and then moved on to Elephantine at Aswan and from there to Thebes, where he installed his daughter Amenirdis I (q.v.) as the powerful God’s Wife of Amun (q.v.). Thus, he completed the Nubian conquest of Upper Egypt and set the stage for the Kushite 25th Dynasty (q.v.) in Egypt. His proclamation (by royal iconography and titles) that he was king of all of Egypt was still more wishful thinking than fully accomplished military fact. But in about 751 BCE, Kashta’s son Piankhy (q.v.) completed the task of controlling the entire Nile valley and became the “Lord of Three Lands” in much the same territorial model as the New Kingdom that had colonized Nubia for five centuries.

**KAWA.** Kawa is located slightly upstream of Dongola but on the eastern bank of the Nile. Recent research by Derek Welsby has demonstrated that it is far older and larger (thirty-six hectares) than previously thought. It was used in Neolithic times and was occupied intensively during the long era of Kerma. Tutankhamen in the New Kingdom first built the Amun temple at Kawa. It remained very significant for the Nubian pharaohs of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), such as Taharka (q.v.), and in subsequent Napatan (q.v.) times. It continued to function in the Meroitic period but at a much
reduced level of activity. An unusual Bes-type figurine was found there, but it was of a female and not the typical male god.

KEMSI. See MENTUHOTEP II.

KERENBES, KARENBES. Following military and political intervention by the Kanuz (q.v.) into Nubian affairs in the late thirteenth century CE, succession to the Nubian throne was in turmoil. Trying to restore some sense of normalcy, King Kerenbes traveled to Cairo from Nubia to promise his loyalty to the Mameluke sultans. The Mamelukes sought to topple Kerenbes and install a Muslim convert, Barshambu, in his place. Thus, in 1311, the Christian king Kerenbes became the last to pay baqt tributes to Egypt from his kingdom of Makurra (q.v.). Despite the effort of Kerenbes to maintain some influence through the Kanz al-Dawla, this initiative collapsed with the Mameluke appointment of Barshambu, and Kerenbes fled south. At last he was arrested and returned to Cairo. However, the murder of Barshambu gave an opportunity for the Kanz al-Dawla to take over Dongola, but then the Mamelukes thought it better to bring Kerenbes back to power. This lasted only a short time before an aspiring nephew again toppled him. Kerenbes retreated to Mameluke protection in Aswan, where he vanishes from the historical record.

His rule is often considered to be the formal end of Nubian Christianity, but it is clear that this faith lingered on far longer in both Lower and Upper Nubia, and the transition to Islam is much more complex. Even though the Muslim Beni Kanz were now in power in Nubia, it is clear that Christianity prevailed in the hearts and practices of many.

KERMA: HISTORY AND LOCATION. Kerma is the modern name of an ancient state in Upper Nubia probably known as Yam or Irem. Some ceramic traces of pre-Kerma occupation have been found that have a similarity with the A-Group (q.v.) of Lower Nubia (q.v.). Its “capital” was south of the Third Cataract on the eastern bank of the Nile in the area across from Badin Island, just downstream from Argo Island. Nearby at Tombos Island were substantial ancient granite quarries. Although Kerma likely controlled the riverine region from the Second to Fourth Cataracts, no evidence exists that its authority
extended very far beyond the western bank of the Nile. This might have been under the control of Libyans or a different intrusive people. Some Middle Kingdom references introduce the term “Kush” (q.v.), which seems to apply generally to Kerma. This confusion in terminology cannot easily be resolved, but for this dictionary “Kerma” refers to the Nubian state existing from about 2500 to 1500 BCE, centered around the Third Cataract, whereas “Kush” is the term used for the Egyptian occupation of Upper Nubia and the Nubian states thereafter. Dynastic Egyptians referred to Lower Nubia as “Wawat” (qq.v.) and other areas in between as “Irtet” (q.v.), while some sources used the sweeping references to the “Land of the Seti and Nehesi” (qq.v.). The exact and shifting boundaries are not resolved. In the nineteenth century, Kerma was the terminus for a short-lived railway and telegraph line from Wadi Halfa. The site is known from today’s village of Kerma.

Kerma was most probably the state of Yam and its associated Nehesi (q.v.) people, known as early as Old Kingdom Egyptian texts. The existing Mahas Nubians in the same area might have their name derived from this ancient Nehesi root. Egyptian mineral prospectors reached the Second Cataract, as is known from rock inscriptions at this time, when the Old Kingdom pharaohs first began fortifying the region at Buhen. At its greatest extent, Kerma likely controlled the Lower Nubian districts of Irtet, Wawat, and Setiu (qq.v.), which were not under effective Egyptian authority during the First Intermediate period. Notable Egyptian trade expeditions, such as those organized by Harkuf and Pepinakht, took place at this time. Egyptian-made alabaster vessels with inscriptions dating to this time have been found at Kerma.

In the adjacent desert lands were the Medjay (or Blemmyes) (qq.v.), likely ancestors of today’s Bisharin and Beja, who are known archaeologically as the Pan-Grave group (q.v.) for their shallow pan-shaped graves with leather sheets covering the deceased, who were surrounded by libation pots. These times are termed by some scholars as the Middle Kerma period. Kerma was related to other Second Intermediate sites elsewhere in Nubia, such as Buhen, Mirgissa, Sai, Semna, and Ukma (qq.v.).

The significance of Kerma rests on its being the oldest major state in Africa south of Egypt and having a character that is clearly not Egyptian in terms of burial and pottery styles and domestic, political,
and religious architecture. In short, Kerma is the oldest African state built on its own traditions, even though it had complex and contradictory articulation with Egypt in trade, military, and political relations.

The precise time of the earliest rise of the Kerma state is not known, but it can be placed at about 2300 BCE or several centuries earlier if one considers the A-Group and C-Group (q.v.) cattle people as somehow ancestral to Kerma. Certainly the state of Kerma was formed before the First Intermediate period in Egypt (2181–2050 BCE). Kerma was contemporary with some of the later C-Group people of Lower Nubia. Both may have had common ancestry with the A-Group people (this can be termed a pre-Kerma cultural horizon or small-scale chieftaincies), but this is not clear, being estimated largely on the basis of relative continuities or discontinuities of pottery typologies and seriation and site locations. In fact, whether the C-Group was ethnically distinct from Kerma, or how they were politically articulated with Kerma, is also not fully understood. Some aspects of C-Group material culture have similarities with modern Nilotics of southern Sudan.

None of these groups had any writing systems of their own. Thus, George Reisner (q.v.) and Charles Bonnet (in the 1980s and 1990s) know them mainly from Egyptian hieroglyphic texts or from the archaeological excavations of their cemeteries, graves, and town sites. The early archaeological work by Reisner provided the A-, B-, C-, and X-Groups their names but misled archaeologists into viewing Kerma as a corrupted outpost of Egyptian culture.

One may speculate that the rise of Kerma in Nubia helped hasten the collapse of Old Kingdom unity of the Egyptian Nile valley. Until the end of the First Intermediate period in about 2050 BCE, Kerma had achieved considerable strength and autonomy. Its society expressed notable social stratification and differentiation. The archaeological reports of the huge grave tumulae (tumulus X was 290 feet in diameter) and human sacrifice (tumulus X has skeletal and tissue remains of 322 retainers) of the Kerma kings suggest substantial wealth and power. The numerous secondary burials into the tumulae may well have been those of nobility who died after their king but wanted to join him for eternity. Of the many mysteries of this ancient state are two large mud-brick structures known as deffufa (q.v.).

The relatively rich material culture, human sacrifice, and the huge monumental works suggest considerable wealth and autocratic power
in Kerma. Given the presence of a small Egyptian community, some Egyptian trade goods, and the persistent need for slaves in Egypt, it may have been that Kerma’s wealth was derived largely from a profitable exchange with Egyptians. This exchange included slaves, ivory, ebony (qq.v.), incense (q.v.), animal skins, ostrich feathers, and livestock and was based on raids and trading farther south of Kerma. Such goods likely were exchanged with resident Egyptian commercial agents for shipment to the north.

The royal family retinue, craftsmen, bakeries, potters, and bodyguards were located within the royal quarter of the city. While the population of Kerma cannot be ascertained with precision, certainly an extensive residential area existed beyond the massive and ditched walls, especially in Classic Kerma times, when the threat from Egypt was acute. Unlike Egyptian cities, especially in the New Kingdom, the streets of Kerma were not orthogonal but rather wandered in the fashion of traditional Sudanese towns. Houses consisted of one to three rooms, with provisions for holding domestic animals and storing grains.

During Egypt’s Middle Kingdom period (2050–1786 BCE), Kerma or the lands upstream of Semna (q.v.) also began to be known as Kush. Kerma experienced further growth and established standard styles for royal burials, polished beaker pottery, and bed (angareb) burials, similar to Nubians today. During the Middle Kingdom, an extensive relationship of trade and interaction was in place. A resident Egyptian trader community probably was in place at Kerma, but the Middle Kingdom border of Egypt was just to the north of Kerma, thereby allowing Kerma continued autonomy and self-government. Indeed, the southern borders of the Middle Kingdom incorporated a series of massive garrisoned fortifications on strategic choke points and islands on the Nile to the southern end of the Butn al-Hajr at the Second Cataract. While Egyptians did not report in any detail the internal dynamics of Kerma at this time, they implicitly revealed that it was a strong, potentially threatening state. The collapse of the Middle Kingdom, in about 1786 BCE, ushered in the Second Intermediate Period (1786–1567 BCE), which offered still more relative autonomy for the Kerma kings.

Indeed, the disappearance of Egyptian authority allowed Kerma to achieve its greatest “Classical” phase, ranging from about 1700 to
1500 BCE. While the intrusive Hyksos (q.v.) rulers of Egypt controlled the delta and Lower Egypt, they did not control Thebes and could not directly reach Nubia, yet trade seals and small jugs from the Hyksos have been found in Kerma. In a celebrated case of an intercepted message, the Hyksos (q.v.) king Apophis (q.v.) wrote to the ruler of Kerma to propose a joint alliance against the Egyptian pharaoh Kamose (q.v.) of Thebes. In 1853, Richard Lepsius (q.v.) reported Hyksos sculptures at Argo Island. Thus, it is clear that the Hyksos and the Kerma rulers were politically allied in their convergent aspirations to undermine and reduce the Egyptian power at Thebes.

As long as Egypt was divided and occupied, Nubians from Kerma were presented with a great opportunity for the aggrandizement of their state in Lower Nubia as far as the First Cataract, and thereby control of the gateway at Kubbân to the valuable gold mines of Wadi al-Allaqi (q.v.). This was, of course, a very different Lower Nubia from that of today, and it was under the leadership of Kamose’s brother and successor, Ahmose I (q.v.), that the grand New Kingdom reconstituted a united Egyptian state. It was Ahmose (the son of Iba) who returned to Thebes with the dead body of Kerma King Tetaan hung upside down from the prow. Sadly, that king’s biography is not more clearly known.

Some time later and perhaps more than once, Kerma was assaulted and burned in the late sixteenth or early fifteenth century BCE. All further traces of Kerma are lost early after the rise of the Egyptian New Kingdom (1567–1090 BCE). At this bloody break in Kerma’s 1,000-year history, it is symbolic and appropriate to drop this reference and now introduce the term “Kush.”

Tuthmosis I (q.v.) may have sent his soldiers to overrun Kerma in about 1520 BCE. By the time of Tuthmosis III (q.v.; 1504–1450 BCE), Egyptians had fully conquered Lower and Upper Nubia, had destroyed Kerma, and had placed a boundary stela above the Fourth Cataract at Kurgus (“yellow place” in Nubian). Since the New Kingdom authorities termed the general area as “Kush” and installed the King’s Son (or viceroy) of Kush to administer this area of Nubia, one may also conclude that Kerma people persisted as Kushites, but now as a colonial population of Egypt rather than their former sovereign state. When the New Kingdom withered after the 20th Dynasty into the Third Intermediate period, Kushites slowly reemerged in this power vacuum and probably reestablished a small, weak state somewhere between the
Third and Fourth Cataracts. Finally, this political process culminated in the emergence of the 25th Dynasty at Napata, when Nubians were able to seize the entirety of the Egyptian state. In this rather sweeping sense, the 25th Dynasty might be considered the renaissance of the descendants of Kerma but in a substantially Egyptianized form, at least during the period when they ruled from the delta and Thebes.

KERMA: MATERIAL CULTURE. As with most ancient civilizations known mainly by archaeology, awareness is highly skewed toward what has been preserved over the centuries. Organic remains of items of wood, plant, bone, and fiber have broadly vanished, and important grave goods certainly have been looted. What may still lie under the Nubian Desert remains to be seen. Kerma’s material culture is known mainly from the archaeological remains. These are from the cemeteries, including multicorridored grave tumulae and more modest graves, and from the town site, including the “royal palace,” defensive structures, workshops (for local bronze and faience production), and the deffufa. The few written records about Kerma are those by Egyptians in hieroglyphics.

Kerma’s material remains can be grouped into six categories. 1) human skeletal remains; 2) animal and bird remains (e.g., skeletal bone of cattle, sheep, and dogs), leather (for garments, burial coverings, and sandals), ivory (for handles and inlays), and feathers (for head decoration and fans); 3) wood products (e.g., tool and knife handles, zoomorphic bed legs, and carvings); 4) metal (bronze, gold, and silver) goods (tools, daggers, razors, toilet articles, and jewelry); 5) pottery, brick, and stone (of varying styles, quantities, and qualities at varying periods) for clay trade seals, construction, and vessels; and 6) minerals used in decoration (faience, carnelian, mica, porphyry, and quartz).

Pottery from Kerma is especially significant in that it is well preserved and typologically distinct. The most celebrated type is the fine-walled, flared “tulip beaker,” which has a black top, red bottom, and white-lined stripe running horizontally in the midsection. The characteristic marking of these lovely vessels likely was achieved by firing the pots upside down in a bed of coals that caused differential heating and oxidation. The thin wall is reminiscent of the skilled potters who produced the excellent “eggshell” pots known for the A-
Group. Some related pots, especially for the contemporary C-Group, typically had incised geometric patterns but were not so finely made as Kerma ware. In addition to the beaker style were flasks with a (beer?) drinking or pouring tube spout. Both are well known in funerary rituals.

**KERMA: RELIGION.** Knowledge of Kerma’s religion is more speculative than its material culture. Several main features of Kerma’s urban and mortuary organization are still debated, but reasonable speculation can reach some tentative conclusions about its religious practices.

The major concentration of Kerma’s economic and human resources in supporting its king at his palace and in his tomb suggests that he likely was given divine status. This is a common pattern of early African states, and on the basis of ethnographic parallel, it is a reasonable assumption. Whether access to power was through patrilineal or matrilineal descent is not clear, but the use of matrilineal metaphors and legitimacy by the subsequent, better-known Kush allows for the hypothesis that matrilineality and perhaps queen mothers played a role. The small but powerful state probably included specialized workers in the area of religious intervention.

Without doubt, a major part of the religious belief system was built around the idea of an afterlife, as previous, subsequent, and neighboring societies all had such beliefs. On the other hand, the Nubian nature of Kerma is seen to contrast with Egypt in burial styles (bed burial, tumulue, and flex burial) and funerary offerings of humans, cattle, and sheep for royal personages. Stellar and zoomorphic images in the faience wall tiles in the tombs and the well-known presence of zoomorphic deities of Nubia make it reasonable to assume that these could easily be integrated with the religious system of Kerma. One zoomorphic form, that of the fly, apparently was not specifically religious but rather a military badge, suggesting the tenacity of Nubian flies. The funerary goods, such as offering bowls, typically were placed on the eastern side of the tombs, with the heads of the deceased also oriented to the east and cattle and decorated ram skulls placed to the south. Such depictions were not featured in the same way in contemporary Egypt, and the extensive use of cattle (up to 500 for the great Kerma X tumulus) for funerary rituals is highly convergent with similar C-Group practices.
On the other hand, an expression of Kerma’s religion was mixed with features of Egyptian religion in statuary, perhaps some deities, and the use of the winged solar disk icon. According to Timothy Kendall, perhaps by the time of Classical Kerma, some experimental mumification, as well as extended rather than flex burials, and the use of funeral chapels suggest a possible Egyptian influence for royal burials at this late time. The number of funerary chapels was far less than the number of tombs, so one may guess that they were used repeatedly for a funerary function. Some bodies were well preserved by natural desiccation on hot, dry sand.

KERMA: MILITARY AND ECONOMICS. The earliest written record about Kerma is during the reign of Pepi II in the 6th Dynasty, when Harkuf, governor of Aswan (Syene), undertook at least four large-scale donkey-caravan expeditions around the cataracts to trade for the goods of “Yam” (now referenced as “Kerma”), which likely controlled Wawat, Irtet, and Setiu, the intermediate districts of Lower Nubia. In addition to ivory, incense, ebony, oils, and leopard skins, a famous “dancing dwarf” was acquired for the amusement of the pharaoh on the last of these missions. During the governorship of Pepinakht, the relationship was less cordial, and armed raids against Wawat and Irtet were undertaken.

After the 6th Dynasty, little evidence of Kerma–Egyptian trade relations exists, but it is likely that Nubians as individuals may have sought military service in Egypt, since they are depicted as archer battalions in the tomb models of the immediately following Middle Kingdom. At the same time, Kerma clearly was a military and commercial river threat to the Middle Kingdom. In the 12th Dynasty, Senusoret I and Senusoret III (qq.v.) campaigned in the region and set up a strict military frontier at Kumma and Semna (qq.v.), just upstream of the Second Cataract, indicating that they had reconquered Lower Nubia and that Nubians were not free to travel or trade beyond Semna. A stela of Senusoret III at Elephantine (q.v.) states his contempt for the “vile” Nubians, who, in his estimation, needed constant monitoring and control. Other forts, such as at Buhen (opposite Wadi Halfa), Uronarti, Mirgissa, and Quban (to guard access to the gold mines of Wadi al-Allaqi [qq.v.]), featured in the complex military network of massive mud-brick walled forts. Some of the forts have
strong defensive ditches, archer loopholes, and fortified entrances protecting inner storerooms, craft workshops, small chapels, barracks, and Nilometers. These fortifications were often placed at strategic points or on islands and also defended the Egyptians from desert attack by Medjay (Pan-Grave?) peoples. Fragments and broken sculpture from the 12th Dynasty are found at Kerma. Thus, knowledge of Kerma’s military comes by implications from these elaborate measures made by Middle Kingdom Egyptians to control the military and trade potential of the soldiers of Kerma.

Information on Kerma’s defensive or offensive capacity also comes from grave goods and from the defensive walls and ditches at the town site, which might foreshadow the parallel structures of Omurum in the late nineteenth century. Especially for male burials, it is not uncommon to find injuries of a violent nature, and many soldiers were buried with their bows and arrows (qq.v.), arrow looses, and handsome daggers in a style reminiscent of those of the Hyksos. Most likely, both soldiers for regional defense and offense for Kerma and royal bodyguards for the king’s personal protection were used.

In sum, the economic, political, and military power of Kerma is illustrated by several factors: 1) a stable, long-term and continuous state; 2) a complex division of labor, including military and craft specialization; 3) centralization of power at a fixed location, and extensive and reciprocal regional trade with considerable wealth in livestock, slaves, and primary goods; and 4) construction of large-scale monumental works, including the deffufa and tumulae. The site of Kerma was reoccupied in Napatan and Meroitic (qq.v.) periods, as recent research reveals.

**KERTASSI (KERDASSY, QERTASSI, TZITZIS).** This small but striking Greco-Roman kiosk was formerly located at Kertassi about thirty-five kilometers south of its present site at New Kalabsha (q.v.) near the western side of the High Dam at Aswan. Its remaining Nubian sandstone papyrus columns have an open-lotus capital, and the two entrance columns are adorned with Hathor heads. In Greco-Roman times, Kertassi was a common pilgrimage site with numerous Greek inscriptions recording various visitors. Just before its reconstruction, it lay in a shambles, and it is considered a tiny gem of the Greco-Roman occupation of Nubia. Originally roofed, it now has only one cross beam, still situated in its former position.
KHABABASH (SENENTANEN, SETEPENPTAH). Khababash was a native ruler of Egypt from about 338 to 336 BCE. This was during the second Persian occupation of Egypt (343–332 BCE) in the Late period, immediately before the arrival of Alexander the Great. He is attested, on an Apis bull sarcophagus in Memphis around 336 BCE, to have buried a royal bull, so his rule must have been stable and extensive enough to achieve this important ritual objective. He is believed to have led a revolt in 336 or 335 BCE against the Persians. Circumstantial evidence suggests that he was of Nubian or Blemmye (q.v.) origin and may have been a local king of Lower Nubia. First, he was like Blemmye soldiers, who were secure and skilled enough to organize a sustained revolt against the Persians. Second, his strength usually was considered to be in the border areas. Third, he was considered “native born” and thus either Egyptian or Egyptian Nubian. Finally, after his revolt was defeated, he apparently fled to more secure regions in Meroë, which was then ruled by either Amanibakh or, more likely, Nastase (q.v.). Thus, Khababash is not well known, but he indicates the very last flicker of hope that an Egyptian or a pro-Egyptian Nubian supported Nectanebo II, who usually is taken as the very last to serve as the pharaoh of Egypt after being toppled in 343 BCE.

KHARAMADOYE (late fourth century CE–early or mid-fifth century CE). This king of Lower Nubia is best known for his inscription on the screen wall at the eastern side of the forecourt of the Kalabsha (q.v.) temple. The inscription is of special interest since it is among the longest of Meroitic demotic texts, yet its meaning still escapes full understanding. One may assume that this was among the last inscriptions in the Meroitic language. Only a few meters away is the King Silko (q.v.) text, which suggests the start of Christianity in Nubia (q.v) in an inscription in poor Greek. Thus, Kharamadoye must have been a late post-Meroitic or Ballana king. It is not clear whether he was of Meroitic (Nubian) origins when this small fragment of the great Meroitic Empire finally withered away in Lower Nubia, or whether he was a Ballana king of Blemmye origin. Clearly, his later follower Silko was a Nubian who defeated the Blemmyes, but it is not totally clear whether Kharamadoye had done this before or whether he had been among the Blemmyes that were defeated by Silko.
Meroiticists such as Francis L.J. Griffith and Lázsló Török estimate that the reference to Blemmye King Yisemeniye suggests a late fourth- or early fifth-century date for Kharamadoye. Whether this was a case of conflict or cooperation between the two is still debated, but if this was before the defeat of Blemmye King Phoenen, then it was before the Blemmye expulsion. Textual references to “Penn” suggest that “Phoenen” was a contemporary, thus hinting that Kharamadoye is also a Blemmye. On the other hand, if the text should be read that Kharamadoye is claiming control of Lower Nubia, then perhaps he defeated the Blemmyes or, at least, some rival Blemmyes. Certainly a regional monarch still existed, as judged by the elaborate post-Meroitic or X-Group tombs at Qustul and Ballana, which offered no inscriptive evidence and now lie deep beneath the waters of Lake Nasser.

KHARGA OASIS. Kharga Oasis lies 200 kilometers west of Luxor. It is one of the great oases of the Western Desert of Egypt, but it is also the southernmost, so it played a significant, ancient role in trans-Saharan connections and later trade between Egypt and Nubia and the western Sudan regions of Darfur and Kordofan. Despite its great history and importance, it often is overlooked.

The Paleolithic Levallois and Mousterian traditions of hand axes that have some secondary flaking are well documented at Kharga and at least down to the fifteenth parallel, south of Khartoum. This has been true from the much wetter Paleolithic times to the start of the Neolithic and to the present, as it has always had some supplies of permanent water.

Kharga has long played a key role in connecting Nubia to Egypt by way of the Darb al Arba‘in (q.v.), which could give access to Kerma (q.v.), or farther west to Cobbé (q.v.) and El-Fasher in Darfur (q.v.). Probably the famous travels of Harkuf (q.v.) in the 6th Dynasty took place on this route, although he may have entered farther south through Kurkur Oasis (q.v.). This oasis and desert route figured importantly in the effort to link Kerma with the Hyksos (q.v.) in Lower Egypt and keep the Egyptians restricted to Upper Egypt. During the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), the Nubians controlled Kharga and other Western Desert oases. At various times, the Blemmyes (q.v.) either attacked or controlled Kharga.
During Ptolemaic times, the Greeks gave substantial importance to the Western Desert oases from as far west as Siwa to as far south as Kharga. At Dakhla Oasis, the temple at Kellis was developed to worship the protective deity Tutu (Dudu) and his wife consort Tapshay. At Kharga, the temple at Hibis was also constructed for a mission of protection against evil, among other religious goals. More important was the Kysis temple at Dush, far south of Kharga and situated prominently and securely on the Forty-Days Road to control trade and aggression from Nubia. At first, Kysis was a mortuary and healing center during pre-Christian Roman times. As the Romans stepped up their effort to control the region, Kysis was brought under the priestly authority as an oracle center with soldiers or parishioners entering a southerly mud-brick annex on the great temple in the desert to make requests and inquiries that the Roman priests could consider. Kharga and Dakhla also served as refuges and places of exile (e.g., for Nestorius and Athanasius [q.v.]). Perhaps as many as two battalions of Roman troops were stationed in Kharga and Dakhla to prevent desert infiltration by Nubians and Blemmyes, who otherwise were controlled at Aswan and other Nile valley sites.

With the early monastic and exile experience of Christianity, Kharga and Dakhla were among the first places in Egypt to have developed Christian communities, churches (such as that at Kellis), and cemeteries (such as that at Bagawat in Kharga). Today in Kharga, the New Valley Development Plan takes water from the Toshka Canal on Lake Nasser/Nubia for use in the oasis. Along its southern road, a modern town termed “Khartoum” connects with ancient trans-Saharan caravan trade routes to Nubia and is the present site of a local market for riding camels.

**KHARTOUM MESOLITHIC.** This hunting-and-gathering culture is found in sites in and near modern Khartoum. It is assumed that life was semisedentary, given improvements in tool technology and food storage and the heavy use of a fishing economy that may have used nets as well as bone harpoon heads. The climate at the time had substantially more rainfall to support grassland hunting of still abundant megafauna using refined microlithic points and other stone tools. The tools included blades, grinders, borers, and scrapers for processing
their food. Unlike the Shaheinab Neolithic site, no fishhooks are known for the Khartoum Mesolithic.

The Khartoum Mesolithic horizons possessed distinctive pottery that is among the oldest known in Africa and the Middle East. The unburnished pottery typically had a wavy-line pattern that evolved to combinations of wavy line and dotted. Some pottery had a conical or ovoid shape and was prepared using a coiling method. It is possible that pottery was invented by lining a basket with mud to improve its value as a container, as is still done by some pre-Nilotic people who likely may be the modern descendants of these “Negroid” people. The distribution of this type of pottery extends considerably into the Sahara. Precise dating is difficult, but some evidence exists for dates from 8000 to 4000 BCE. A Spanish team has excavated Mesolithic horizons at Sheikh Mustafa and al-Mahalab near Soba. Their strata date from about 5700 to 4400 BCE. Other Mesolithic evidence is found at Saggai, Geili, Sorourab, Shaqadud, and Khartoum Hospital. The wavy-line type of pottery seems to decline in late Mesolithic cultures, but zig-zag patterns persist into the Neolithic.

KHARTOUM NEOLITHIC. See SHAHEINAB.

KHNUM. This ram-headed god of the First Cataract, particularly at Elephantine in modern Aswan, is one of the most ancient Nubian deities to be incorporated into the Egyptian pantheon. He was worshiped at Elephantine from the most ancient times through the Greco-Roman period. He is usually depicted with his wives Satet and Anqet (qq.v.). A basic feature of his iconography is that his horns are always depicted as laterally twisted in a corkscrew, unlike the later ram god of Napata that was conflated with Amun. The ram form of Amun, popularized in the New Kingdom, always had horns that curved forward, although sometimes both horns are shown as combined. As a god of the Nile, like Hapy, Khnum is considered a creator god, and among his creations is the use of a potter’s wheel on which he made human beings. The Ptolemaic temple at Esna has a prominent role for Khnum.

KHOR ABU ANGA. This Paleolithic site just south of Omdurman may represent the northernmost extension of Sangoan people from central
Africa. It boasts a rich collection of 1,000 hand axes, cleavers, cores and flakes, hammerstones, and other stone tools that now rest in the Sudan National Museum. The river-washed gravels were of good quality for this technology, which may have persisted into the Acheulian times.

**KHOR BAHAN. See BAHAN CULTURE.**

**KHOR HUDI.** This site north of the Sixth Cataract and a tributary to the Atbara River (q.v.) has produced Chellean tools. The site is on the terraces above the river, and it has also produced bones of megafauna and the pebble tools, hand axes, and cleavers that were used to process them. Anthony J. Arkell believed that this site would give evidence of the importance of the Atbara corridor to connect the Paleolithic traditions of Egypt with East Africa.

**KHOR MUSA.** The Upper Paleolithic archaeological tradition known by this site is of some interest because it offers some stratification that allows the development of a regional sequence. All horizons have cores, scrapers, some flakes, and blades. The lower levels show more mammal bones typical of hunters, while the upper layers have abundant fish bones, suggesting a later refinement in their food-producing technology, including an increase in pebble burins. Carbon dates put this assemblage as early as about 23,000 BCE to as late as about 18,000 BCE.

**KING’S SON OF KUSH.** This title from the New Kingdom colonization of Kush established a vice-regnal government for Lower and Upper Nubia. Frequently, the King’s Son of Kush resided in the district of Wawat at Aniba (qq.v.) but went on regional administrative tours of Nubia and reported directly back to the pharaoh he served. Probably most of these viceroyes were Egyptian, but it is possible that the last ones to hold this office in the closing years of the 20th Dynasty may have been of Nubian origin, such as Panehesy and Piankhy (q.v.). As the 20th Dynasty withered away, the High Priest of Amun Herihor (q.v.), former viceroy of Nubia, rivaled the contemporary King’s Son of Kush to determine who actually was in charge of a collapsing Egypt. (See appendix for a full list of the titleholders.)
KOR. The fortress at Kor was located amidst the Middle Kingdom defensive system at the Second Cataract. It was reused during the New Kingdom.

KOROSKO ROAD. The Korosko Road was an overland trade route that led to Egypt from the Nile at Abu Hamad and rejoined the Nile at Korosko in Lower Nubia. Thus, the Korosko Road passed the great bend of the Nile and led to the Wadi Gabgaba gold fields. Tuthmosis I and Tuthmosis III (qq.v.) erected boundary stelae along the route. In Meroitic times, the Korosko Road became the main link between central Sudan and the Mediterranean world.

KUBBAN, QUBAN. Kubban served as a major administrative center during the rule of the 18th Dynasty; a great fortress–warehouse was erected. Kubban lies approximately 120 kilometers south of Aswan (q.v.) at the mouth of the Wadi Allaqi (q.v.) gold fields, the richest gold fields in the region. During the time of Egyptian gold exploitation, Kubban played a central role and probably was established to serve as a control-and-supply point for trade along the desert road. In other words, Kubban was the anchor point of the Lower Nubian gold industry. Prisoners and slaves supplied a substantial part of the labor force.

KULB, KULUBNARTI. This lightly fortified Christian town is located in the Batin al-Hajr (q.v.) region approximately sixty-five kilometers south of Semna (q.v.) at the head of Lake Nasser. About two kilometers long and one kilometer wide, it features two churches, two cemeteries, and ten island hamlets. The island is eight kilometers downstream from Akasha (q.v.) and near the Dal Cataract (q.v.). Excavation done by William and Nettie Adams, from 1969 to 1979, revealed that the site was occupied at least from the eleventh to the nineteenth century. Meroitic and X-Group (qq.v.) pottery was found there, but as no settlement sites or grave sites have been identified, it must be assumed that Kulubnarti was active mainly in the late Christian period but lasted long into Islamic times.

The community had no uniform architecture. For example, many houses were built of brick and some of stone, and some featured a combination of both. Rectangular and round rooms were intermixed. However, most of the houses were two level, a typical feature among
Christian architecture. Kulubnarti was thought to be an ideal site for studying the transition from Christianity to Islam, but the relative poverty of the community did not allow strong judgments to be made. Objects recovered, mostly from refuse heaps, included rope, leather, wood, baskets, sandals, mats, diverse pottery, textiles, wool, bone, shell, a little glass and metal, and animal bones mainly of sheep, goats, fish, and pigs (through the end of the Christian period). Pottery remains were particularly numerous and included jars, bowls, kegs, sakia jars, amphorae, cups, vases, lamps, censers, and lids for purposes of eating, cooking, and storage. Kulubnarti was contemporary with other communities at Qasr Ibrim, Sai, Jebel Adda, Faras, Semna East, Meinarti, and Diffinarti (qq.v.). The largest amount of pottery could be regarded as utilitarian ware rather than anything of high quality. Some textual fragments were also found in Greek, Old Nubian, Arabic, and Turkish. The first two textual languages declined rapidly with the end of Christianity in Nubia (q.v.), while the last two increased with the arrival of Islam. [R. Lobban with P. Saucier]

KUMMA. See SEMNA EAST.

KURGUS. Kurgus means “yellow” in Nubian, and it likely refers to the yellow sandstone of the region. Kurgus is upstream of Abu Hamed, which is at the southern terminus of the desert route to Korosko, which could bypass a long stretch of the Nubian Nile above the Fourth Cataract. At Kurgus, Tuthmosis I and Tuthmosis III (qq.v.) inscribed a prominent rock face to mark the southern boundary in Nubia of the Egyptian New Kingdom. Field research by Derek Welsby and Vivien Davies revealed that Kurgus was also a burial and settlement site.

KURKUR OASIS. Kurkur is a small oasis located sixty kilometers southwest of Aswan in the Western (Libyan) Desert. It is a site of Middle Paleolithic assemblages. Its strategic location on the desert has meant that it long served as a staging post on long-distance desert caravan routes, like those of Harkuf (q.v.).

KURRU. Kurru is a royal pyramid field for some of the pre-Napatan (q.v.) kings, such as Kashta (K8), and as many as sixteen other tumulæ for unidentified kings who had come to rule before turning to
the recovery of Lower Nubia. Without inscriptional evidence, the evaluation and ordering of this period is particularly difficult, but one can construct the early part of the Third Intermediate period, following the collapse of the 20th Dynasty after the death of Ramses XI and the interregnum conflicts that ensued with Herihor and Panehesi (qq.v.) in about 1060 BCE. Without the Egyptian overlords, Nubians could begin to recover from the five centuries of colonial rule, and it is likely that a small-scale kingdom may have been the result. If the calculation is correct that sixteen kings are buried at Kurru, and a low average of twenty years of rule is estimated for each, then this regional administration may have lasted until 740 BCE. This coincides with the known emergence of King Alara (q.v.), who expanded the territory from Kurru to Kawa, and then King Kashta (q.v.), who extended the territory into Lower Nubia. Finally, with Egypt still weak, Piankhy could gain control of the entire Egyptian Nile as well. If this tentative reconstruction is correct, it is possible to project an early Kurru phase of state formation by the Kushites at this time, which is usually termed the Nubian “Dark Age” that immediately preceded the establishment of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.).

Supporting this view is that Kurru is the burial place for all 25th Dynasty kings, including Piankhy (K17), Shabaka (K15), Shabataka (K18), and Tanutamun (K16) (qq.v.), except for Taharka, who began the burials at the Nuri pyramid field. Kurru is located on the eastern bank of the Nile, as it heads in a southwesterly direction from Jebel Barkal, which lies about twenty kilometers northeast.

KUSH. This is the name for a region and kingdom centered in Nubia. The terms “Kush” and “Kerma” (q.v.) are particularly difficult to extricate from each other. This dictionary refers to Kerma for the period from about 2500 to 1500 BCE and Kush for the time thereafter until the end of Meroë in the fourth century CE. On the one hand, the Nubian people of Kerma were essentially the subordinated political ancestors of colonial Kush as well as of the later independent Kush or Napata. In this general sense, they are all linked. On the other hand, no written texts or king lists from Kerma indicate what they called themselves or who ruled, so we must use the Egyptian terms for “Irem” or “Yam” in this respect, but the territorial limits of Kerma are not clear, especially upstream. Yet most archaeologists today use the Kerma reference for a small local village at
the site, even though it is most unlikely that this is what it was called. Some Middle Kingdom Egyptian records begin to use the term “Kush” for what is now called “Kerma.” The more consistent use of “Kush” begins in the New Kingdom colonial occupation, when Nubia was brought under the authority of the viceroy of Kush or the King’s Son of Nubia. This reference to Kush then continued through the 25th Dynasty Napatan and Meroitic times but fades in post-Meroitic times.

Thus, Kush may or may not be the “true” lineal descendant of Kerma, depending on one’s definition of territory, nomenclature, or history, but it does seem that the impulse toward Nubian state formation of Kerma was reborn with Kush (i.e., the 25th Dynasty) after the intrusive centuries of New Kingdom (1567–1090 BCE) colonization of Kush ended. Throughout the New Kingdom, most major pharaohs recorded punitive raids or attacks against Nubia, either to generate booty of livestock, gold, and slaves or to suppress the almost endless rebellions against their rule. Such are the cases in 1530 BCE, when Pharaoh Tuthmosis I (q.v.) waged a war against Kush; during the period 1490–1436 BCE, when Pharaoh Tuthmosis III (q.v.) noted repeated military expeditions against Kush past the Third Cataract while seeking slaves and livestock; and in 1375 BCE, when Nubians revolted against Amenhotep III (q.v.). Clearly, the Egyptian presence was maintained by force, but a distinct Kushitic identity persisted even through endless campaigns of subjugation.

This model of colonial rule became more apparent in the common appointment of a viceroy of Kush under all New Kingdom pharaohs. An important example of such a person is Herihor (q.v.), who served in this position under Ramses XI (the last pharaoh of the 20th Dynasty). As the 21st Dynasty closed (ca. 945 BCE), Herihor asserted himself as the pharaoh with his “son” Piankhy (q.v.) becoming the new viceroy of Kush. It is worth noting that this Viceroy Piankhy was not the same as the Piankhy (751–716 BCE) who ruled during the 25th Dynasty (q.v.).

As the New Kingdom weakened in the early tenth century BCE, the kingdom of Kush that had existed as a tributary state was being reborn in comparative security at Napata. By about 950 BCE, the Kushites, perhaps under King Aserkhamen, started raids on Upper Egypt in an attempt to expand northward. Sometime in the ninth century BCE, Viceroy Piankhy, who was not the founder of the 25th Dynasty, claimed Thebes as a province of Kush. It is presumed that this
is the first instance of such a claim. By the time of the reign of
Kushite Pharaoh Alara (790–760 BCE), the divisions in Lower Egypt
enabled this pharaoh to establish the 25th Dynasty of Lower and Up-
per Egypt as well as Kush.
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**LASIYA, AL-, EL-LESIYYAH, ELLESIYAH.** The small cliff chapel
of al-Lasiya was located about six kilometers downstream of Qasr Ibn-
rim (q.v.). Both were on the eastern bank of the Nile before the S-turn
of the Nile at Korosko and thus very near Aniba (q.v.) of the district
of Wawat (q.v.). This structure dates to the New Kingdom under
Tuthmosis III (q.v.). The most interesting feature is that the Egyptian
pharaoh appears before the Nubian gods Dedun and Satet (qq.v.). The
temple was deliberately altered during the reign of the “heretic”
pharaoh Akhenaton (q.v.). In the 19th Dynasty, Ramses II (q.v.) re-
stored the chapel in his effort to renew the Amun cult and establish
his dominance over Nubia. The temple was dismantled in 1966 and
given to the Egyptian Museum in Turin, Italy, for its distinguished
Egyptian collection.

**LATE PERIOD.** No real consistency is seen among experts about the
parameters of the Late period, as some wish to include it (or portions
thereof) within the Third Intermediate period. For example, Nicolas
Grimal (1996:394) includes the 21st through 23rd Dynasties in the
Third Intermediate period, but parts of the 24th and 25th Dynasties
are in the Late period, as is the 26th Dynasty. Kenneth A. Kitchen
(1986:530) places the 21st through 26th Dynasties in the Third Inter-
mediate period, which appears to be synonymous with the Late pe-
riod. Rosalie and Antony E. David (1992:176) consider the 21st
through 26th Dynasties to be of the Third Intermediate period and
only the 27th through 31st Dynasties as parts of the Late period. Pe-
ter A. Clayton (1994:172) follows the same approach as the Davids,
while John Baines and Jaromír Málek (1985:9) take the Third Inter-
mediate period to be part of the first Theban period of the 25th Dy-
nasty, while the second portion is placed with the start of the Late pe-
riod, which goes to the end of the 31st Dynasty. Often, the Late
period is defined as spanning the 26th through 30th Dynasties, when the last Egyptian pharaoh, Nectanebo II, ruled Egypt before his flight to Nubia. Clearly, part of the problem is whether to consider the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) as part of or separate from the Late period or whether the 25th Dynasty should be seen in a unitary way or divided as it was evolving toward comprehensive control. Indeed, the usual test of dynastic order is to see whether the Egyptian Nile had a unitary state; if it did not, it would be relegated to the First, Second, or Third Intermediate periods. However, sometimes (like the Nubian 25th Dynasty) unity was achieved, but not by Egyptians, so should they be considered as foreigners in the Nile valley or just as another native source for unitary pharaonic authority? Some authorities include the 25th Dynasty within the Late period. A further complication of the definition of the Late period is the debate over the reckoning of Dynastic history into thirty or thirty-one dynasties or whether to include or exclude the second Persian occupation within dynastic history. Meanwhile, recent work on the Late Predynastic period has formulated a “0” (zero) Dynasty. A quiet comment on this debate appears on the exterior face of the Egyptian National Museum that omits the Nubian kings of the 25th Dynasty altogether.

**LEOPARDS.** In Egypt, the leopard is associated with two deities: Seshat and Mafdet. The goddess of writing and measurement, Seshat, is usually represented as a woman clad in a long panther skin. In the New Kingdom, Seshat became closely associated with the king’s *sed* festival (the royal jubilee ritual), where she served as the keeper of records. Mafdet, the divine manifestation of judicial authority and goddess of capital punishment, is depicted in the full animal form of a leopard. Mafdet is also considered a helper of the deceased, and leopard skins are depicted on coffin lids up to the Middle Kingdom. Manfred Lurker (1974) proposed the likelihood that similar customs involving leopard skins among African peoples were related to those of the ancient Egyptians. He cites two particularly interesting examples: a group in northern Nigeria who bury their dead in leopard skins and the Shilluk of southern Sudan, who also adorn and bury their dead rulers with leopard skins.

Leopard skins also appear in Egypt as the most distinctive item of priestly garb. Whole skins (with head intact) were worn as an insignia
of office by ancient Egyptian *sem* priests, who performed the role of son for father (Horus to Osiris) in the “opening of the mouth” ritual. This association of the leopard with both state authority and priesthood reflects the interdependence of religion and state in Egypt and Nubia.

While leopards may have once inhabited the Nile valley during Egypt’s very early history, they deserted the region for less populous southern areas early on. Consequently, leopards and leopard skins were obtained by either trade or tribute directly from Nubia. The earliest account of a trade in leopard skins comes from the 6th Egyptian Dynasty (ca. 2300–2100 BCE). Records chronicle several expeditions to Kerma (q.v.) in order to procure leopard skins and other luxury goods. Depictions of Nubian emissaries presenting leopard skins to Egyptian kings are also to be found in three New Kingdom tombs. Reliefs from the tombs of Sobekhotep (1400 BCE) and Huy (q.v.), viceroy of Kush (1330 BCE) portray the presentation of leopard skins. A similar painting in the tomb of Rekhmire (1450 BCE) depicts the presentation of a live, leashed leopard.

During the Napatan period, Egyptian ideology dominated and maintained state authority through association of the Nubian kings with the priests of Amun at Gebel Barkal (q.v.), who certainly wore leopard skins as a privilege of their office. However, in both the periods prior to and after the primacy of Gebel Barkal, no such evidence exists for the use of leopard skins in Nubia. In the Meroitic period, royalty and priests are exclusively associated with the lion. [by k. rhodes]

**LEPSIUS, KARL RICHARD** (1810–1884). German-born Lepsius was a major European archaeologist and philologist of the nineteenth century who undertook serious Egyptological analysis and field studies and published major descriptive reports. Lepsius was a professor and the director of the Berlin Museum. From 1842 to 1845, he directed the three-year Prussian expedition to Egypt, “Ethiopia” (Nubia/Sudan), and Sinai. He cleared the great temple of Abu Simbel during this period. King Frederick William IV funded this huge effort, and it resulted in a twelve-volume publication, *Denkmäler aus Ägypten und Äthiopen*. His *Letters from Egypt, Ethiopia, and Sinai* was published in German in 1852, and in English the following year.

Lepsius’s work largely revisited the sites first described by Frédéric Cailliaud (q.v.) but with a team of draftsmen, painters, cartographers,
and engineers. This scientific effort was considered a major advance in the documentation of these monuments. He visited Meroë and made detailed records of the site, especially including the pyramid fields to the east. He visited Naqa and reported a bilingual bark stand that later proved significant in the transliteration of Meroitic. He also published a large number of Meroitic inscriptions and a grammar and lexicon of Nubian languages, and he incorrectly predicted that Meroitic would be quickly translated. It was not.

**LINANT DE BELLEFONDS, LOUIS MAURICE ADOPLHE** (1799–1883). This French geographer and explorer, born in Brittany, had been destined for a career as a maritime cartographer for the French navy. However, he left this work, and during an 1817 tour of the Middle East, he finally arrived in Egypt in 1818 to do illustrations for European writers then residing in Cairo. From 1818 to 1819, he traveled in Lower Nubia from Aswan, stopping at Abu Simbel, to the Second Cataract with British Egyptologists William Bankes and Giovanni Belzoni (q.v.). In 1820, still only a teenager, he joined an exploratory party under the authority of Muhammad ‘Ali Pasha and, led by Bankes, traveled to Siwa Oasis in the Western Desert. From June 1821 to July 1822, he went as far as Dongola (q.v.) in Nubia, drawing along the way. This was during the Turkish military conquest of Sudan. Accompanied by Frédéric Cailliaud, Bankes led these travels and explored as far south as Meroë. This makes him the first modern European to have seen the sites of Naqa and Musawarat (qq.v.) in 1822. He returned to London in 1823, but was back in Nubia for a second tour from March 1826 to September 1827, when he ventured up the White Nile as far as Shilluk territory. In 1831–1832, he traveled to the Ethio-Sudanese borderlands along the Atbai valley in hopes of finding gold for Muhammad ‘Ali. Linant de Bellefonds also traveled as far as Darfur in the west in 1847. His published and illustrated works are numerous, but most important for Nubian studies is his *Journal d’un Voyage à Meroë dans les Années 1821 et 1822*, which was edited and published by Margaret Shinnie in 1958. His extensive, early modern travels made him a much valued associate of Jean-François Champollion (q.v.) and Richard Burton. Linant de Bellefonds died in Cairo.

**LIONS.** See APEDEMEK; LEOPARDS; MAHESA.
LONGINUS. The successor to Julian (q.v.) was another Monophysite (q.v.) missionary during the period of Christianity in Nubia (q.v.). After facing obstacles from the Melkite Christians, Longinus disguised himself to escape their authority and traveled to Nubia around 569 CE. He evangelized and rebuilt the clerical staff at the Dongola church of Nobatia from 570 CE until about 575 CE, when he returned to Alexandria. The sectarian disputes between the Melkites and Monophysites were still roiling, and the Alexandrian patriarchate forbade Longinus to return to Nubia in 578 CE, when requested to do so by the king of Alwa at Soba (q.q.v.). The Melkites said that Longinus was not empowered to baptize or ordain clerics, but the Alwa king prevailed and wanted to follow the same Monophysite tradition formerly rooted in Dongola. After these political negotiations were resolved, Longinus still had to face many hardships, since Makurra was then under Melkite control and refused to allow him to pass through their territory. Dodging their authority, Longinus took the dangerous desert route through Blemmye (q.v.) territory far to the east of the Nile. At long last, he reached the kingdom of Alwa to baptize its king and meet with fellow Monophysites from the Christian church of Axum (q.v.).

LOWER NUBIA. Lower Nubia usually is considered to be the stretch of Nubia from the First to the Second Cataract, or, in modern terms, from Aswan to the modern Egypto-Sudanese border. Ancient references considered it to be Wawat (q.v.), and Greco-Roman references referred to part of the region as the Dodekaschoenos (q.v.). This frontier region was the main point of contact or conflict between Egypt and Nubia, so it often was the site of major military fortification and/or colonial administrations through the long history of relations between the two peoples. The importance of Lower Nubia also rested on its access to the gold mines of the Wadi al-Allaqi (q.v.) and caravan routes in the Western Desert and its serving as a barrier against the Blemmyes or later nomads of the Red Sea Hills, such as the Kanz al-Dawla (q.v.). When Egypt was weak or internally divided, Nubians, such as those from Kerma, Napata, or Meroë, occupied Upper and Lower Nubia.

LULI (ELULAIOS), KING (R. 737?–701 BCE). King Luli was the king of both Sidon and Tyre (but not Akko) in Phoenicia and was politically and military allied with the Nubians of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) in their
common opposition (along with the Judaeans under King Hezekiah) to Assyrian expansion, especially under Sennach erib (704–681 BCE) during his third campaign in the region. Serving under Nubian Pharaoh Shabaka (q.v.), it is believed that Prince Taharka (q.v.) may have played some role in encouraging the Phoenician resistance to the Assyrians before he himself became a king. In desperation, King Luli escaped the Assyrian grasp and fled to nearby Cyprus in 701 BCE. Sennacherib replaced him with Ittobaal II, and Luli was assassinated in Cyprus shortly afterward. This was a critical time for the Phoenicians as well as the Nubians, and it appears that this military and political failure may have had something to do with the end of the reign of Shabaka and his replacement by Shabataka (q.v.), but the historical record is silent in details.

MACIVER, DAVID RANDALL (1873–1945). This English archaeologist directed the 1907–1911 Eckley B. Coxe expedition in Egypt and Nubia. With Charles Leonard Woolley, he excavated the fortress of Buhen (q.v.) and the town and cemetery sites at Areika and Karanog (q.q.v.). His work appeared in publications of the University Museum in Philadelphia.

MAHARRAQQA, MAHARRAKA, HIERASYKAMINOS. This Roman temple originally was located on the western bank of the Nile just upstream of Wadi al-Alaqi, about thirty kilometers from its present site. Today it is just below the Dakka (q.v.) temple. It looks eastward over a vast stretch of Lake Nasser. It was built to honor Isis and Serapis, the latter a popular syncretic deity of Greco-Roman Egypt.

The remains of the temple of Maharraqa are not very large, and they are only lightly inscribed in some interior places. During its functional period, it served largely as a Roman territorial marker when the Romans controlled this region of Lower Nubia. In fact, the temple was not completed because of the withdrawal of Roman control. Subsequent use in Meroitic or Christian times is not clear. Its complete former structures could not be fully restored. Its hypostyle hall is now its main structure, but a corner staircase leads to the roof level. Paintings
by Hector Horeau and David Roberts, in 1838, showed it in a poor condition, with the outer wall collapsed. When relocated in 1965 by UNESCO, it was restored as far as possible and placed on its new site.

**MAHESA, MA’AHES, MAHES, MAAHES, MAYHES, MIYSES, MIHOS, MIYSIS.** This guardian deity of apparent Nubian origin usually is depicted with a fierce lion head on a human body wearing a short kilt. Mahesa can be either a kingly leonine attribute or a separate lion deity. L. V. Zabkar believes that Mahesa was exported from Middle Kingdom Egypt to Nubia. In a New Kingdom case, Tuthmosis III (q.v.) is termed Mehesa, son of the lioness goddess Sekhmet. Mahesa may be crowned with a solar disk, sometimes including a uraeus, but commonly with a plumed *atef* crown. Mahesa was present in Egypt, particularly in his cult center at Leontopolis in the delta in the Late period. In contemporary Lower Nubia, Mahesa is depicted at the Isis (q.v.) and Hathor (q.v.) temples at Philae (q.v.) and at Dakka, Dabod, and Dendur (qq.v.). In Upper Nubia, Mahesa is found at Musawwarat es-Sufra (q.v.) and is probably represented at Basa (q.q.v.). At Napata (q.v.), King Tanutamun (q.v.) was supported by Mahesa to give him aid in recovering the declining Nubian control of Egypt. In Egypt or Nubia, Mahesa could be depicted devouring those who resisted state authority or protecting those in power. Mahesa is sometimes shown chewing on the heads of captives. This is illustrated in a sculpture at the Sudan National Museum.

The customary theogony of Mahesa had the cat goddess Bastet or Sekhmet as his mother and Amun-Re as his father. In Ptolemaic times, Mahesa is syncretically merged with Horus. The iconography for Mahesa suggests that he was a protective solar god who was in charge of maintaining order against the forces of evil. Mahesa may be confused with the other very important Nubian lion-god Apedemek (q.v.) or with the Egyptian goddess Bastet. A few faience examples of Mahesa are known, and Mahesa is depicted at Dabod temple in Lower Nubia (q.v.). Some scholars speculate that Mahesa has provided the root for the Mahas people of Nubia.

**MAHERPRI, MAHERPA** (fifteenth century BCE). The burial of Maharpri in the Valley of the Kings in tomb KV36 offers a glimpse of this Nubian royal fan bearer serving in the New Kingdom. He was estimated to have been about twenty-four years of age at the time of his
death. The physical features and hair of his properly mummified body make it certain that Maiherpri was of Nubian origin. He is the only known Nubian to be buried in this exclusive royal cemetery, and his position was of a valued servant. Since its discovery in 1899, by Victor Loret, this tomb has not been adequately published, but it is known through the work of Georg Schweinfurth, explorer and Egyptologist in the nineteenth century. It is one of the very few in situ burials in the Valley of the Kings to be excavated in modern times.

Although the grave had been partly looted, it still had a gilded cartonage cover, suggesting the affiliation to the royal household. Other burial items included his canopic chest and a set of three nested anthropoid coffins (one of which was not used) as well as food, remaining jewelry, bowls, vessels, games, weapons, and a copy of the Book of the Dead in which he appears as the dark-skinned deceased. Also included were two well-worked dog (q.v.) collars but no dogs, suggesting that he may have been in charge of these animals during his life. One item from his funerary equipment is on display in the New Kingdom (q.v.) room at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. This is an extremely fine-cut gazelle skin loincloth that was placed in a small box in his tomb. Various interpretations about this Nubian’s status have been offered, but it is most likely that he was a companion to a young member of an 18th Dynasty royal family (perhaps Hatshepsut or Tuthmosis IV? [q.v.]). Perhaps he was a son of a Nubian consort of the king. He was given the intriguing title “Lion in the Battlefield.”

MAKURRA, MAKOURIA, MUKURIA. This Christian kingdom emerged in Nubia after the fall of Meroë and the intervening X-Group period. Its capital was at Old Dongola (q.v.). In contrast to the neighboring states of Nobatia and Alwa (qq.v.), the rulers of Makurra appear to have converted to Orthodox rather than Monophysite (q.v.) Christianity in Nubia (q.v.) in about 569 CE. It merged with Nobatia to create the kingdom of Dongola in the 690s CE. Makurra officially came to an end as a Christian kingdom in 1317 CE, when its principal church was converted into an Islamic mosque. Yet a bishop still functioned at Faras (q.v.), the former capital of Nobatia, and many Christian practitioners persisted in their beliefs and practices there and in Dotawo (q.v.). The remaining Christian kingdom of Nubia, Alwa at Soba (q.v.), carried on until 1504.
MANDULIS (MARUL, MARUR, MENRULI, MERWEL [in Nubian], AION [in Greek]). Mandulis is the Greco-Roman common name for this Blemmye (q.v.) and/or Nubian sun god. The Greeks first sought to cultivate the worship of Mandulis as early as the third century BCE. The Romans continued this practice to honor and thereby win the loyalty and respect of the local Blemmyes. As the political motivation for celebration of this Blemmye god deepened, the Romans apparently sought greater control by developing an oracular tradition for this god that could be manipulated by their appointed priests. Mandulis was an important deity for religious pilgrimages and for oracular shrines in Greco-Roman times. The Roman practice of oracle shrines was similar to what Trajan (q.v.) also did in the Ky- sis temple at Dush in Kharga Oasis (q.v.) in the Western Desert.

Mandulis was a son of Horus and thereby a part of the great Osiris–Isis cosmogony. In this context, he can be shown with Isis. Mandulis was depicted as a local Nubian anthropomorphic sun god, and as such he had some affinities to the sun god Re. He usually wears the composite plumed and horned atef crown. His best-known center of worship was at Kalabsha (q.v.), where he was endowed with healing powers. Kalabsha (ancient Talmis) likely was also a Roman garrison town. Mandulis is also known at Dendur (q.v.) temple and in a mostly destroyed small Roman chapel at the eastern colonnade at Philae (q.v.) temple. The Kalabsha temple was probably first built in the 18th Dynasty, but it was reconstructed probably by Ptolemy V and Ptolemy X (qq.v.) and especially by the Romans under Augustus. Mandulis was worshiped in Lower Nubia (q.v.) at least until the fifth century CE, when Justinian (q.v.) closed the Philae temple.

MANETHO (323–245 BCE). Working from still existing king lists, this third century BCE historian–priest organized the chronology of ancient Egypt in his Aegyptica. This work was probably instigated by Ptolemy I and Ptolemy II (qq.v.) in their efforts to collect knowledge from all known sources for the development of the great library of Alexandria. Manetho created the framework of thirty pharaonic dynasties that continues to be standard for the study of ancient Egypt and Nubia. Manetho was the Egyptian high priest at the temple of Sebennytos in the delta, and his work wasLuckily but only partially perpetuated by some of the early Christian priests who must have recognized its historic value and
copied from his original, which would otherwise have been lost. Such historians as Eusebius and Josephus also preserved some of the writings of Manetho, so larger parts of his original work can be reconstructed.

Manetho is the source that gives Narmer as the first king of unitary Egypt. He also referred to Djer (q.v.; or Athothis), who was among the first Egyptians to attack Nubia. It was Manetho who spoke of the origins of the 5th Dynasty as being from Elephantine (q.v.) and about Queen Nitocris (q.v.), whose name reappears in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). Manetho suggests that Taharka (q.v.) may have been involved in a plot that killed Shabataka (q.v.). Manetho’s records about the Hyksos (q.v.) also appear in the work of the Jewish historian Josephus. Manetho preserved many of the traditions of the 25th Dynasty in his writings, such as the destruction of Bakenrenef (q.v.) by Shabaka (q.v.). The inclusion of astronomical events and king lists makes the foundational work of Manetho key in calibrating the calendar (q.v.) of ancient Egyptian and Nubian history.

MANJIL. This is a title used by exceptionally important chiefs subject to the Funj (q.v.) sultans. The best-known manjils were the ‘Abdal-lab (q.v.) leaders around Gerri, which lies upstream of ancient Meroë and may be derived from the Meroitic word qor (king), suggesting that this was the residence or capital of kings. The title manjil may also be of Meroitic origin.

MARK, SAINT. This disciple and evangelist of Saint Peter is credited with bringing Christianity to Egypt in 61 CE and founding churches in Alexandria during the rough reign of Emperor Nero (q.v.). Saint Mark had been born to a Jewish (q.v.) family from Cyrenaica in Libya but grew up in Jerusalem. His first convert was reported to be Anaias, a Jewish shoemaker from that city. Saint Mark traveled to Rome, where he stayed until 64 CE, when he returned to Alexandria. There, an enraged anti-Jewish crowd set upon him, perceiving that he was responsible for a desecration of the local Serapis bull cult temple. He was captured, beaten, and dragged to his death in the streets of Alexandria in 68 CE. Other records about this very early time are deficient, and the earliest clear ideas about Egyptian Christianity under the Romans usually are attributed to Origen (q.v.). The papal line of Monophysites (q.v.) descended from the See of Saint Mark. Relics of Saint Mark are
reported in Venice and in the Cathedral of Saint Mark in Alexandria, and icons of Mark are common in the Nile valley.

**MASH.** This Nubian sun god is known only from his cult found at Karanog (Nalote) (q.v.), where tombs and a temple give evidence of this deity. The modern Nubian word for “sun,” mashil, suggests some continuity from this past god.

**MASHWASH (MA).** The Mashwash were of Libyan (Libu) origin. They were alternatively of military value or a military threat to New Kingdom Egyptians, particularly in the Western Desert and in the delta; elsewhere, they were used as mercenaries in the Egyptian army. Apparently, it is Mashwash chiefs who were depicted among New Kingdom tribute-payers, such as at Medinat Habu. The Mashwash usually were drawn showing their characteristic sidelocks; long, curled beards; and penis sheaths.

If our understanding is correct, Mashwash may be a general term for specific Libyan peoples, such as the Tjehenu and Tjemehu (q.v.). Alternatively, these may all be local or regional names for different Libyan peoples. It also appears that Mashwash of some variety were a periodic danger to oasis routes and to western Thebes. Judging from the Kawa inscription of Taharka (q.v.), the Mashwash were a threat that he needed to address with punitive measures.

**MASMAS.** The site of Masmas is located in Lower Nubia (q.v.) on the western bank of the Nile just downstream from Toshka West (q.v.). In the Second Intermediate period (q.v.), Masmas was the home of a late C-Group (q.v.) population that used a small cemetery there. The graves were small and round, with some flex burials and simple C-Group pottery. It was reoccupied in the 18th Dynasty of the New Kingdom. Nearby cemetery site 201 from the early New Kingdom had ceramic vases and jars, simple necklaces, and scarabs with hieroglyphic inscriptions. The sites at nearby Khor Kokmar and Khor Dambusia on the eastern bank of the Nile date to the same time.

Meroitic tombs at Masmas had their customary polychrome painted pottery with flowered and geometric designs, ankh’s, and some with images of frogs, birds, and humans. Some pottery with shells embedded into moist clay was found. A Spanish team reconstructed a
Meroitic tomb from Masmas that was in the form of a mastaba with a chapel annex having provision for a modified ba statue and Meroitic-inscribed offering tablets for funerary libations. This style was similar to contemporary Meroitic graves at Karanog (q.v.).

At Nag Sawesra, near Masmas, the Spanish investigated a very early Christian cemetery. Christian tombs there were of considerable stylistic variation, including one double-ended grave with multiple burials. A stone funeral marker written in Coptic was found in this context. L. P. Kirwan and Walter Emery (q.v.) investigated Masmas in the early twentieth century. The Spanish excavation was by Martín Almagro, Eduarado Ripoll, and Luis Monreal Graves during the Nubian salvage campaign from 1960 to 1962.

MATRILINEAL, MATRIARCHY, MATRILocal. A considerable amount of discussion has been generated about the reputed presence of matrilineal kinship in ancient or modern Nubia. Technically, matrilineal descent means the tracing of descent, as in family names and property, only through the female line. Often this is conflated or confused with matriarchy and matrilocal, which relate, respectively, to public power and to postmarital residence. Certainly matrilineal kinship is known in several places in Africa, such as for the Ashanti in modern Ghana and for several ethnic groups in the “matrilineal belt” of central Africa. Matrilineality does also correlate with horticultural societies and those in more egalitarian social relations, especially with a lesser role for movable wealth, particularly in the form of livestock.

With this background, the ancient or modern anthropological evidence for strictly matrilineal descent in Nubia is weak. However, several areas in Nubian social practice are indicative of a high status of women and an important role for women in legitimating men and society. Perhaps the oldest evidence for matriarchy is from the A-Group (q.v.), where one burial having the greatest endowment of grave goods is attributed to a woman. As ancient Egyptian history unfolded, one sees only three cases—Nitocris, Sobekneferu, and Hatshepsut—where women came to rule the state.

For Nubia, especially in the Meroitic period, at least eight regnant queens—including Amanikhatashan, Amanirenas, Amanishakete, Amanitore, Shanadakate, and three other anonymous queens—are buried in Bejrawiya pyramids 4, 25, and 26. Apparently, these were...
fully regnant or coregent queens and not just queen consorts. Legitimacy through women was also seen in the institution of the God’s Wife of Amun (q.v.), which was neither started nor ended with Nubians, but certainly was followed closely during the period of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). Likewise, the status of the royal mother of Nubian and Meroitic kings seems significant, not to mention the title “candace” (q.v.; kdi-qqo), meaning “royal woman.” Thus, Nubian women could hold the titles of regnant queens, royal mothers, God’s Wives of Amun, and queen consorts, indicating their elevated power. Yet descent cannot be described in any real way as truly matrilineal, and confusion exists since, within the royal family at least, endogamy and sibling marriages were common, hence the perception that descent was through women.

No case of a regnal queen or bishop is seen during Christian times in Nubia. It appears that the practice of Muslim Kenzi Nubians to take wives from Christian Nubian women paved the way for the further erosion of matrilineal tendencies, such a maternal son descent. The case of the Christian king Kerenbes (q.v.) is instructive since his sister’s son was the current Muslim Kanz al-Dawla (q.v.), leading to legitimacy on one hand but, since Arab kinship and society is strongly patrilineal and patriarchal, to greater ultimate loss of any residual matrilinealism on the other. It is not uncommon for modern Nubians to still have matrilocal postmarital residence.

MEDJAY, MATOI, MAZOI. “Medjay” is just one of the variant spellings of this semisettled ethnic group located especially in the Nubian Desert between the Nile and the Red Sea. They were also found west of the Nile in the Libyan Desert but probably in lesser numbers. In the accounts of Merenre (q.v.) of the 6th Dynasty, they are termed the “Matoi,” and they were very highly valued as soldiers in the Egyptian army. The Coptic language preserved the word matoi to mean “soldier.” At that time, the Medjay were reported as living “east of Yam and south of Wawat” (qq.v.). Intermediary groups of Irtet and Setiu (qq.v.) between Wawat and Yam were also recognized during the time of Merenre, who claimed authority over them. It appears that they have had virtually continuous occupation of this region for at least 5,000 years. They are probably the same as the people known archaeologically as the Pan-Grave culture (q.v.), so called for the shape of their shallow flex burials.
The Medjay’s ancient hostility or rivalry with the settled Nubians often meant that an inherent division could be exploited by the rulers of Egypt. Consequently, the Medjay have been long employed by Egyptians or the rulers of Egypt as scouts, border guards, and police, especially in this region but also throughout Egypt as early as the Middle Kingdom under Senusret III (q.v.). The ancient reference to Medjay typically is synonymous with “police” or “judicial administrators.” When they served as mercenary troops, they were noted especially for their fast infantry or, later, cavalry attacks from the desert that offered strategic advantage over the settled peoples. After the arrival of wheeled military chariots, the Medjay were proficient in their use. In fact, Medjay troops were critical in the first half of the sixteenth century BCE in support of the efforts of Kamose and Ahmose (q.v.) to drive away the Hyksos (q.v.) and establish the New Kingdom. The alliance between the Hyksos and Kerma (q.v.) suggests that Nubians were hostile to the Medjay role in asserting five centuries of New Kingdom colonization of Nubia. Evidence exists that Tuthmosis III (q.v.) used Medjay as garrison troops in his New Kingdom forts in Nubia and elsewhere. During the time of Akhenaton (q.v.) in the fourteenth century BCE, his “police chief” Mahu likely was of Medjay origin. Records from the Workers Village at Deir al-Medina show that Medjay guards were used for security details in the Valley of the Kings. Their service was not limited to the Eastern Desert, and their military use was also seen in the Western Desert oasis patrols, such as at Dungul, Kurkur, and elsewhere, and in raids against Libyan incursions into the Western Desert oases in particular. Since one of their local deities was Dedun (q.v.), the Medjay were sometimes known simply as the Dedu, or followers of this patron god. In the Middle and New Kingdoms, some pharaohs build specific shrines or temples, such as at Semna (q.v.), to honor Dedun and curry the favor of the local Medjay.

Occupying an intermediary position between Egyptians and Nubians, the Medjay were used in divide-and-rule strategies of regional control. In Greco-Roman times, the people of this region were termed either Troglydotes (“Cave Dwellers”) or Blemmyes (q.v.). In post-Meroitic times, when the Noba intruded into this region, it was probably Medjay or Blemmyes (later termed X-Group or Ballana people), who were subordinated if one may judge correctly from the King
Silko (q.v.) inscription at Kalabsha (q.v.) temple. Today these same peoples are those known ethnographically as the Bisharin in Egypt or Beja peoples in Sudan. They belong to the Tu-Bedawie or Cushitic language group. Today they are heavily Arabized and Islamized, but they still retain various aspects of their independent culture.

MEINARTI. Meinarti is a flat alluvial island located in Lower Nubia near the Second Cataract between Buhen and Murgissa (qq.v.). It was used as a military relay fort during the New Kingdom. In Meroitic, post-Meroitic, and Christian (qq.v.) times, it featured a small agricultural village that measured over one-quarter of a hectare (about half an acre). Also known as the “Island of Michael,” this island was reoccupied during the Meroitic period and used through the Middle Ages (200–1400 CE). It was also used during the Ballana and X-Group (qq.v.) periods. Much of what we know about Ballana village life comes from this site. Among its duties, Meinarti served as a customs post, marking the northern front of the Lower Nubian (q.v.) free-trade zone and the Upper Nubian (q.v.) closed zone. The original Meroitic settlement consisted of various public buildings, such as temples, market areas, and winepresses, all surrounded by houses. The winepress is one of a dozen in the region. However, it is one of only two indoor presses; another is featured at Wadi al-Arab. The stratigraphy of Meinarti provides valuable information on its social and economic changes from beginning to end. Floods during its long uninterrupted existence repeatedly damaged Meinarti.

MEK (MAK, MEEK). This is a title used by some traditional chiefs in Sudan. Mek likely is a term of Meroitic origins, meaning a local king. A very late use of this term was for Mek Nimr, the king of Shendi (near Meroë), who was famous for his resistance to the Turkish invasion in 1821.

MEKHER. This is an ancient reference to an imprecise region in Nubia that was mentioned in the trade expeditions of Harkuf (q.v.). Perhaps it was in the vicinity of the Second Cataract.

MEMPHIS. Memphis has an extremely ancient history in the Nile valley, as it served as the first capital of a unitary Egyptian state. Its deep
traditions, necropolis, and iconography have long been important in Egyptian religion and history. Since Memphis was at the southern point of Lower Egypt, its practical relationship with Nubia was remote, but it certainly was venerated as a holy place by Nubians. Memphis figures more directly in Nubian history, when it was involved in Piankhy’s (q.v.) takeover of that city and the delta in the formative period of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). Seeking legitimization, the Nubian pharaohs of this dynasty used Memphite traditions, such as the coronation of Apis bulls and frequent reference to Ptah, especially by Shabaka (q.v.). In the closing years of Taharka (q.v.), Memphis proved to be a battleground where the Assyrians (q.v.) assaulted the walls and Taharka’s son was captured and taken back to Nineveh as a prisoner.

MENTUEMHAT, MONTUEMHET. Mentuemhat was the governor or mayor of Thebes during the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) and the 26th Dynasty. As such, he saw or participated in the glories of its monumental construction, especially during the long reign of Taharka (q.v.), as well as its ignominious defeat and sacking under the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal (q.v.), who finally reached that royal religious center in 664 BCE. Unlike Horemakhet (q.v.), who was of Nubian origin, Mentuemhat appears to have been Upper Egyptian in origin. While Horemakhet was serving as the High Priest of Amun at Thebes, Mentuemhat was probably serving under the lesser title of the Fourth Priest of Amun. One of a dozen known sculptures of Mentuemhat was found at the Mut temple in Karnak. The effort to portray him realistically reveals him as a burdened, somber, heavy, and unsmiling figure. The limited effort to rebuild the 25th Dynasty under Tanutamun (q.v.) was also within the experience of Mentuemhat, as was the birth of the 26th Dynasty under Psamtik I. Remarkably, he survived until the fourteenth year of that pharaoh, whose task had been the eradication of Taharka. When Mentuemhat died, he was given a huge, stately mud-brick tomb (TT 34) with a sun court in the Asasif, in the western necropolis. Like in the 25th Dynasty, his tomb incorporated conservative themes inspired from the Old and Middle Kingdoms (q.v.).

MENTUHOTEP II, MENTUHOTPE II, NEB-HETEP-RE (ca. 2060–2010 BCE). This pharaoh of the 11th Dynasty is credited with the complete restoration of the unity of the Nile, which marked the
formation of the Middle Kingdom. For this reason, Mentuhotep belongs in the same category as Narmer and Ahmose, as all three were founders of major periods in Egyptian history. Following the pattern of Nile political relations, when Egypt is strong, it usually is a difficult time for Nubia. This would also be the case for Mentuhotep II. After the civil strife and collapse of the unitary Egyptian state in the First Intermediate period (q.v.), power began to reemerge in a series of Theban kings, Intef (or Inyotef) I (2134–2117 BCE), Intef II (2117–2069 BCE), and Intef III (2069–2060). The precise transition and specific battles that led from Intef to Mentuhotep II are not well understood.

Well into his reign, in about 2040 BCE, Mentuhotep II’s forces managed to retake Heracleopolis or, at least, to reassert Theban control over the previous rivals in the later First Intermediate period during the 9th and 10th Dynasties. With Upper Egypt under his authority, he was able to proceed with military engagements in the western delta with the Libyans and with “Asiatics” in the Sinai. Thus, Mentuhotep II is credited with rebuilding the unity of Upper and Lower Egypt between 2050 and 2040 BCE and becoming the real founder of the 11th Dynasty, which ushered in the Middle Kingdom (q.v.).

It appears that Mentuhotep II, the son of Intef III (q.v.) and Queen Yah (Aoh), came to rule Thebes and its vicinity. It is possible that Mentuhotep II was of Nubian origin if one judges from the images in his statuary and the images of his favorite wives. Assuming this to be the case, it is not clear whether his Nubian roots were inherited from Intef III, Yah, or both. One of the most celebrated statues of Mentuhotep II, now in the Egyptian National Museum in Cairo, shows this pharaoh seated in an Osiride posture with his arms crossed. No doubt, he had held a flail or royal implement in his hands. He had the false beard of pharaonic authority and the double crown signifying that he was “Lord of Two Lands.” Unlike most former or successive pharaohs, his skin was shown as black. Some commentators believe that this color symbolizes his Osiride rebirth (such as black-colored funerary statues of Tutankhamen, who was not Nubian), but other evidence that surrounds Mentuhotep II suggests that his black skin indicates a Nubian origin even if he represents Egyptian interests there. This certainly was the basic model in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) more than a millennium later, when Nubians came to rule all of Egypt but Egyptianized themselves in the process.
His complex and changing titulary having three different Horus names is also indicative of someone struggling for legitimacy. The very name Mentuhotep ("Montu is [praised] or content") reflects his reverence to the Theban war god Montu, who was invoked because of the military struggle that established his reign. This can also be reflected in the wooden models showing ranks of Nubian and Egyptian spearmen and archers found in Assiut in Middle Egypt in the tomb of Mesehti. The focus on military matters is also clear in the nearby burial of some sixty of his soldiers, many with war-related injuries, in a tomb near that of Mentuhotep II at Deir al-Bahri.

These military themes suggest the degree of force required to reassert his state power over regional authorities, or nomarchs, at this time. Very late in his reign, expeditionary inscriptions in Lower Nubia and in Middle Egypt support this record of military conquest to restore Egyptian control. The Egyptian reference to "Kush" (q.v.) first appears at this time (in the Florence stela from Buhen). For these military missions, Mentuhotep II used mercenaries from both Libya and Nubia, as shown in the Mesehti tomb models. Mentuhotep II’s interests in Nubia were to restore trade, provide military security, and reopen the access to Nubian gold mines and quarries of hard stone. During the First Intermediate period, Nubians from Kerma had restored the C-Group (q.v.) occupation of Lower Nubia, and they had initiated the development of this most ancient large-scale Nubian state. But with the Middle Kingdom Egyptian reconquest of Lower Nubia, the former C-Group people were either dispersed or subjugated. Certainly Mentuhotep II raided in this region. During his reign, he brought in steady, peaceful commerce to areas in Lower Nubia, lands west of the Nile, and the Sinai, and resumed the timber trade to Phoenicia and some incense trade to Punt (q.v.) via the Red Sea.

During the Middle Kingdom, Egyptians reasserted their control of most of Lower Nubia with a series of heavy military fortifications, especially at the Second Cataract, mainly during the following 12th Dynasty under Sennusret III (q.v.). Mentuhotep II appears to have personally engaged in the restoration of trade in ivory, incense, feathers, and slaves as well as gold mining and stone quarrying in Nubia. His administration there may have included the recruitment of Nubian archers in addition to Nubian servants in his royal household and his apparently Nubian family members.
Mentuhotep II’s constructions are numerous but are found primarily in Middle and Upper Egypt. In Nubia, at Elephantine, he constructed a temple to the Nubian triad of Khnum, Satet, and Anuqet (qq.v.). Most notable of all was his major mortuary temple on the western bank of the Nile at Thebes, excavated in the early twentieth century by H. E. Winlock. This temple often is overlooked today since it was smaller than the later and bigger temple of Hatshepsut (q.v.) of the 18th Dynasty and was not present at the time of Mentuhotep II. Perhaps some of the stone from the Mentuhotep II temple was used in her temple. The very impressive mortuary temple and tomb for Mentuhotep II rested on a huge terraced stand that was reached by a central ramp to the raised colonnaded forecourt of the mortuary temple. Some sort of superstructure existed, perhaps a pyramid at the center of this forecourt. Whether it was a stepped or smooth pyramid or some other form has not been resolved. At the base of the ramp, a cenotaph and avenue of sculpture are presumed, but this is still under debate. Evidence of planted trees or gardens has been found along this avenue. This complex then extended back through a hypostyle hall into a rock-cut sanctuary chamber for the king. Immediately behind arose the majestic cliffs of Deir al-Bahri. Beneath the temple and buried still deeper into the cliffs of Deir al-Bahri was his burial chamber. Access to the royal tomb was from a tunnel cut into the plain in front of the huge temple base. Inside, it had a peaked roof and his alabaster sarcophagus. It was there that Howard Carter found the famed statue of Mentuhotep II. The temple was about 140 meters long. The architectural style of incorporating forward tunnels into and under funerary temples or pyramids was later readopted in Napatan (q.v.) royal burials. At the rear of his mortuary temple are the shaft burials of six royal consorts and his mother. Among these are his royal queen and sister Neferu. This is similar to Nubian patterns (elaborated in the 25th Dynasty [q.v.]) in which a king’s sister was also the God’s Wife of Amun (q.v.) at Thebes.

Relative to his possible Nubian origins, his consort sisters Amunet, Kawit, and Kemsit were also buried at this same location. The latter two are shown with a dark skin while being served by lighter-skinned Egyptian women servants who are grooming their mistresses while smelling a fragrant lotus. This color iconography gives additional weight to the family’s being of Nubian origin. Both are referred to as
the “Sole Favorite of the King.” Their status, even if not queenly, clearly was high, judging from the scale, quality, and image of their portraits. His daughter (?) princess Ashayt is also shown with dark skin, not like Egyptians, also seated comfortably sniffing the fragrance of a lotus. His consort Tem is believed to have been the mother of his son and his successor Mentuhotep III. Tem’s tomb is the largest of these royal women, and her sarcophagus of alabaster is said to be most impressive. The high prominence for the queen mother is a practice that strongly persisted among Nubian royalty ruling from or originating from Napata. Even in the famed and very detailed tomb models for Mentuhotep’s chancellor Meketre, one sees Egyptians and Nubians differentiated by skin color. For example, the herdsmen in the well-known livestock-tallying model are clearly Egyptian, while the carpenters are painted with skin colors of Nubians.

Thus, in addition to the military and political context of Mentuhotep II as well as his coloring, the kinship and depiction of his related royal wives give further support to his Nubian origins. These graphic depictions of Mentuhotep II and his wives, the critical use of Nubian troops, and his conservative emphasis suggest that this founder of the Middle Kingdom may have played a similar role as Nubian King Piankhy (q.v.) in later times.

MERENRE, NEMTYEMSAF (2283–2278 BCE). This third Egyptian pharaoh of the 6th Dynasty was sandwiched between Pepi I and Pepi II (qq.v.). He followed similar policies for Nubia. Under the instruction of Merenre, five additional canals were constructed through the First Cataract to allow easier access to the human, natural, and animal resources of Wawat and Yam (qq.v.). In the fifth year of the reign of Merenre, he actually appeared in Elephantine to receive the subordinated Nubian (C-Group? [q.v.]) chiefs representing Wawat, Irtet, and the Medjay (qq.v.), who were valued as soldiers for Egypt. They were pleased that only one warship was needed for protection when trying to access the granite quarries of Nubia to procure suitable stone for his sarcophagus and pyramid at Memphis.

On his father’s death, Merenre appointed Uni “Governor of the South,” who also held the title “Keeper of the Door of the South” since the military and economic control of Nubia was a significant feature of this administration. It was also under the rule of Merenre
that Harkuf (q.v.) was first appointed as the “Governor of the South” to replace Uni. Under Pepi II, Harkuf continued to organize large, long trade expeditions to Kerma. The mummified head of Merenre (without the lower jaw) still resides in the Cairo Museum.

**MERKURIUS, MERCURIUS, KING.** Merkurius was the single monarch of the joined kingdoms of Dongola (i.e., Makurra [q.v.]) and Nobatia (q.v.) during the reign of Eparch Markos of Nobatia, who represented the crown at Faras (q.v.). These kingdoms were unified under his rule in the late seventh century (ca. 697 CE) to improve their defensive position against Muslims expanding in Egypt. With this strong defense, he was sometimes termed “the Constantine of Nubia.” Egyptian Muslims referred to the “Kingdom of the Nuba” to define this newly unified state. The more exposed territory of Nobatia had already and exclusively signed the peace treaty, or *baqt*, with Egypt, and it is clear that they needed additional alliances with Makurra. King Merkurius is known from an inscription in his eleventh year (707 CE) in the five-aisled church of Faras. He is also known from an inscription in his thirteenth year from Tafa. Despite this geographic and religious isolation, King Merkurius persisted in following the Monophysite (q.v.) faith of the Alexandrian patriarchate. Although in line of royal descent, Merkurius’s son Zacharias did not assume the throne, preferring more religious duties, and the crown of the joint Christian kingdom passed to King Simon.

**MERNEPTAH, MERENPTAH (1212–1202 BCE).** Merenptah was a son of the great Ramses II (q.v.). He was the first pharaoh of the 19th Dynasty, and during his reign, a concerted effort was made by Libyans to organize a revolt. Part of their strategy was to gain control of the delta and the western oases while encouraging a joint revolt in Nubia. This was to have paralleled the strategy of Kerma and the Hyksos (qq.v.) that succeeded three centuries before in isolating Egyptians to the Thebaid. However, a preemptive strike by Merenptah defeated the Libyans, but the Nubian revolt went ahead, though without surprise or allies. Merenptah then turned the largest portion of his forces against his southern rivals. Lower Nubia had been rather peaceful for most of the time of his father, Ramses II, and Merenptah was to set a stern example by crushing the Nubian opposition.
MEROË, (ca. 270 BCE–ca. 340 CE). Meroë is the general name for the state that prevailed in Nubia from the early third century BCE until its close in about 340 CE. As far as it is presently understood, Meroë represents a linear dynastic sequence from the earlier Napatan (q.v.) state, which is a continuation from the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) or even before. At some point in the third century BCE, the capital was moved from Napata to Meroë, thus initiating the Meroitic period, when the reigning monarchs were no longer buried in the royal cemeteries around Napata but were buried in the royal necropolis of Bejrawiya at Meroë. It persisted until its deteriorating economy and perhaps ecology made it susceptible to foreign aggression. In this instance, the attack came from the newly formed Christian kingdom of Axum (q.v.), led by its king Ezana. Patrice Lenoble believes that Hobagi (q.v.) represented a weak effort to perpetuate the Meroitic leadership, but without inscriptions this case remains plausible but not proven. In about 315 BCE, King Nastasen (q.v.) was probably the last Kushite to be buried near Napata at Nuri (qq.v.) pyramid 15. At the death of King Arkamani (q.v.; 270–260 BCE), he became the first to be buried at Meroë (Bejrawiya), near modern Shendi. Thus, it apparently was between the reigns of Nastasen and Arkamani that the Kushite capital was shifted from Napata to Meroë. At Meroë, the Kushitic traditions continued for another 600 years, long after the “mother society” of Dynastic Egypt had vanished. Notable features of Meroitic society were the expansion of Meroitic writing (q.v.); the continued construction of pyramids in Nubia/Sudan (a greater number than even in Egypt); the export of cattle, elephants (q.v.), and other livestock to the Greeks and Romans; and the significant production of iron (q.v.) implements.

Certainly Meroë existed as a trading center during the Napatan period. Among its many prominent features was an Isis temple, an Apedemek (q.v.) temple, large city walls and a royal compound, and impressive hills of iron slag that must have been produced there in great quantity over a long period of time. Nonroyal cemeteries lie nearby, and royal cemeteries lie farther to the east on a ridge. Numerous pyramids and funerary shrines dot the landscape.

In a more comprehensive and stylistic sense, Meroë may refer to the so-called Island of Meroë or the Butana (q.v.) region of eastern
Sudan. As such, it includes the other important sites of the same period, such as Naqa, Musawwarat es-Sufra, Basa (q.v.), and as sites occupied as far away as Lower Nubia, which certainly are related, judging from common ceramic traditions and Meroitic inscriptions (q.v.). Facing economic and ecological challenges in the early fourth century CE, as well as incursions by the eastern Beja people, Meroë was vulnerable to attack, and some time well before 350 CE, the Christian Axumites from Ethiopia invaded and destroyed Meroë. After Meroitic civilization ended, it was replaced by the syncretic X-Group peoples (the Ballana or Tanqasi cultures [q.v.]). Ancient Sudan had ended, and it entered another “Dark Age” that lasted until the rise of the Christian (q.v.) kingdoms in the sixth century CE.

MEROITIC: DECIPHERMENT. The historical analysis of the rise of Meroitic writing is essential in forming the strategies for the decipherment of Meroitic. Epigraphers still wish to find a substantial bilingual text in Meroitic to compare to the famed Rosetta Stone critical in Egyptian hieroglyphic decipherment. Such is still possible, since the Meroites and Greeks were in prolonged interaction. Perhaps some extensive bilingual texts in Meroitic demotic (q.v.), Greek, Latin, or Axumite (q.v.) may be found in Meroë to help. Yet it is sometimes forgotten that the Rosetta Stone for Egyptian hieroglyphics and demotic only started the process of decipherment. This second and much slower process was possible through the many cognates between ancient Egyptian and Coptic. Thus, the transliteration of Meroitic letters has been achieved and is generally accepted. The chief barrier for further advancement has been the debate about the linguistic affiliation with Meroitic and other cognatic languages, especially in the absence of a long bilingual text. Early researchers had small lexical databases and few established written forms of modern Nubian dialects, so that path grew cold, and many sources suggest that no relationship exists between Meroitic and modern Nubian dialects that belong to the Sudanic language family. In my own studies, I see some overlaps in modern Nubian dialects and Old Nubian (essentially a liturgical Nubian written in Coptic letters). Similarly, some words and meanings are shared between Old Nubian and Meroitic, at least as far as this language is understood. Certainly they share many parallel phonetic patterns that make further comparisons
worthwhile. A sophisticated, speedy computer program developed by Adam Gerard, Helene Longpre, Monica Ouelette, Kharyysa Rhodes, and Melissa Talbot has helped create a substantial lexicon with known meanings from Egyptian demotic, Old Nubian, and modern Nubian dialects. This program searches for consonantal clusters and sequences that have some congruence with conventionally transcribed Meroitic words, which now number well over 1,000. The process is not neat or linear, but it has found some cognates in these languages with Meroitic. This gives a basis for hypothesis generation and contextual testing in the absence of the sought-after bilingual text. This process is by no means complete, but it has been more productive than expected. The known meanings have been determined by contexts such as royal and official titles, funerary contexts, and shared deities, toponyms, genders, numbers, and ethnicities, so we can be rather sure about the general meanings of texts while searching for intermediary words, grammatical rules, and spelling variations. The comparative computer-driven word search strategy can at least generate new hypotheses for alternative or possible words that can proceed to fill in missing information. Considering that this is the oldest written African language on the continent aside from hieroglyphics, the mission to decipher Meroitic has received some new impetus in recent years. Increasingly, scholars and members of the public are reexamining Nubian and African culture and history. A major role in advancing this work has taken place in the pioneering effort by French scholars such as Jean Leclant, André Heyler, Catherine Berger-El Naggar, Claude Rilley, and Claude Carrier to create the systematic computer-based system known as REM (The Collection of Meroitic Epigraphy) and in the huge effort by the Bergen, Norway, scholars, including Tormod Eide, Tomas Hägg, Richard Holton Pierce, and László Török, who have created the marvelous primary database known as the Fontes Historiae Nubiorum, which unifies most of the known written documents of ancient Nubian history. With these sources and computers and with patience, the problem of Meroitic will be solved one day (see appendix IX).

MEROITIC: DEMOTIC (CURSIVE). Once Francis Ll. Griffith (q.v.) had his breakthrough with Meroitic hieroglyphs (q.v.), he could relatively easily move to the next stage with the realization that every
glyph had a corresponding demotic form, and this could be confirmed by substitution and cross-checking. Aside from some adjustments introduced by the computer age, Griffith’s system of transliteration (slightly adjusted) has been confirmed in numerous ways. Often, the prevailing form of Meroitic is termed “cursive” for no good reason since the letters have no linking ligatures as one should expect from a “running” or “cursive” script. Moreover, the evolution from and morphological relationship between some Meroitic demotic letters and a number of Egyptian demotic letters suggests that the time has come to use the term “demotic” for both. Indeed, just as the morphology of Meroitic hieroglyphics was heavily influenced by classical Egyptian, so was it the case for Meroitic demotic. This is not to say that the two languages are conceptually related, only that they are related in the Meroitic borrowing of some letter morphology. Before this time, the only written language ever used by Kushites was Egyptian hieroglyphs, hieratic and demotic. One may also speculate about the context for the rise of Egyptian demotic that is dated to either the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) or the 26th Dynasty. The borrowing of some demotic letters presages a similar process in rendering Old Nubian into Coptic or Greek letters. Again, this should not be understood to link these languages etymologically or conceptually but only to borrow a writing form during their common Christian periods. Another attempt was briefly made in the nineteenth or twentieth century to render Nubian languages into Arabic letters. At present, some linguists and Nubian cultural promoters, such as Herman Bell and Jalal Hashim, are seeking to transcribe and regularize modern Nubian in Latin or Coptic letters.

MEROITIC: HIEROGLYPHIC ALPHABET. Meroitic writing probably first appeared in the third century BCE, but clearly dated examples appear in the second century BCE. It continued at least until the fourth century CE. The precise creator of Meroitic is not known, but its emergence was during the time of the Ptolemies (q.v.) and their construction of the famed library at Alexandria. This ancient “think tank” had a great thirst for documents in all foreign scripts and tongues, and it is reasonable to imagine that the Greeks might have had an important role in stimulating the production of this writing system. At least one of the Ptolemies, that is, Cleopatra VII (q.v.), may have had some
ability to speak this ancient Nubian language. It was never used much
north of Aswan (q.v.), nor does it appear south of the confluence of the
Niles, though it does appear slightly to the east of the Nile in the Bu-
tana (q.v.) heartland. Meroitic writing became known in the nine-
teenth century by the works of Frédéric Cailliaud and Franz Gau
(q.q.v.). But it was the pioneering work of Griffith that advanced our
understanding from epigraphic inscriptions to transliteration. Follow-
ing a strategy similar to that of Jean-François Champollion (q.q.v.) in his
decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphs, Griffith took full advantage of
a very limited text from a bark stand found at Wad Ben Naqa (q.v.) in
the Butana. This stand, now in Germany, had royal cartouches in an
Egyptian hieroglyphic form that paralleled cartouches written in de-
rivative Meroitic hieroglyphs (q.v.). Through a meticulous process of
substitution and corroboration, the Meroitic hieroglyphs were solved,
since several of the Meroitic hieroglyphs had ancient Egyptian coun-
terparts that helped this process. All together, this was actually a much
less difficult transliteration than it was for hieroglyphs since that work
had already been done, and Meroitic is virtually alphabetic with
twenty monoconsonantal glyphs and only three syllabic glyphs.
Meroitic has hardly any homophones, biconsonantal glyphs, or tri-
consonantal glyphs, as exist in many confusing cases in Egyptian hi-
eroglyphics. Moreover, aside from the use of cartouches, only rarely
do determinatives occur in Meroitic, unlike hieroglyphics.

In addition, Meroitic (like Ge’ez and Amharic) makes use of the clar-
ifying double-dot or rare triple-dot word dividers. They are absent in hi-
eroglyphics and early Greek and Latin, and this had long been an ad-
ditional complexity for those languages. Moreover, Meroitic hieroglyphs
are themselves quite rare and are used mainly for royal nomenclature.
The usual form of Meroitic is in its “cursive”/demotic form. Meroitic hi-
eroglyphs can be written in only two ways: from the top downward in
vertical contexts or from right to left. No instances of left to right or
“mirror” writing occur in Meroitic, as is the case for hieroglyphs, nor
does boustrophedon writing, as sometimes happens in Greek. Despite
these important advances in the study of Meroitic epigraphy, only a lim-
ited numbers of words have been translated, and these include names for
kings and queens, some titled offices, cognatic deities, toponyms, and
some personal names from funerary inscriptions. A copy of the Meroitic
alphabet in hieroglyphs and cursive is provided in appendix IX.
MEROITIC WRITING. The history of Meroitic writing can be sketched only in general terms since much is still not known or understood. Nubian people during A-Group, C-Group, and Kerma (q.v.) times had been exposed to Egyptian hieroglyphic writing systems, but these three Nubian peoples/phases did not accept any variant forms of hieroglyphics to record their own history, king lists, inventories, religious beliefs, or funerary practices. During the New Kingdom (q.v.) colonial occupation, Nubians were even more directly exposed to hieroglyphic inscriptions in their own lands. Yet during the early centuries of the Third Intermediate period or Late period (q.v.), when Nubia returned to Nubian control, they still did not often write in this or other languages, despite the fact that they resumed monumental burials at Kuru (q.v.), but the names of these kings remain obscure until Alara and Kashta (qq.v.). Only when Nubians emerge fully on the scene as holders of state power along the Nubian and Egyptian Nile during the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) do they write their own history, but in the conventional grammar and vocabulary of Egyptian hieroglyphics.

At some point in the seventh century BCE, Egyptian hieroglyphics took a new, popular written form known as demotic. Demotic was a simplified and speed-written form of hieratic or hieroglyphic cursive. While hieratic retains apparent elements of hieroglyphics, demotic loses this clear morphological relationship despite the fact that it is still the ancient Egyptian language. Some scholars determine that this adaptation was during the 25th Dynasty, while others believe it took place in the 26th Dynasty. In either case, Nubians in the Napatan period were exposed to both forms of hieroglyphics, and both continued through the Greco-Roman period, thus providing a model for rendering Nubian languages into those forms when Meroitic finally emerged as its own form of writing. As much as it is unclear whether Nubians or Saites should be credited for the transition to demotic, it is also unclear who should be credited with the emergence of Meroitic, which also has hieroglyphic and demotic (cursive) forms. Several contexts for this can be considered during the third century BCE, when the first Meroitic inscriptions begin to appear. First, the linguistic and political dominance of Egypt was much withered by this time. Second, the sense of Nubian nationalism was maintained in both Napatan and Meroitic times while Egypt was itself under Greek or Roman control. Third, the huge intellectual influence of the great Alexandria library may also have played
that this ancient “think tank” endeavored to collect texts and samples of all contemporary writing. They may have encouraged Nubians to render their own tongue into a written form, and it is well known that the Ptolemies and Meroites collaborated in many ways. Some classical sources say that even Cleopatra VII (q.v.) spoke some “Ethiopian” language. The famed Rosetta Stone was written in hieroglyphics, demotic, and Greek, and the hope to find an equivalent in Meroitic has been tantalizingly frustrating. A very short text was found at Jebel Adda, and a longer bilingual text was found on a bark stand at Meroë that allowed F. Ll. Griffith (q.v.) to reach major conclusions about transliteration of Meroitic as it was presented in association with the then-known hieroglyphic signs. Meroitic decipherment (q.v.) is slowly advancing, but a substantial bilingual text would certainly accelerate this process, which can still proceed slowly by searching for cognates in such languages as demotic and Old Nubian.

**MEROITIC: NUMBERS.** The use of numbers in Meroitic inscriptions is featured in tribute lists that included such things as male and female captives and perhaps livestock and in dates that sometimes appear at the end of long stela texts. Apparently, numbers are not known on *hetep* (funerary offering) tablets or on funerary stelae. Meroitic numbers usually operated on a base-10 system that was parallel in function to the Egyptian hieroglyphic system, and during the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) and in the early Napatan (q.v.) period, Egyptian hieroglyphic numbers were used. Derek Welsby believes that Meroitic fractions were represented by a series of dots.

With the emergence of demotic in Egypt during the 25th or 26th Dynasty, the number system in Egypt and Nubia also shifted to the simplified demotic (enchorial) variety; that is, it continued to be base-10 but with a special form of left-sweeping line under the numbers when shifting to hundreds. Demotic numbers could be used in a common form for tallies or with an alternative marker when used in dates.

Since early Greek, Latin, and Semitic languages used letters with a determinative as numbers, it can be imagined that Meroitic may have done likewise. The state of Meroitic translation does not allow this to be proven, but some untranslated Meroitic numbers suggest this possibility. On the other hand, Meroitic numbers, as seen in Jebel Barkal inscriptions, have a morphology that shows strong affinities to Indian Kharosti
numerals known in the third and second centuries BCE. It was then that Meroitic was also in active evolution and development. The Kharosti system was the unusual base-4 system, which appears to have been incorporated in some Meroitic tally lists from Jebel Barkal (q.v.). Both Meroitic and Kharosti languages died in antiquity. While the names of the numbers in hieroglyphics and its successor Coptic language are known, it cannot presently be confirmed that Old Nubian or modern Nubian are cognatic relative to the vocative terms for Meroitic numbers.

MEROWE. See SANAM.

MERYMOSE. Merymose was the viceroy of Kush (q.v.) under his father, Pharaoh Amenhotep III (q.v.), sometime after 1349 BCE, when the former viceroy also called Amenhotep died or was replaced. Since this period of the 28th Dynasty in the New Kingdom (q.v.) was one of strong colonial rule, one concludes that Merymose was very effective in keeping Kushites (q.v.) under control and paying regular tribute. Rather little military activity in Nubia is known for this period. However, one hour-long engagement was recorded for Merymose at Ibhet, where he killed 312 men (chopped hand count) and captured another 150 men, 250 women, and 175 children, among a total of 740. The high number of men killed and the high number of women and children captured was typical for ancient patterns of slave raiding that did not need forced male labor but that was more interested in domestic servants and concubines for the royal families.

MIAM. See ANIBA.

MIDDLE KINGDOM. See MENTUHOTEP II.

MIDDLE KINGDOM FORTS. See BUHEN; DIFFINARTI; KUBBAN; KOR; KUMMA; MEINARTI; MIRGISSA; SEMNA; SERRA EAST; SHALFAK; URONARTI.

MIKET. This poorly known Nubian deity seems to have been celebrated mainly in the vicinity of the First Cataract. This deity is depicted at the Bait al-Wali temple of Ramses II (qq.v.), where Miket is embraced by this pharaoh.
MIRGISSA. Being located at a strategic site at the Second Cataract, Mirgissa served as a frontier post, trade center, and river control point during the Middle Kingdom. Always nervous about attacks from Kerma (q.v.), Mirgissa and, just downstream, Buhen (q.v.) fort were on alert in the 11th and 12th Dynasties (q.v.). Because of its continued occupation, Mirgissa has the dominant central fort but also a town site and cemetery. Although not as significant as a military center in the New Kingdom (q.v.), a small shrine to Hathor (q.v.) was built there at that time.

MIU. Miu is an ancient place-name that appears to be in the vicinity of the Fifth and Sixth Cataracts, or the Shendi region of modern Sudan.

MONOPHYSITE. The theological view of Monophysitism holds that Christ has wholly one divine rather than a parallel human nature. The humanity of Christ is excluded. This unitary view of Christ is that held by Egyptian Coptic Christians and their followers in Ethiopia and medieval Christian (q.v.) Nubia. Although this is not the place for a major treatise on theological history, it is worth noting that the ancient Egyptian view of the highest god Amun was that he was invisible or hidden and was simultaneously universal. This view of a singular god is maintained with Monophysitism. Likewise, the relationship envisaged in ancient Egypt between god and the apparently human pharaoh was that the pharaoh was virtually a deity who was born of the immaculate conception of Amun (q.v.) and his consort Mut. Since Monophysites believed that Christ was divine, he was a god in a manner similar to deities in their polytheistic past.

This view was in opposition to that of the early Alexandrian Christian rivals, the Arians (q.v.), who held that only God himself was divine and that Christ and the Holy Spirit were not. The effort to isolate the Arians in 325 CE, at the Council of Nicaea by Constantine I (q.v.), was welcomed by the Monophysites under their early patriarch Athanasius (q.v.) in Alexandria and by Monophysites in Syria and even in Constantinople. But despite his flexibility, the western Roman church was not inclined to be so accommodating of Monophysite views as eastern and western Christianity began their separate paths. In addition, the Roman church favored a unity of church and state that was opposed by the Monophysites.
However, the initial plurality of views about Christ in the early Christian church gave way to Trinitarian orthodoxy as the church and the imperial state of Christian Byzantium solidified. Beyond the theological differences, another dimension of this dispute rested on the political (and perhaps the linguistic and national) independence of Egypt. The marginalization of Alexandria was implicit in Christian Greeks ruling from Byzantium. Egyptian Monophysitism was a regional or national reaction to this perceived threat. The more dominant Trinitarian view was that God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit were all divine and that Christ thereby had “two natures” (i.e., Dyophysite), both divine and human. The issue of orthodoxy again came to a head in 451 CE, at the Council of Chalcedon near Constantinople, where it was determined that the Monophysite view was also heretical; that is, the declaration that Christ had both a divine and human nature was rejected by the Monophysites.

Operating on this renewed theology, the Byzantine church removed the Monophysite bishop from Alexandria and installed a Dyophysite, Bishop Proterus, as the patriarch of Alexandria. The Monophysites were hugely provoked by this heavy-handed approach of Byzantium, and when a religious mob murdered Patriarch Proterus, the seeds for this long-lasting division were deeply sown. A failed effort to resolve this division in 482 CE was initiated by Emperor Zeno, with his moderate proposal known as the Henoticon, which accepted some Monophysite views. The death of Emperor Anastasius in 518 CE was a great blow, as he had been a devout Monophysite and had advanced its interpretation with appointments of Monophysites in eastern Christendom, where the followers of Byzantium became known as “royalists” (melikiya [Melkite] in Arabic).

Without the leadership of Anastasius, fissures erupted between these Melkite believers and the Monophysite Copts as well. By 565 CE, Emperor Justinian (q.v.) had managed to maintain control in Byzantium and the eastern Mediterranean and was asserting himself in Egypt and North Africa, from the eastern Maghreb to Cyrenaica, which was recovered from the Vandals. He advanced still more to take over southern Spain and Italy, which was recovered from the Ostrogoths.

Egyptian Copts had not been diverted from their commitment to Monophysitism, and Justinian had to tread cautiously in this respect since he relied heavily on the huge grain supplies from the Nile
valley, just as Romans had in the past. Elsewhere, he sought to expel those patriarchs with Monophysite views, but Egypt was handled more delicately. In fact, Egypt became a refuge for Monophysites being pursued elsewhere in the region. In 578 CE, Jacob Baraeus, a Monophysite from Antioch, carried on propagating Monophysitism with the support of Theodora. His involvement generated another name for the dispute, which began to be termed as the movement of the “Jacobites.”

But when Arabs entered Egypt in 640 CE with their new prophetic religion, the Coptic Egyptians were much divided. They were weakened by the three centuries of theological division between Byzantium and Rome (over the accommodation of the Henoticon), between Byzantium and Alexandria (Dyophysite “Chalcedonians” and Monophysites), and in Alexandria (between Monophysites and Arians). Perhaps the still earlier heritage of Arianism already inclined them to see Christ and Muhammad in a similar light of humans with a divine mission.

Today, Coptic or Monophysite Christianity still prevails among a large minority in Egypt and Ethiopia. Christianity survived for about a millennium in ancient Nubia, but had to wage a diplomatic and military struggle against Islamic expansion. See also CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA: RELIGIOUS SCHISMS.

MOUSTERIAN. See PALEOLITHIC.

MUSAWWARAT ES-SUFRA. Musawwarat es-Sufra is the modern place-name of one of the main archaeological sites of the Meroitic period of ancient Sudan. It is situated at the western fringes of the Bubanta (q.v.), about 180 kilometers north of Khartoum and about 30 kilometers east of the Nile in the Wadi es-Sufra. Fourteen ruin complexes are scattered here in a circular-shaped valley about 3.5 kilometers in diameter (Hintze 1982).

The ancient place-name of Musawwarat was Aborepe (Hintze 1962b:20). It must have played a significant role in the religious and political life of the Meroitic kingdom. Most of its ruins are remains of temples. However, secular buildings, such as the so-called Small Enclosure, and other remains of the Meroitic period exist as well, including artificial water basins (hafir), stone quarries, and settlement
areas. The cemeteries belong probably to later periods, since the only cemetery excavated is a post-Meroitic Noba one.

According to Hintze and Hintze (1970:50–63), building activity started in Musawwarat es-Sufra probably as early as in the Napatan (q.v.) period. However, remains of these early buildings no longer exist. The predominant part of the preserved ruins was erected during the early and middle Meroitic periods—the prime of Musawwarat es-Sufra. The only sovereign known to have built in Musawwarat is King Arnekhamani (q.v.; ca. 235–218 BCE). During the late Meroitic period, building activity was confined to repairs and preservation work. However, at least one of the buildings was reused in the Christian (q.v.) period.

The predominant ruin complex of Musawwarat es-Sufra, the so-called Great Enclosure, is situated at the western side of the valley. This building complex, which covers an area of more than 42,800 square meters, belongs to the greatest examples of Meroitic architecture. Its main components—three temples (two of which are built on several-meter-high terraces), side chapels, and auxiliary rooms—are interconnected by elevated corridors, having ramps leading down to a complex of twenty-four courtyards. Many features, like the general architectural design of the buildings, the ramps, and the courtyards, are known from Egyptian and Ptolemaic (q.v.) architecture. Other elements—like protomes of human- and animal-headed gods ("Dreiköpfe") decorating the temple doorways, columns designed partially as sculptures and supported by animal-shaped column bases, as well as a parapet wall terminated by an elephant (q.v.) sculpture—lack any parallel throughout the Nile valley. The harmonic composition of all these elements makes the Great Enclosure a unique, marvelous example of genuine Meroitic architecture.

The Great Enclosure’s main buildings were plastered and painted. Only a few reliefs are preserved on columns in front of the central temple. They show the king in contact with gods—subjects known from ancient Egyptian temple relief iconography. However, the walls of the Great Enclosure are covered with thousands of graffiti that originate from the Meroitic, post-Meroitic, Christian, and Islamic periods. Ancient and modern visitors scratched these graffiti there. The corpus includes about 150 ancient inscriptions, for the most part in Meroitic, as well as inscriptions in Old Nubian, Latin, Greek, and demotic languages.
The pictorial graffiti, many of which are of outstanding artistic quality, display a large variety of subjects, including wild and domestic animals, gods, priests, horsemen, representations of hunting and fighting, architectural elements, boats, and Christian and Arabic symbolism (Hintze 1979; Wolf 1994).

To the east of the valley is situated the so-called Lion Temple dedicated to the Meroitic god Apedemek (q.v.; Hintze et al. 1971, 1993). It was built during the reign of Arnekhamani. As a typical genuine Meroitic temple, it consists of only one room. Since its reerection in 1969–1971, it is among the best preserved monuments of the Meroitic period. Its exterior relief decoration, depicting King Arnekhamani and Prince Arka in front of Apedemek and other genuine Meroitic and Egyptian gods, is of extraordinary artistic quality. The iconography of these reliefs represents war and kingship power on the southern side of the temple. On the northern side, peace and creation are predominant. This typical Meroitic dualism lacks any parallel in ancient Egyptian temple decoration (Wenig 1989). The interior reliefs represent King Arnekhamani in front of Amun (q.v.) and Apedemek during stations of the cult procession. The early Ptolemaic inscriptions (names and hymns of the represented gods) are the last known examples of complete hieroglyphic relief inscriptions in Meroitic architecture (Hintze 1962).

Linant de Bellefonds (Shinnie 1958:114–21, pls. xviii–xxiv) and Frédéric Cailliaud (q.v.; 1826:140–58, 1823:pls. xxii–xxxvi) were the first European travelers to visit Musawwarat es-Sufra (1822). In 1844, the Königlich Preussische Expedition, led by Richard Lepsius (q.v.), made the first thorough scientific documentation of the site (LD I, 139–42; V, 71–75; LDT V, 343–45). Archaeological fieldwork started in 1958 with the Butana Expedition of the Institute for Egyptology of Humboldt University of Berlin, led by Hintze. Until 1971, several seasons of archaeological fieldwork were dedicated to the investigation of various sites in the valley of Musawwarat. Among others, these excavations produced a documentation of the Great Enclosure’s architecture based on the archaeological record. In addition, a chronological framework was established by subdividing the Great Enclosure’s building history into eight periods, during which the central temple and other buildings were several times dismantled and reerected with a slight change in orientation. The sixth building period was dated into the reign of King Arnekhamani.
Fieldwork was revived in 1993 by the Seminar for Sudan Archaeology and Egyptology of Humboldt University, led by Wenig. These excavations focus on the study of the function and the development of various parts of the Great Enclosure. Other components of the fieldwork include epigraphic documentation of the graffiti (Wolf 1994; Wolf, Duwe, and Gründer 1994); interdisciplinary research, such as geodetic, photogrammetric, paleoecological, and geophysical surveys; and conservation and reconstruction work, sponsored by the Sudanarchäologische Gesellschaft zu Berlin.

Recent excavations unearthed the largest known temple garden of ancient Sudan (Wenig and Wolf 1996, 1998a, 1998b; Wolf 1997). It is situated to the east of the Great Enclosure’s central temple. An avenue of two rows of up to 150-centimeter-deep plantation pits forms the north–south axis of the garden. In the south and in the garden’s eastward extension, its layout changes into rectangular patterns of small and medium-size pits. Because of the lack of organic remains, it was not yet possible to define the species of plants. However, according to the variety of pit types having different sizes and shapes, the elaborate multilayer soil fillings, and the remains of different types of planting vessels, it might be suggested that different species of plants were planted that were raised in nurseries near the Nile. Several observations support the view that the garden was rearranged and prepared on the occasion of probably intermittently celebrated festivals in the Great Enclosure but that it was left without attention between these festivals. The garden developed through its history, and its layout changed in connection with the building periods of the Great Enclosure. The garden’s irrigation system consists of about thirty-centimeter-wide trenches dug about twenty centimeters into the ground. The trenches are supported by brickwork in areas where they crossed pathways. Water basins of up to three and a half meters by at least five meters probably were used as intermediate water storage. They were laid out in red bricks and plastered with a thick water-resistant rendering.

Another important discovery was the evidence of a ceramic workshop housed in the northernmost part of the Great Enclosure (Edwards 1998; Wolf 1997). There, an archaeological test trench revealed a deposit of ash up to 120 centimeters thick, sandstone debris, and about 24,000 ceramic sherds. Among them were about 3,000
sherds of fine wares with painted and stamped decoration. The fine wares, partially of outstanding artistic and technical quality, can be dated by style into the first century CE. Kiln remains have not yet been identified with certainty. However, many shards of kiln wasters, fragments of unfired vessels, and potter’s tools (e.g., decoration stamps and a potter’s wheel) have been found. This makes it clear that the deposit belonged to a ceramics workshop that specialized in the production of high-quality temple pottery.

Since, in contrast to Lower Nubia, even large sites of the Meroitic south revealed only relatively few sherds of the Meroitic fine wares, the origin of the pottery of the Classical Meroitic period, which is part of the most outstanding artistic heritage of northeastern Africa, was under discussion for a long time. The discovery of the pottery deposit probably is the largest corpus of fine wares ever excavated in a nonfuneral complex of the Meroitic south. This proves the assumption that fine wares were produced in the center of the Meroitic Empire (Wenig 1978:94) and that it was not a mere import from Lower Nubia (as suggested by Adams 1973:232, 1986:13–14; Török 1988:203).

Since the discovery of Musawwarat in 1822, several ideas have been issued in order to interpret the Great Enclosure. It was explained as a palace of the Meroitic queen (Candace), as a priests’ seminar, as a military post and cadet school, as a sanatorium, and even as a training camp for elephants. However, most of these ideas lack any scientific foundation. At the end of the 1960s excavations, Hintze adopted the interpretation that Musawwarat was a place of pilgrimage, with the Great Enclosure as its religious center (Hintze and Hintze 1970:50). This conclusion was drawn from several facts. Stone was used as building material for the monuments, although stone generally was used for sacral and funeral monuments only. Many of the Meroitic graffiti are “sign-ins” for contemporary visitors. The immense artificial water basins (hafirs) suggest that large groups of people stayed in Musawwarat es-Sufra during specific periods. On the other hand, no urban structures and no Meroitic cemeteries have been found yet.

Discussion on the interpretation of the Great Enclosure has recently been revived. It focuses now mainly on the question whether the Great Enclosure might be explained as a palacelike secular building complex (Török 1992:121–24, 1997:437; Welsby 1996:145). However, in
addition to the arguments brought forward by Hintze, other aspects, like the architectural iconography of the main buildings (Wenig 1999; cf. Wenig 1992:139–40) or the overall arrangement of the building structures inside the Great Enclosure, support an interpretation as a sacral temple complex. In addition, the study of the Meroitic graffiti supports the interpretation of the Great Enclosure as a center of Apedemek worship. Almost all the mostly fragmentary preserved invocations—proscynemata addressed to specific persons or gods—were addressed to Apedemek, the only god who received such invocations in the Great Enclosure, making it the site with the most evidence of this god's name (Wolf 1999).

NOTES

1. For further reports of European travelers and early expeditions to Musawwarat, see B. Porter and R. Moss, Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings, VII, in Nubia, the Deserts, and Outside Egypt (Oxford, 1951).


MUSIC. The history of ancient Nubian music has hardly been written, but some pieces can be put together from known instruments and texts. Among the instruments are sistrum for religious functions, and such are still in use among Axumite (q.v.) Christians today. Clappers and bells were also known and may have played a similar or also public role. Wooden, ivory, and reed flutes are known from burials at many different periods. Likewise, long bronze horns were popular at least from the New Kingdom on. A trumpet was discovered at Musawwarat es-Sufra (q.v.). Large war drums and small dancing drums are known. At Temple T at Kawa and at the Music Temple at Philae, one may find graphic images of stringed instruments, such as lyres, multistringed harps, and early forms of the modern Nubian rababa or the Egyptian lute, or nefer.
NABTA PLAYA. This site in the Western Desert of Upper Egypt or Lower Nubia (q.v.) provides very early evidence of raising cattle (*Bos* sp.) at about 8000–7500 BCE by using the grassland region and perhaps by access to wells. By 7000 BCE, sheep and goats likely had been added to their domesticates. Large numbers of grinding stones also reveal processing techniques for wild (?) sorghum and other grains in their diet. The people of Nabta Playa may also have been responsible for petroglyphic inscriptions of their cattle. The site was semisedentary, judging from the remains of a series of small houses, pottery, and storage pits. This evidence suggests that these people had entered the Neolithic transition before being intensified by further Saharan desiccation. This archaeological assemblage stretched broadly into the Sahara as well as south of the Kharga Oasis (q.v.) along the ancient Darb al Arba‘in (q.v.), through the Selima Oasis (q.v.). Some evidence points to the site of Nabta Playa as having been one of the corridors that livestock and Neolithic cultigens entered into Upper Nubia (q.v.) to the later sites at Kadada, Kadero, Kadruka, and Shaheinab (qq.v.).

NAPATA. The term “Napata” can have several referents. Generally, it refers to the specific geographic location downstream of the Fourth Cataract at the huge plateau of Jebel Barkal (q.v.), next to the modern Sudanese town of Kareima. In the New Kingdom (q.v.), Napata was often termed “Karoi” (q.v.). Thus, “Napata” can refer to this general modern area or to the extremely important religious and political capital of ancient times at the same location. With respect to antiquity, the general reference to Napata should also include the ancient residential and commercial town of Sanam (q.v.), across the Nile at the modern site of the town of Merowe (not to be confused with the ancient capital at Meroë [q.v.]). The general site of Napata probably was prominent even in prehistoric times and at all periods of Nubian history. The major monumental and temple constructions date back to the New Kingdom occupation of Nubia and especially to the period when Nubians were creating and ruling their own state and during the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), when they ruled Egypt. Even after Nubians were forced back out of Egypt in the late 660s BCE, their religious and political
capital was retained. In this case, the term “Napatan” can refer to the subsequent Nubian rule down to about 270 BCE, when the political capital was shifted to Meroë, so in this case “Napata” refers to a historical period as well as a place. Finally, the area of Napata was also the site of royal burials, major pyramids, and cemeteries of some of the most notable kings. The cemeteries of Kurru, Nuri (q.v.), and Jebel Barkal may be included even at times before and after the 25th Dynasty. The religious site of Napata is composed of a number of major features that are arrayed around the eastern, southern, and western sides of the huge bluff or plateau of Jebel Barkal. These include the huge temple for the Amun cult (q.v.), royal palaces and temples, and a pyramid burial field in sectors 1000 and 2000. The site was actively destroyed by fire in the 26th Dynasty by Psamtik II (q.v.; 595–589 BCE) and perhaps again in early Roman times.

Various European visitors noted Napata in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but active scientifically based archaeological investigation versus monument looting was not really commenced until the 1918–1919 fieldwork of George Reisner (q.v.). Taking advantage of the British military conquest and occupation of Sudan, he was able to excavate and explore areas of Nubia that were formerly unknown to the archaeology of the Nubian Nile. Like much of Nubian chronological nomenclature (A-, C-, and X-Group), it is Reisner’s reference numbers that persist in identifying the main structures at the site of Napata. These include the huge Amun temple numbered B[Barkal]0500, which has subdivisions of 0501 for the first forecourt, 502 for the second forecourt, and 551 for the outer kiosk and avenue of sphinxes (attributed to Natakamani [q.v.]). Much of the structure of B0500 was either built, expanded, or substantially reconstructed during the reign of Taharka (q.v.), but an inner kiosk was added by his successor, Tanutamun (q.v.), and probably for some Meroitic kings. To the southwestern side of this temple was a well or Nilometer.

Other smaller temple structures are the partially rock-cut temples B0200 and B0300 of Taharka, which may also have been started in the New Kingdom (q.v.). Other temples are located at B0600, B0700, B0800 (reused in Meroitic times), B0900, B1000, and B1100 (now believed to have been an early temple for this site). As with temple B0500, subsections and rooms of these buildings descend from these base numbers.
Given the religious importance of the site, the Nubian kings built large, impressive palaces for annual and coronation rituals. Among these, the best known to date is B1200, which was used, destroyed, rebuilt, and reused for many centuries during the Napatan period. Located outside and to the southwest of the Amun temple B0500 and temple B0800, the palace had an orientation similar to that of Ramses III (q.v.) at Medinat Habu. Such a temple–palace may well have been a model for its orientation, and an earlier palace from the New Kingdom at the same location is not inconceivable. The first clear instance of Nubian use of the palace site was that of Kashta (q.v.; 760–747 BCE). This palace was also used by Piankhy (q.v.; 747–716 BCE), Anlamani (q.v.; 623–593 BCE), Aspelta (q.v.; 593–568 BCE), Irikeamanote (431–405 BCE), Harsiyyotef (q.v.; 404–369 BCE), and even to Amanislo (qq.v.; 260–250 BCE), who was buried at Bejrawiya and not in the Napatan cemeteries like the others noted here. Some textual evidence points to Aspelta’s perhaps perishing in the palace during the military raid of Psamtik II, and thus the site may have been cleared and rebuilt thereafter. On the other hand, if the regnal dates for these rivals on the Nile are correct, it can only mean that Psamtik II destroyed the palace and statues of Aspelta, who must have escaped his personal destruction. The much reused palace site is oriented in such a way that suggests that coronation rituals celebrated the Amun spirit that was believed to reside in the mountain. Its complexes include complex corridors, rooms for storage and sleeping, and an extensive kitchen. Few items have been found intact, but immense amounts of fragmented pottery, faience, column drums and capitals, and broken statuary suggest both its greatness and the great violence that took place at one stage of its life.

No doubt the main deity worshiped at Napata was the ram form of the god Amun, but numerous other Egypto-Nubian gods and goddesses were also invoked at this site. These include Atum, Hathor, Isis, Maat, Mut, a Nubian form of Neith, Nekhbet, Nun, Onuris, Osiris, Sekhmet, Tefnut, and Wadjet. See also KUSH.

NAQA, BENAGGI, BEN NAQA, WAD BEN NAQA. The Naqa region in the Butana (q.v.) is related intimately to Meroitic (q.v.) times. When John Garstang and Richard Lepsius (qq.v.) initially researched Meroitic civilization, only some of the ruins of the main buildings of
Wad Ben Naqa (q.v.) were recognized. Excavations in recent years have revealed a far more complex pattern of residential and agricultural occupation: an extensive multiroomed brick palace complex. Further east at Naqa is the religious superstructure of the Apedemek (q.v.), or Lion Temple, of Natakamani (q.v.), an Amun temple, and a famed syncretic kiosk of sandstone. In the same region is the related site of Musawwarat es Sufra (q.v.). Thus, this important region in southern Nubia still has much to reveal in terms of regional trade during its occupation.

**NAQADA, NAGADA, NAKADA (I, II, III).** The Naqada periods are also known as the Amratian period/Naqada I (4000–3500 BCE), the Gerzean period/Naqada II (3500–3300 BCE), and the Late Predynastic/Naqada III (3300–3050 BCE). All these are Predynastic Egyptian sites that existed toward the close of the prehistoric times of Nubia, so they were contemporary with the Nubian A-Group (q.v.). Essentially, one may consider that Nubians and Egyptians were in something of an unconscious race toward state power. The Naqadan people finally emerged at Hierakonpolis as a major kingdom of Upper Egypt under Narmer, who then proceeded to conquer Lower Egypt as well and unify the Egyptian Nile for the first time in history. One may also wonder about the extent of Nubia at this time since the presence of people of a Nubian race (q.v.) during Predynastic times certainly reached Upper Egypt. Meanwhile, A-Group Nubians were coalescing around Qustul. By the Old Kingdom (q.v.), Pharaohs Djer and Senefru (qq.v.) emerged from Egypt and began a long history of attacks against Nubian rivals, such as those at Qustul. Before this major transformation in Nile valley power relations, the Naqadans and Nubians were remarkably similar in technology, cultural and political complexity, and funerary practices.

Naqadans were characterized by large mud-brick and reed settlements, black-topped pottery, and other painted vessels common to graves. Weaving of textiles and mats developed artistically. They had settled agriculture based on wheat and barely as well as domestic animals, including sheep, goats, cattle, pigs, and dogs. Copper tools also came into existence during this period. Burials were typically flexed in oval pits, sometimes with a stepped burial chamber having covering stones. Stone cosmetic palettes and grinding stones are common in Naqada burials.
NARMER. Conventional Egyptian chronology places King Narmer (Menes) as the first to achieve the political unification of Egypt in about 3100 BCE of the Archaic or Early Dynastic period. His Narmer palette records that he is the first to wear the crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt. He may have ventured south of Aswan into Lower Nubia (qq.v.) for his empire building. Alternatively, Nubian populations may have extended as far north as Edfu at that time, so Narmer may have been conquering Nubia by controlling lands now considered eternally Egyptian.

NASTASEN (335–315 BCE). This Napatan king ruled in the late fourth century BCE, that is, during the arrival of Alexander the Great (q.v.) to Egypt and during the early construction of Ptolemaic rule. His stela at Jebel Barkal (q.v.) is the last clearly dateable historical document (ca. 336 BCE) during the Napatan kingdom. His administration was much modeled after that of his predecessors Harsiyotef (q.v.) and Irike-Amanote (q.v.) in terms of common features in iconography, military concerns, and political objectives of restoring Kushite control of Egypt, which had fallen under foreign rule and the resistance led by Khababash (q.v.), which had been broken. Nastasen was known to have fought the Meti (Medjay? [q.v.]) and the chiefs from the lands of Mekhentequent, Rebarut, and Mashat. According to Reisner (q.v.), Nastasen was the last king to be buried in the north at Nuri (q.v.), in pyramid 15. The several successive kings were buried at Jebel Barkal pyramids, and are all poorly known. At the end of this sequence, probably during the reign of Arkamani (q.v.), the capital was moved from Napata to Meroë (q.v.), so his reign is commonly referred to as the end of the Napatan era.

NATAKAMANI (12 BCE–12 CE). This Meroitic king ruled from the Butana (q.v.) as a contemporary of Christ. Natakamani ruled jointly with Queen Amanitore (q.v.), and they were known for extensive restoration projects. These included restoration of the Napatan (q.v.) temples and the construction of his impressive lion-gated palace near to the Great Amun temple (B0500) at Jebel Barkal (q.v.). He also built the famed Lion temple at Naqa (q.v.). This temple shows King Natakamani before the lion-headed god Apedemak (q.v.) and the gods Horus and Amun (q.v.). This iconography illustrates the replacement of Egyptian royal costumes with Meroitic styles.
Similarly, not a great deal is known about his son, Prince Arikankharer (“Born of the Living Horus”), except for an inscribed plaque showing him slaying enemies with the assistance of a dog who is shown eating some victims. Prince Arikankharer was shown with a royal cartouche, but it is likely that he did not actually come to power. His father, King Natakamani, was buried in Bejrawiya north pyramid 22.

NECHO, NEKAU I. The Assyrian king Ashurbanipal (q.v.) installed this puppet king in the seventh century BCE to assert his power against the Saite kings very shortly after the expulsions of the Nubian dynasty of Egypt. Psamtik I (q.v.) immediately followed his very short reign.

NECHO, NEKAU II (610–595 BCE, Wahemibre). Necho II was the son of Psamtik I (q.v.). He became the pharaoh of Egypt during the fall of Assyria to the forces of Babylon and the Medes and the rise of Nebuchadrezzar II, with whom he contested and lost Judaea. Despite these important dilemmas, Necho II brought in Greek sailors to modernize the Egyptian navy and must be given credited for making the first canal from the Pelusaic (eastern branch) of the Nile to join it with the Red Sea, bringing strategic and commercial advantage to the region. The later Persian king Darius I completed and cleaned the canal in 518 BCE, so that he could sail directly from Egypt to Persia.

Necho II’s most remarkable achievement is the funding for the first documented circumnavigation of Africa (Libya) in a famed three-year voyage conducted by Phoenician sailors who began from Etzion-Gaber in the Gulf of Aqaba. Then they went down the east coast to plant a crop that would feed them for the next leg of their voyage and so on until they returned through the Straits of Gibraltar (the “pillars of Hercules”) and back to the Egyptian delta.

NECTANEBO II, NAKHYENEBES, NAKHTNEBEF, SETEPENINHUR (360–343 BCE). Nectanebo II was the very last Egyptian king of Egypt. The 30th Dynasty concluded with his departure from power. An Egyptian did not rule Egypt again for 2,300 years. His defeat by the Persian Artaxerxes III in 343 BCE set the stage for the later arrival of the “liberator” Alexander the Great (q.v.). Interestingly,
Nectanebo II fled south from the invading Persians to Nubia for his refuge, but his trail then disappears. His stone sarcophagus was reused, and in modern times it was taken by the British and installed in the British Museum. An effort to mythically link Nectanebo II to Alexander was made, but this is simply not possible.

NEHESI, NEHESIU. See TA-NEHESI.

NEHESY, KING. Nehesy is a poorly known king of the delta during the late 13th or early 14th Dynasty of the very unstable Second Intermediate period, which was contemporary with ancient Kerma (q.v.). His name hints that he may have been from Ta-Nehesi (q.v.), that is, a Nubian. More circumstantial evidence is that his burial inscriptions are known from doorjambs in the style of the Kerma funerary chapels. Buried with him were several girls, as was the practice of “classical” Kerma kings. The limited chance to gain power for a Nubian would have been possible only during these turbulent and insecure times, and at that his reign in the eastern delta was short lived. This conjecture does presage the documented relations that did later exist in the 17th Dynasty between the later kings of the Hyksos (q.v.) and Kerma who were seeking to overtake the Egyptian kings residing in isolated Thebes.

NEOLITHIC. See SHAHEINAB.

NERO, EMPEROR (54–68 CE). Nero sent an exploratory expedition up the Nile to Meroë (q.v.) and beyond into the Ethiopian highlands, viewing various flora and fauna. For example, rhinoceros, elephants (q.v.), monkeys, green grass, and a description of the Sudd were recorded. The purpose of the expedition is not clear, but historians believe Nero was intending to organize a military conquest of Nubia. His assassination aborted whatever plans he may have had, and Nubia was spared Roman domination. Pliny (q.v.) and Seneca have recorded the details of the expedition undertaken under the rule of Nero, a contemporary of Saint Mark (q.v.). Nero’s brutal oppression of Christians and Jews (qq.v.) was notorious, including the martyrdom of Saint Peter and Saint Paul in the context of finding someone to blame for the burning of Rome in 64 CE.
NESTORIAN. See ARIANISM.

NEW KINGDOM. This term refers to the period of ancient Egyptian history constituted by the 18th through the 20th Dynasty, covering the years (1570–1070 BCE) when the New Kingdom was completely consolidated by Ahmose I (q.v.) in the 18th Dynasty until its collapse in the 20th Dynasty under Ramses XI. This ushered in the Third Intermediate period or Late period (q.v.), led by the dispute between Herihor and Piankhy (qq.v.), that brought on the so-called Nubian “Dark Ages.” The New Kingdom was a period of colonial or temple manorial occupation of Nubia from Aswan to the Fourth Cataract or above. With access to Nubian trade and natural resources—especially gold, ivory (q.v.), woods, hides, and slaves—this was an Egyptian “Golden Age.” However, in the eternal relations along the Nile, the strength of one of these two powers was at the expense of the other. Because the New Kingdom was so long lasting, it is difficult to characterize briefly all its complexities. To keep the Nubian population under control, the record is very full of recurrent military attacks and punitive raids. Yet it is also a time of deep Nubian acculturation to Egyptian values, art, language, and religion. Many New Kingdom pharaohs, such as Hatshepsut, Tuthmosis III, Amenhotep III, Akhenaton, Tutankhamen, Ramses II (qq.v.), and many others, left important monuments in Nubia or at least written records of their ties to Nubian resources. In the eighth century BCE (if not before), Nubians recovered from this long Egyptian occupation, and they managed to reestablish a Nubian state at Napata (q.v.) that reemerged from the ancient shadows of the Nubian kingdom of Kerma (q.v.). Although little is known about the earliest rulers, recognized leaders appear in the cases of Alara and Kashta (qq.v.), and by the time of King Piankhy (q.v.), Nubians are able to occupy all Egypt. However, their inscriptions are in hieroglyphics, and their art and iconography follow Egyptian patterns. Thus, it is clear that the effects of Egypt were persistent and much accepted by these new rulers.

NILE. The Nile River proper is 6,680 kilometers in length and ranges from the merger of the White and Blue Niles at modern Khartoum to the delta along the southern shore of the Mediterranean. It is the world’s longest river, with a prodigious history, bringing ancient Nubia and Egypt to life in a symbolic and real way and providing irrigation...
(q.v.) and transport. The river flows northward, so that Lower Nubia (q.v.) is to the north of Upper Nubia (q.v.). Six cataracts punctuate the Nubian Nile. These make up a natural series of demarcations in the river that have long proven to be natural points for military defense, break of bulk, trade and transport hubs, and political boundaries. The First Cataract, coming upstream from Egypt, is at Aswan (q.v.), which marks the northernmost extent of Nubia proper. The region between Aswan and the Second Cataract is termed Lower Nubia or the Dodekaschoenos (q.v.) in Greek and Roman times. The Second Cataract often has been a frontier post for Egypt in both ancient and modern times. From the Second to the Third Cataract, the Nile is termed the Butn al-Hajr (q.v.), or the “Belly of Stones,” since the riverbed is rocky, especially at the low-water season. The section of the river between the Third and Fourth Cataracts is sometimes termed the Letti basin. The stretch between the Fourth and Fifth cataracts is known as the Manasir or Abu Hamad reach, and these border the Bayuda (q.v.) desert to the south. The Fifth to Sixth cataracts are in the heartland of Meroë (q.v.), and these separate the western Bayuda desert from the eastern Butana (q.v.) steppe lands and their northern boundary of the seasonal Atbara River (q.v.), which enters the Nile in this region. Above the Sixth Cataract, or the Sabaluka rapids, is the confluence of the White and Blue Niles. Excavations of the White Nile are very limited with respect to ancient culture, but along the Blue Nile, certainly Meroitic and Christian occupation is well attested at a number of sites.

NILO-HAMITIC. See NILOTIC.

NILO-SAHARAN LANGUAGES. In the absence of written records, historical linguistics provides a means by which to structure and relate ancient languages. Historical linguistics, which is based on the concept of language divergence, employs methods such as the lexical, semantic, syntactic, and phonological comparison of living languages to reconstruct protolanguages (mother languages). In this way, linguists are able to construct phylogenetic (or family) trees that illustrate the relationship between ancient and modern languages. The well-known historical linguist Joseph Greenberg was the first to definitively construct a genetic classification of the languages of Africa. One of the many families delineated in Greenberg’s (1966) construction of the languages of Africa was Nilo-Saharan. Geographically, Nilo-Saharan
includes parts of the central Sahara and the Lake Victoria region (including parts of Kenya, Uganda, and Zaire) and Lower Nubia. The Nilo-Saharan family includes the subgroups of Songhai, Saharan, Maban, Fur, Koman, and Chari-Nile languages. This latter subgroup has further subdivisions of Sudanic (q.v.) languages.

Nilo-Saharan languages in northeastern Africa exist in contrast to the widespread Afro-Asiatic family, to which ancient Egyptian and Ge’ez (Ethiopic) belong. Although modern Nubian, Dinka, and other “indigenous” languages of the Sudan are classified as Nilo-Saharan, attempts to place Meroitic (q.v.) into the Nile-Saharan family using historical linguistics have not proven fruitful except for some limited success with Sudanic cognates. [by k. rhodes]

NILOTIC. All Nilotes belong to the eastern group of Sudanic (q.v.) language speakers. Most are cattle, sheep, and goat pastoralists by tradition. They arrived from southeastern Sudan sometime before 1000 CE, but earlier regional migration and back migration may have occurred. The extent of greater Nilotic territory also includes others, such as the Luo, Masai, Karamajong, Jie, and Turkana. At the north-eastern peripheries of their territory, they came into contact with Cushitic or Hamitic influences through Ethiopia and are sometimes called Nilo-Hamitic people.

In Sudan, after reaching superior grazing lands to the east and west of the Bahr al-Jebel, Nilotic people dispersed in all directions. The best-known Sudanese Nilotes are the Dinka and Nuer. Elsewhere, they spread over a group of earlier inhabitants, the pre-Nilotes, and transferred their linguistic system to them. The Azande people blocked their spread to the southwest. Cattle-herding Arabs and pre-Nilotic Shilluk blocked their northern expansion. See also CATTLE-HERDING ARABS.

NIMLOT. See PIANKHY.

19th DYNASTY. See MERNEPTAH; RAMSES I AND II; SETI I AND II.

NITOCRIS, GOD’S WIFE OF AMUN. This God’s Wife of Amun or Divine Adoratrice of Amun was the daughter of 26th Dynasty Psamtik I (664–610 BCE), who came to rule as a puppet king or satrap
for the Assyrians after they drove out Taharka and Tanutamun of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). Nitocris was “adopted” by God’s Wife of Amun Amenirdis II (q.v.) to give legitimacy to the 26th Dynasty rulers. Amenirdis II was herself a “daughter” of Pharaoh Shabataka and God’s Wife of Amun Shepenwepet II (q.q.v.), both of whom were Nubians. Nitocris held her very influential position for six decades, and she achieved such prominence that she was entitled to a huge bureaucracy and impressive titles and could have her name inscribed in a royal cartouche. At the northern enclosure of Karnak are chapel gates in the wall that are inscribed to Nitocris.

Indeed, Nitocris was the second to the last to hold the God’s Wife of Amun title, as this New Kingdom practice was terminated under Persian times. Apparently, in the scramble for legitimacy, the archaizing tendencies of the 25th and 26th Dynasties were, an effort was made to find their own roots in the past.

It seems that Nitocris was named for Queen Nitocris, who supposedly closed out the Old Kingdom’s (q.v.) 6th Dynasty in a dramatic fashion. Although scholarly debate exists about the lack of inscriptive evidence for Queen Nitocris and some alleged that she was mythical, her story was taken as inspirational. Queen Nitocris reputedly was the first queen to rule over Egypt, according to Strabo and Herodotus (q.q.v.). After the death of Pepi I (q.v.), the chaotic First Intermediate period began, and as the wife and sister of the assassinated king Metsouphis II, Queen Nitocris sought revenge and plotted the murder of her husband’s assassins. Accomplishing this deed, she ruled for two years, one month, and one day before she committed suicide. The virtues of justifiable revenge, devotion to her husband, and acting as a model of women’s rule must have been powerful factors for the God’s Wife of Amun Nitocris to adopt the same name. In the 25th and 26th Dynasties, such conservative themes often were celebrated since neither dynasty was Egyptian, and both sought legitimacy to be on the Egyptian throne.

NOBA. The reference to the Noba is one of the more ambiguous ethnic concepts along the ancient Nile. It is a reference used by outsiders for people of the Nubian Nile and farther south and especially to the western side of the Nile. The first complexity is that the Nubians of the cataracts are certainly a heterogeneous population because of the great length of their history and the strategic role as the corridor to
Africa. Moreover, the long presence of stratified and slave-based economies have long given further expansion to racial admixture. Thus, people commonly identified as Nubian “slaves” in New Kingdom iconography may not be the heterogeneous “cataract (or riverine) Nubians” but rather slave prisoners from regions still farther south, that is, Noba people as are still known in the Nuba Mountain regions of southern Kordofan. This ambiguity only raises more problems of ethnic identity since it is virtually certain that these Noba or Nuba Mountain people originally had a territorial range that far exceeded that of the present. Their current range represents an enclave refugee population resulting from centuries, if not millennia, of predatory slave raiding by peoples of Lower Nubia (q.v.) and Egypt.

Classical references try to differentiate the Noba from the Nobatae, but it is not sufficiently clear that these are different people at all or in fact that they may just be further ambiguous references to people south of Egypt without clarifying precisely who is who. Adams does use the term “Nobatae” for those people west of Butn al-Hajr (q.v.), while the term for the Noba is used in the region of the Bayuda (q.v.), west of Meroë (q.v.), and west of the White Nile (q.v.). This implies that this might have been the northern range of the people of the Nuba Mountains, who entered this northerly domain as a result of the collapse of the Meroitic state. Both the Greek geographer Eratosthenes (q.v.) and the Roman geographer Claudius Ptolemaeus (q.v.) refer to the Noba in the Greco-Roman period.

What is generally agreed is that by post-Meroitic (X-Group [q.v.]) times, these Noba or Nobatae people are the so-called Ballana (q.v.) people of Lower Nubia or the Tanqasi (q.v.) people of Upper Nubia, and they certainly were beyond the authority of Meroë, especially in its declining period. As further verification of this, the famed report of King Ezana of Axum (q.v.) claims that he and his army traveled down the Atbara River (q.v.) to the meeting of the Nile and made war on the Noba, who by that time apparently had even crossed into the eastern Butana grasslands, as suggested by African-style housing constructed at Meroë.

**Nobatae, Nobadæ. See Noba.**

**Nobatia.** It is useful to use this variant spelling of the Nobatae to distinguish these Pre-Christian Nobatae (q.v.) people from their apparent
descendants in the Christian kingdom of Nobatia. The kingdom of Nobatia emerged in Lower Nubia in the late 200s CE. The origins of the Nobatae are unclear, but they seem to have received assistance from the Roman rulers of Egypt in conflict with the Blemmyes (q.v.). It is possible that the Nobatae were of the X-Group or Ballana Culture (q.v.), but some scholars identify the latter as the Blemmyes. To confuse the situation further, at times the Nobatae and Blemmyes joined together to fight the Romans based in Egypt. The rulers of Nobatia converted to Monophysite (q.v.) Christianity through the works of missionary Julian (q.v.) around 543 CE. The kingdom eventually merged with Makurra (q.v.) to form a unified kingdom at Dongola (q.v.) in about 650–700 CE.

Despite the isolation from the Egyptian Orthodox Church, an aggressive attempt that can be dated to 452 CE was made to spread the Christian message from Egypt to Sudan. A political and religious alliance was established by 524 CE between Byzantium in Egypt and the Axumites (q.v.) in Ethiopia. At some point in the sixth century, King Silko (q.v.) proclaimed himself king of the Nobatae after defeating the Blemmyes, who had been his rivals in Lower Nubia. This was done in the name of his singular God, thus making him the founding Christian king of Nubia. When Justinian (q.v.) came to rule Byzantium in 727 CE, this movement gained even greater force. Julian (q.v.) was a Monophysite missionary sent by Empress Theodora to compete with other missionaries sent by Justinian.

During the years 543–569 CE, the first Monophysite Christian kingdoms were organized in Nubia. In 543 CE, Faras (q.v.) was established as the capital of Nobatia. Julian’s Monophysite successor in the missionizing of Nubia was Longinus, who visited the region in 569 CE, when he recognized Dongola as the capital of Makurra. He extended his missionary work as far south as the kingdom of Alwa. By 579 CE, Alwa (q.v.) was probably converted to Christianity, and its capital was established at Soba (q.v.).

However, it was only a few decades later, in 640 CE, that another religious history was being written. Arab Muslims conquered Egypt and immediately moved across North Africa. The holy war quickly spread southward to Lower Nubia (q.v.). By 641 CE, the forces of ’Amr ibn Al-’As reached the plain just north of Dongola, but they failed to capture this Christian capital of Makurra. See also BALLANA; BLEMMEYES; CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA; DONGOLA; JULIAN; MUKURIA; ROMAN INFLUENCES IN SUDAN.
NUBA. The Nuba people of the Nuba Hills in southern Kordofan must be distinguished from modern Nubians, even though some Nuba refugees have also found their homes in northern Sudan. The Nuba proper speak Kordofanian languages, while the Nile Nubians speak lexically different languages. At the same time, both are members of the Eastern Sudanic family of Nilo-Saharan languages. Thus, at a general level, they are linked are by linguistic structure but not in common communication.

The exact origins of the Nuba are not clear, but they represent an isolated people in a borderland area perhaps less affected by pharaonic, Kushitic, or Sudanic cultural and historic forces. The archaeology of the Nuba is poorly developed. In ancient times, one may conclude that either the Nuba territory extended much farther north or that Nubians raided the lands of the Nuba for slaves. In either case, whether by their own will or by coercion in slave raids, the genetic inheritance from the Nuba certainly is deeply present in Nubia and southern Egypt. Images of “Nubian” slaves in Dynastic times are closely parallel in physiognomy and dress (earrings, feathers, and bracelets) to those people of the modern Nuba Mountains. This also raises the difficult issue of determining the ancient extent of the Nuba; might they have been the same as the Noba (q.v.)? This complicated question of ethnogenesis is not yet resolved.

The Nuba are “Negroid” by conventional “racial” (q.v.) classification and probably had at least a somewhat more extensive territory until pushed into their mountain retreat by the cattle-herding Nilotics to the south in the tenth century or perhaps long before. From the sixteenth century on, cattle-herding Arabs from the north and relentless predations of Jellaba slavers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries pressed heavily on the Nuba. This historical dynamic continues until the present. The Nuba have maintained distinctive linguistic and cultural traditions but have been increasingly incorporated into northern Sudanese life. See also CATTLE-HERDING ARABS; NOBA; NUBIA; NUBIAN.

NUBIA. Nubia is the general name of the area in the Nile valley south of Aswan in Egypt at the First Cataract on the Nile, extending today into northern Sudan to the Third or Fourth Cataract. In the ancient past, Nubia reached as far north as Upper Egypt and as far as the confluence of the White and Blue Niles (q.v.) at modern Khartoum.
Indeed, the modern community at Tuti Island at the juncture of these great rivers is almost entirely Mahas Nubian. Nubia is the land of the ancient kingdoms of Kerma and Kush (qq.v.) and the various small ancient states, such as Wawat, Irtet, and Setiu (qq.v.). The term “Nubia” mostly likely is derived from the Egyptian word Ṽb (gold), but the common use of the word “Nubia” appears more in medieval times since ancient Egyptians and Nubians usually termed their land “Kush” (q.v.) and the Greeks and Romans called it “Ethiopia.”

After the fall of the medieval Christian kingdoms (q.v.), the population converted almost completely to Islam (q.v.). Although many Nubians speak Arabic, the Nubian languages have been maintained, with a number of local dialects being spoken. Nubians have been active in trade and politics. Many have left the home area but maintain a close sense of community in the cities and towns of Egypt and Sudan where they have settled.

As a result of the inundation of land caused by the building of the High Dam at Aswan, many Nubians have been resettled. More than 30,000 were moved to Khashm al-Girba in eastern Sudan in the 1960s. Because of a relatively high level of education and active involvement, Nubians have played an important role in modern Sudanese politics. See also CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA; KUSH; MERÔE, NUBIAN.

NUBIAN. Nubians and their subgroups have a very long history linked to the rise of agriculture, ancient states, and urbanism. In the ancient history of Nubians, even before Dynastic Egypt, they are probably the descendants of the Khartoum Mesolithic (q.v.) with some admixture from Egyptian peoples (Capsian stone tool types) to the north. “Negro” ancestors of Nubians also appear in the Khartoum Neolithic as riverine hunters and fishermen who also had domesticated dogs (q.v.), sheep, and goats between 4000 and 3500 BCE. Grain cultivation came sometime later, probably based on millet (durra) from the western savanna, and later merged with Egyptian cultigens. Anatomical and archaeological evidence places Nubians as the northern extension of the eastern branch of Sudanic languages, that is, not related to the Afro-Asiatic or Semitic languages of the regions farther north and east. Part of the problem in translating the ancient written language of Nubians
Meroitic [q.v.] rests on its isolation and barely known vocabulary, although phonetic values have been determined. Nubian relations with ancient Egypt are long and deep, as Nubia was, for millennia, a source of gold, slaves, cattle and other livestock, animal skins, ivory, ebony, ostrich feathers, gum, and incense, all of which played a substantial role in the accumulation of Egyptian wealth and power. In the case of Kerma (q.v.), Nubians independently created their own trading state. At the time of the New Kingdom, Nubia was fully colonized by Egyptians, and in the case of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), Nubians ruled the entire Nile valley and contested with the Assyrians (q.v.) for control as far away as Lebanon. In about 340 CE, late Nubian (Meroitic) civilization was destroyed by Christians from Axum (q.v.), but in less than two centuries, Nubia became reorganized as the three Christian kingdoms of Nobatia, Makurra, and Alwa (qq.v.), substantially delaying the arrival of Islam (q.v.) through the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries. During this period, some Nubians fled to a remote location in Darfur (q.v.) and Kordofan, where some linguistic traces may still be seen. Such refugee groups include the Anag, Birked, Dilling, Kadaru, Meidob, and Nyama; some say that they are “Negro” with “Caucasoid” traits (a terminology that confuses more than clarifies), but they should be distinguished from the other people of the Nuba Hills who speak unrelated Kordofanian rather than Sudanic languages. The other group of Nubians, sometimes called “Barabra” (a pejorative Latin-rooted term), stayed in their ancestral riverine region in Nubia. It is this group that has mostly closely preserved the Nubian lifeways. Generally, they are found in their respective territories: Kenuz Nubians are found from the First to the Second Cataract; Sukkot and Mahas from the Second to the Third Cataract; and Danagla from the Third to the Fourth Cataract. Nubians also occupy the southern portion of Egypt up to the First Cataract at Aswan (q.v.) and elsewhere as a result of their migrations and the resettlement following the dam construction.

Traces of matrilineal (q.v.) inheritance are also found with Nubians, who show somewhat less patrilineal descent than other Arabized peoples. Nubians also dispersed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to communities along the Nile near Khartoum (such as the Mahas town at Tuti Island) and as far as Sennar. They developed a tradition
of religious scholarship and teaching, helping them gain influence under the Funj sultanates. As bearers of Islam to the Funj sultanate (q.v.), Mahas Nubians frequently provided fuqaha (religious sages) and advisers to the rulers at Sennar. Mahas religious schools of Faqih Hammad wad Marium, Sheikh Khogali, and Sheikh Arbab al Agayed were established at the confluence of the two Niles and along the Blue Nile up to Sennar. The mosque and school of Sheikh Arbab, built in 1691, can be said to be the first permanent structure in Khartoum.

In the 1960s, the rising waters of Lake Nasser/Lake Nubia flooded much of Nubia. Most of the traditional town sites were involved, compelling Kenuz Nubians to move to Egypt (especially Kom Ombo), and Sukkot, Mahas, and Halfawi Nubians were relocated to towns in eastern Sudan, such as New Halfa and Khasm el-Girba. Some Nubians still remained but moved their homes to higher elevations. Danagla have not been affected by the floodwaters but are more Arabized than their relatives to the north.

Although a mixture of “Arab” peoples dominates in the northern urban areas of Sudan today, the Nubians are one of the most important minority ethnic groups. This fact is made more significant when it is understood that Nubians today constitute only 3 to 4 percent of the national population of Sudan. Other entries in this dictionary provide additional information about this region and its people. In terms of “race” (q.v.), Nubians have a phenotypic diversity that is in harmony with the complex history of their territory. “Arabs,” autochthonous Nubians, southern slaves, North African and European conquerors have all left their genetic marks. Nubians of northern Sudan, speaking a non-Arabic tongue, must be distinguished from the peoples of the Nuba (q.v.) Hills, who appear to have been isolated in southern Kordofan before the main penetration of Islam into Sudan. In any case, the modern people living in the region between the Fourth and Sixth Cataracts have been heavily Arabized and Islamized and often boast of Arab pedigrees and speak only Arabic and no Nubian languages. However, Nubian languages are still the mother tongues of the people from the First to Third Cataracts straddling the Egypto-Sudanese border. See also CHRISTIANITY IN NUBIA; GREEK INFLUENCES IN NUBIA; KERMA; KUSH; KUSHITES AT NAPATA; ROMAN INFLUENCES IN SUDAN; 25TH DYNASTY.
NURI. The modern hamlet and ancient cemetery termed Nuri is at the location of the ancient royal cemetery initiated at the end of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) and persisting through much of the Napatan period (q.v.). The Arabic name from the modern hamlet near this site is the name usually applied to the royal cemetery. In the early twentieth century, the Nuri cemetery was found to have been looted at some ancient date. However, it was excavated by George Riesner (q.v.), who recovered some large objects, some fragments, and other material remains of the funerary activities that took place from its foundation to its last interment. As far as is presently known, the cemetery was first used in 664 BCE for the royal burial of King Taharka (q.v.), and the last rulers buried there were either Nastasen (q.v.) or Amanisbakhi in the late fourth or early third centuries BCE. In general, the royal cemetery of Nuri replaced those on the opposite shore of the Nile (q.v.) at Jebel Barkal and Kurru (qq.v.). After Nuri’s last royal burial, all later kings of Napata were buried at Meroë (q.v.); hence, it represents the last of the Napatan epoch that followed the 25th Dynasty.

Taharka’s pyramid is the largest at Nuri at more than thirty meters on a side. Only its core remains intact at the present time. Like other Napatan pyramid tombs, they rose at a steep angle of sixty to seventy degrees, like those of the workers in Deir al-Medina and unlike the pyramids of the Giza plateau. The burial chambers were essentially separate structures underneath the sandstone pyramids and were accessible by a ramp leading to two or three underground chambers. Mortuary chapels were usually on the eastern sides. Still under Egyptian culturoreligious influences, the burials were not on wooden beds, as with Kerma (q.v.), but some had stone benches on which the coffins were placed. The coffins were built of stone or wood, and the practice of mummification persisted. Other ranking members of the royal family were buried nearby at Nuri.

OBSIDIAN. Obsidian was an important and valued export from Nubia to Egypt. It is the naturally glassy volcanic stone known also as “Ethiopian stone.” It does not seem to be found naturally, or at least in quantity, in Egypt itself. It was found in various ways from the Predynastic times on
through all of Dynastic and Greco-Roman history in Egypt and Nubia (q.v.). It has varying colors, but the favored ones were usually dark black or dark green. Its value rested partly on the very sharp edge that could be produced by chipping away at a core to produce arrowheads and knives. In the absence of high-quality metals such as iron (q.v.) and even after bronze technology (q.v.), obsidian was still valued for decorative purposes as well as cutting edges required in knives and sickle blades.

Another use for obsidian was to make the inlaid eyes in human and animal sculpture, coffins, and mummies. In such an instance, it could give a realistic image of the black pupil of the eyes. Obsidian also appears in beads and jewelry and some early vessels and vases.

OCTAVIAN. See AUGUSTUS.

OLD KINGDOM (2686–2181 BCE). This Dynastic epoch of ancient Egypt usually is constituted by the period from the 3rd to the 6th Dynasties, but some sources might extend this further. The Old Kingdom continues the Archaic or Early Dynastic period (the 0, 1, and 2 Dynasties). The First Intermediate period follows the Old Kingdom, when the politically cohesive Egyptian state again devolved into regional rival kingdoms. During the Archaic period, Egyptians were preoccupied mainly with the first instance of forming a unitary government of Upper and Lower Egypt. During the 1st Dynasty, at least one case of a raid occurred against Nubia, conducted by King Djer (q.v.), as seen in the petroglyph now in the Sudan National Museum in Khartoum.

However, as the Old Kingdom unfolded, Egyptians turned their attention to more regular military and economic conquests south of Egypt in Nubia. This was the case especially in the 4th Dynasty, under Seneferu (q.v.), who brought back substantial amounts of livestock and captives in his raids in Lower Nubia. During the time of Pepi II (q.v.) in the 6th Dynasty, reports were made of relations with Nubia, but these appear to be mutual trading rather than raiding. The most celebrated of these trading expeditions were those of Harkuf (q.v.), who set out to Kerma (q.v.) with a desert donkey caravan that brought back many valuable items from Nubia. It is clear, however, that the Old Kingdom Egyptians initiated a series of massive strategic mud-brick fortresses in Lower Nubia (q.v.) to restrict and control
Nubian economic and military access to Egypt. These were substantially renewed on the same sites in the Middle Kingdom.

At the conclusion of the Old Kingdom, Egyptians could no longer maintain their military presence in Lower Nubia, so Nubian peoples known as the C-Group (q.v.) were able to reoccupy their territory and have relatively peaceful interaction with Egyptians based at Aswan (q.v.).

**ORIGEN** (184–ca. 254 CE). The foundation of Christianity (q.v.) in the Nile valley usually is dated to Saint Mark (q.v.), the disciple of Saint Peter, but these early times have left little record since the communities were small and they were under periodic Roman oppression. It was Origen who brought Christianity into sharper focus by the second century CE. Nubia (q.v.) was geographically and theologically situated between the governing bishops of Alexandria and the Christian kingdom of Axum (q.v.) in Ethiopia. However, since these two reference points were outside the mainstream of the orthodox Christianity of Constantinople, so also was Nubia. The regional isolation of the Christians of the Nile valley was because they were followers of Monophysitism (q.v.), which had been influenced by Arianism (q.v.) and the teachings of Origen, whose influence had been isolated in the Byzantine period before the institutional acceptance of state Christianity in Nubia (q.v.).

Origen was a major conservative theologian of early Christianity, and he was an active participant of the sectarian and theological debates in Alexandria and eastern Mediterranean Christianity. Clement and Philo influenced him. His scholarly research into ancient chronology and the precise Jewish translation of the Septuagint led to his major work: the *Hexapla*. Since his father had been martyred, he was much driven by the martyr complex and was eager to adhere to a strict Christian interpretation, especially if it would support his preference for austerity and his great vigilance against perceived evil. Similar to the Monophysites, Origen understood that Christ and God were one, but Christ was subordinate since he was the Son of God and only a mediator or route through whom God might be reached.

**OSIRIS.** The god Osiris is one of the most important deities in the ancient Nile and even much wider region of the ancient Mediterranean. Osiris was born of the deities Geb and Nut along with his evil brother
Seth, his sister Nephthys, and his sister–wife Isis (q.v.). Together Isis and Osiris were parents of the falcon god Horus, who was the model of filial piety and the eternal protector of his father’s name and of all kings. The epic conflict between Horus and Seth is the prototype of the struggle between good and evil. When Osiris was treacherously slain by Seth, the dutiful Isis reassembled his body parts, except his missing phallus, which was eaten by an Oxyrhynchos fish in the Nile. Fluttering over Osiris, Isis immaculately conceived Horus to avenge his father’s death.

Subsequently, Osiris became the god–king over the afterlife/underworld and he presided over the weighing of the heart ceremony that all deceased must encounter. In short, Osiris was the noble deity bringing order to the afterlife and providing a model of exemplary behavior himself; those relating to him are likewise favored. Religious historians see him as a prototype for Jesus, as a god of resurrection, and one may see parallels in religious traditions having fratricidal conflict as well as the Christian Immaculate Conception.

The huge, enduring importance of Osiris in Egypt extended to those areas to the west, east, and south that came under these religious influences. Certainly for Nubia, Osiris and his related divine family were of great importance from the New Kingdom on and were incorporated in various lesser ways even earlier. All Osiride beliefs and rituals were practiced in ancient Nubia from this time through the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), the Napatan period, all of Meroitic (qq.v.) times, and in syncretic forms until the rise of Nubian Christianity. Among the known words in the Meroitic language are shori (Osiris) and woshi (Isis), which typically are found in funerary contexts.

OSORKON I (924–889 BCE). Osorkon I was the second king of the Libyan or Tanite 22nd Dynasty. He was the son of its founder, Sheshonk I. As Sheshonk I had used Nubian mercenaries in his conquest of Judaea in 925 BCE, one may imagine a similar function for his son. The 21st through 24th Dynasties usually are included in the Late period (q.v.), as they could come to power in the delta only because of the weakness of the Egyptian authorities in Upper Egypt. By definition, none had the power for the complete conquest of the Egyptian Nile. Inasmuch as the political or military position of Nu-
bians might be improved by a weakened Egypt, such was the case for the 22nd Dynasty. Osorkon I built extensively in the delta during his reign and was ineffectually engaged in Karnak politics through his son Sheshonk II. His other son, Takelot I, ruled for fifteen years but is very poorly known through existing monuments or inscriptions, as Egypt slipped steadily into persistent disunity.

OSORKON II (874–850 BCE). As with other kings of the 22nd Dynasty, the reign of Osorkon II was contemporary with the embryonic rise of the Nubian state in the vicinity of Napata (q.v.). Unitary political authority over Egypt was tenuous at this time, and Nubians were beginning to restore a regionally centralized government as a result. The authority in Karnak was his cousin Harsiese, the High Priest of Amun (q.v.) who claimed to be the king of Upper Egypt. Following the death of Harsiese, Osorkon II installed his son Nimlot (q.v.) in this capacity and another son as the High Priest of Memphis. These critical placements allowed Osorkon II to regain some lost control for the 22nd Dynasty, especially in Lower Egypt, but fears of Assyrian expansion were highly diversionary for his administration. On his death, his son Takelot II (q.v.) came to power in the delta, with his brother Nimlot still holding on in Karnak as the High Priest of Amun. Politically arranged marriages within these family branches managed to bring some additional unity within the 22nd Dynasty, but it was without meaningful institutionalization, and hostile rivalries resumed on the death of Nimlot.

OSORKON III (787–759 BCE). This Libyan king of the 23rd Dynasty in the Late period (q.v.) struggled to restore political unity of the Egyptian Nile (q.v.) by defending the rival delta capital at Leontopolis (818–712 BCE) against the claims of the Tanite kings. Without a common administration in the delta, the rest of Egypt had split loyalties. Even the late appointment of Osorkon’s son Takelot II (q.v.) as the coregent did as much to confuse the situation as it did to establish dynastic unity. Once again, Nubians (q.v.) could gain more recovery of their own political administration with Egypt so divided. Even Egyptologists find this period difficult to describe and analyze since construction and inscriptions slowed and numerous contradictory claimants for pharaoh of Egypt were made. By the end of the 22nd
and 23rd Dynasties, one may consider Egypt as a set of several city-states but hardly a common government. With their attention diverted to the northeast in some fear of Assyrians (q.v.), and especially diverted by their own internal politics, these Libyan rulers had not been paying attention to the Nubians to the south. Their even more feeble successors in the 24th Dynasty, such as Bakenranef and Tefnakht (qq.v.), would not be able to stop the Nubians of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) from coming to power in Nubia and Egypt during the reign of King Piankhy (q.v.).

**OSORKON IV (730–715 BCE).** This Libyan king was the last of the 22nd Dynasty to rule from the eastern delta at Tanis. By his time, the Leontopolis rivals in the central delta had weakened him there, and the Saite rivals had challenged him in the western delta. The divided royal house could not stand, and by the 24th Dynasty, further challenges arose at Hermopolis and Hierakonpolis. To the east, the Assyrians (q.v.) were increasing their threat on the kingdom of Judah. It was a tense time for Lower Egypt. The time for the restive Nubians (q.v.) was at hand, and it would be a matter of time until Piankhy (q.v.) came out of Nubia to make his bid for Lower Nubia, Aswan, and Karnak and then advance northward to confront these confused Libyans fighting each other for control of the delta.

**OSTRICH FEATHERS AND EGGS.** Ostrich feathers and eggs were unique products of ancient Sudan. Ostrich feathers in particular served as an important ritual item in Egyptian ideological practice. However, by late Predynastic times, free-ranging ostrich had disappeared from both the desert and floodplain of the Egyptian Nile in favor of less populated areas to the south in Sudan. Consequently, ostrich feathers were acquired through trade with Nubia (q.v.), as shown in this New Kingdom (q.v.) scene from the Theban tomb of Rekhmire. In Egyptian ideology, ostrich feathers were worn in the headdresses of the god Shu and the goddess Ma’at. In fact, the ostrich feather alone represented Ma’at as the “feather of Truth,” which was weighed against the heart of the deceased in the Egyptian ritual of the same name. Ostrich feathers were also used in the decoration of ceremonial *meret* chests, a symbol of the land of Egypt.
The ostrich played a modest role in indigenous Nubian culture. Perhaps as a local animal, less ritual attention was paid to the ostrich than in Egypt. Beads made from ostrich eggshell served a utilitarian purpose and were extremely common through all periods of ancient Sudanese history. In Kerma (q.v.), the ostrich itself appears as a motif in art. The most beautiful and striking example of this motif was found in a Kerma burial that yielded a leather cap onto which mica appliqués in the form of ostrich and ostrich feathers had been sewn. Curiously, this motif disappears after colonization of Nubia by New Kingdom (q.v.) Egypt. Perhaps we can assume at this time the adoption of Egyptian beliefs concerning the ostrich and the use of its feathers in ideology. In either case, by the Napatan and Meroitic periods, the ostrich motif is rarely used in indigenous art, although products of the animal continued to be traded to Egypt. [by k. rhodes]

PALEOLITHIC. Our understanding of the Paleolithic in the Nubian Nile (q.v.) valley is still very incomplete since only stone tools are known rather than any fossil human remains until *Homo sapiens sapiens*. However, the hominid fossils to the east in the Danakil valley of Eritrea, to the south in the Omo valley and the Rift Valley, and to the west in the Lake Chad basin (*Australopithecus bahralghazali*) take the origins of regional humanity back to the very beginning, at three to four million years ago. With this wide distribution over several million years and no natural barriers, it is likely that such early hominids also traveled across the ancient Nubian savanna and river systems. The Lower Paleolithic site near Abu Simbel is considered by Nicolas Grimal (1994:18) to date back to 700,000 BCE, or the end of the Oldowan assemblage of “pebble tools” associated with late Australopithecines. Perhaps it is just a matter of time before Australopithecines, *Homo erectus*, and *Homo sapiens neandertalensis* remains of Kanjeran (q.v.) stock are located in Nile silts, along the upper gravel banks, in deep-cut wadis, or in former well-watered depressions in today’s Sahara.

Human forms continued to live along the entire Nile from then, if we may judge from the pre-Chellean and Chellean sites at Wadi
Huda and Wadi Halfa (q.v.). Acheulian bifacial tools were discovered at Wadi Halfa and at sites near Omdurman, while Levallois cores and flakes are known from Wadi Halfa, Tanqasi, and Selima Oasis (qq.v.), giving indirect proof of the early human presence in a broad region of ancient Nubia. Major changes in climate and rainfall have reconfigured the bed of the modern Nile, especially in comparison to several other ancient parallel watercourses. Tools that appear to be early Paleolithic are found at Gala al-Haddadiya along the eastern bank of the Blue Nile, but the lack of hand axes makes it questionable that they may be parallel to those of Khor Abu Anga (q.v.). Middle Paleolithic sites are known in the vicinity of Soba (q.v.), and they include some denticulate scrapers. Upper Paleolithic sites are found in Lower Nubia (q.v.) and elsewhere along the Blue Nile.

Also complicating the image of the Paleolithic along the Nile is confusion about the ethnicity or race (q.v.) of its populations. Precisely when racial differences became apparent and the extent of the territories of African, Nilotic, and Semitic people is a subject of dispute. In the Middle Paleolithic, at about 100,000 BCE, the evolution to early sapiens forms had taken place, at least in the Lower Nile, as a regional parallel to the human evolution in North Africa and Europe. This transition is mirrored in the shift from predominant bifacial hand axes to Acheulian and Mousterian stone flake and core tools. Another complication for this period is to try to understand the extent of proto-Nilo-Saharan and proto-Sudanic languages that may have existed in Homo sapiens times. Certainly the isolated positions of today’s Nilo-Saharan language must be a faint residue of a much larger territory they occupied in ancient times.

Some of the major Paleolithic tool industries and their sites in Nubia/Sudan include 1) Nubian Mousterian, Type A, from 47,000 to 35,000 years BP, found in a site east of Wadi Halfa (q.v.); 2) Khor Musan (q.v.), 22,000 to 18,700 BP, scrapers, burins, and flakes found in a site at Debeira East (q.v.); 3) Halfan, 20,000 to 17,000 BP, found at a site at Wadi Halfa; 4) Sebilian, 15,000 to 11,000 BP, found at a site near Mirgissa (q.v.); and 5) Qadan (q.v.), 14,500 to 6,400 BP, found at a site in Halfa Dequim, south of Wadi Halfa. See also JEBEL SAHABA; KHARTOUM MESOLITHIC; SHAHEINAB.
PANEHESI (PANEHSI, PA-NEHESI). During most of the New Kingdom, the royal authority usually appointed a viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) or a King’s Son of Kush to administer Egyptian colonial claims over Nubia (q.v.). Panehesi was such an officer, but he was the very last to serve in this capacity, and thus he ushered in the Third Intermediate period. His ethnic identity is unclear, but his name suggests that he may have been of Nubian origin since “Nehesi” or Ta-Nehesi (q.v.) was a common referent for Nubia in antiquity. It is not unlikely that, at this time, colonial Egyptians relied on experienced Nubian administrators from Nubia.

Panehesi served as the royal Egyptian representative in Nubia during the weak administration of Ramses XI (q.v.). Amidst a widespread famine, political confusion, and a Theban revolt over the succession of a High Priest of Amun (q.v.), Panehesi sought to restore order in a way similar to that of King Piankhy (q.v.) in the 25th Dynasty. In this power vacuum, Panehesi assigned Herihor (q.v.) to take over Thebes, end the divisive disputes, and restore stability to Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia. Promptly, Herihor exceeded his mission and became the de facto ruler of Upper Egypt (1080–1074 BCE) as the High Priest of Amun at Thebes, while his colleague Smendes (q.v.) became the ultimate authority of Lower Egypt. Panehesi continued to assert that he was the highest authority for the entire Nile valley. In fact, he controlled only Nubia, which had, by default, become entirely separate from Egypt by this time. Panehesi quarreled with the weak Theban priests for as much as a decade, until his death and burial in Nubia. Even thereafter, the feeble pharaoh Ramses XI resided mainly in the delta, and Viceroy Piankhy (q.v.) was the effective ruler of Thebes sometime between 1080 to 1074 BCE. Perhaps this is why the Nubian king of the 25th Dynasty selected Piankhy for his name when he became the ruler of Nubia and Egypt in about 740 BCE.

Thus, at first this viceroy of Kush under Pharaoh Ramses XI sought to express his loyalty to a unitary Egypt. However, the sharp divisions among the Theban priests of Amun meant that control of Upper Egypt was unpredictable, and the kings residing in Lower Egypt could hardly be confident of a stable national government. As the Rameside 20th Dynasty concluded, the five centuries of Egyptian New Kingdom colonial rule were over, and Nubian autonomy was restored, however inadvertently. The case of Panehesi is important to Nubia in several respects. First, it created
another opportunity for Nubia to be self-governing. Second, it may have put Nubians in a legitimate role to claim a religious and political responsibility to rule Egypt and Nubia while Egypt was internally divided. Third, this initiated a period of Nubian “Dark Ages.” Egypt was no longer in a position to record events in Nubia, and Nubians did not have a literate tradition to make their own records for several centuries. When the historical record resumes in the eighth century BCE, Nubians have formed their own state around the Fourth Cataract and are ready to rule Egypt as the 25th Dynasty.

PAN-GRAVE. The Pan-Grave culture is so called because of the shallow oval graves without any substantial superstructure that characterize the burials of these people. Pan-Grave people are found in Lower Nubia (q.v.) concentrated at Dakka, Qubban, and Aniba (qq.v.), where they may have been guarding the valued Wadi al-Allaqi (q.v.), and even north of Abydos and as far as Memphis in Egypt, where they may have been serving in a military role. This association is strengthened by the appearance of some Pan-Grave pottery within Egyptian fortresses in Lower Nubia. Sometimes this differentiated grave type with its associated pottery is in C-Group (q.v.) cemeteries.

Generally, it is presumed that the Pan-Grave people were Medjay (q.v.) of the Eastern Desert who sold their military, scouting, and police service to Old Kingdom (6th Dynasty) and Middle Kingdom (12th Dynasty) Egyptians and at times with the C-Group and the Kerma (qq.v.) kings. It is clear that Medjay played a key role in routing the Hyksos (q.v.) under the Egyptian king Ahmose I (q.v.) in the 18th Dynasty of the New Kingdom. The Pan-Grave people likely had their own chiefs, or hekii, in such regions as Webetsepet and Aushek. Given their periodic service to Egyptians, some cases of Egyptian grave goods have been found in Pan-Grave burials. Thus, the Pan-Grave people were a further political and ethnic complication of the border politics of Lower Nubia.

Their pottery is similar to but distinguished from that of the C-Group. Generally, the pottery was of lesser quality because of dung firing techniques, and low, black bowls are common for the Pan-Grave. Some of the C-Group themes of incised black rims and hatching continued with Pan-Grave pottery that was placed with the de-
ceased. Often the bodies were buried on their right sides on a leather sheet and were covered by another leather sheet. For males, Egyptian-style weapons included knives, axes, and bows and arrows as well as fly medallions typical of those in military service. For men and women, shell jewelry and bracelets from the Red Sea were common. Other typical grave goods, especially for males, are cattle skulls (bu-crania), gazelles, and other animals in black and red colors. A few of these skulls have hieroglyphic inscriptions.

PASER. Paser was a viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) for Ramses II (q.v.) during his twenty-fifth to thirty-fourth regnal years. His tomb was in the vicinity of Abu Simbel (q.v.). It shows scenes of both individuals making offerings to Nubian deities as well as one scene in which Paser worships Anubis (jackal), Sobek (crocodile), and the deified Senusoret III (q.v.). Paser was followed by Huy (q.v.). This tomb may be reconstructed at a new site near modern Abu Simbel.

PEKHERKHONSU. This man served as Doorkeeper of the House of Amun during the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). Fragments of his wooden anthropoid coffin are at the Metropolitan Museum in New York. His mummy was also covered by a cartonage face mask. His burial also contained several shawabti, a shawabti box, Osiride figures, and canopic jars that are indicative of his relatively high status and of Theban wealth of the seventh century BCE.

PENNIUT, PENNUT. See ANIBA.

PEPINAKHT. Pepinakht was an Old Kingdom Egyptian trade caravan leader to Nubia and Asia during the time of Pepy II (q.v.). His role was a prototype of the position of the Hekaib (Brave-hearted governor) of Aswan in the Middle Kingdom or the Viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) that was formalized to rule over Nubia in the New Kingdom. His tomb 35, in the cliffs at Qubba al-Howa in Aswan (q.v.), gives some testimony of these assignments by the king. One of his missions was to return to Aswan with the body of Enkhet, another caravan leader and trader to Punt (q.v.) on the Red Sea coast. Another mission was to put down a revolt by Nubians (q.v.) and compel their leaders to indicate their submission to Egypt.
PEPY I, MERYRE (2332–2283 BCE). This Egyptian pharaoh was the second to rule in the 6th Dynasty of the Old Kingdom (q.v.). As with his predecessors Sahure and Djoser (qq.v.), he sought control of Lower Nubia (q.v.) beyond the “Door of the South” at Elephantine (q.v.). His military raids into Nubia produced slave soldiers who were critical in battles elsewhere in his empire.

PEPY II, PEPI II, NEFERKARE (2278/2269–2184/2175 BCE). This pharaoh of the 6th Dynasty was a successor to Pepi I (q.v.) and had a reign of remarkable length both because he assumed the throne at an early age and because of a very long life. Relative to Nubia (q.v.), it was during the reign of Pepi II that the trading expeditions to Kerma (Yam) (q.v.) were undertaken by Harkuf (q.v.) and celebrated by Pepi II. Fragments of Egyptian-made alabaster vessels with the name of Pepi II (as well as Pepi I and Merenre) have been uncovered at Kerma as further documentation of this interaction. During his heyday, he ruled a strong, unitary Old Kingdom (q.v.), and in the wake of the murder of Mekhu (q.v.), he also undertook punitive raids into Wawat (q.v.) led by Pepinakht (q.v.), who followed Harkuf in the position as “Governor of the South.” Pepinakht carried out much slaughter, seized livestock and slaves, and captured two of the (C-group?) chiefs of this region of Nubia.

The end the reign of Pepi II led into the First Intermediate period, as the governors (Hekaib) of Elephantine sought but failed to hold on to Lower Nubia (q.v.) in the name of the pharaoh. Ruling from Memphis, Pepi II and his wives were buried at the pyramid complex of Sakkara. His son Merenre II could not hold the Egyptian state together. This gave C-Group (q.v.) Nubians the chance to reoccupy Lower Nubia and for a Nubian state to continue development at Kerma (q.v.).

PERSIANS. Persians are an ancient reference to the people of modern Iran. At their height, their territory included Egypt in the sixth century BCE, when their local satraps were installed there. Each satrap maintained law and order and supplied the taxation required in Persepolis, their primary capital. On the eve of their takeover of Egypt, their king, Cyrus II, died in 529 BCE, but by 525 his successor, Cambyses, was able to resume this effort. Following an intense battle at Pelusium,
Cambyses (525–522 BCE) was installed as the ruler of Egypt after driving out Psamtik III (q.v.), the last king of the 26th Dynasty, which had replaced the former Nubian dynasty in the delta and Memphis. This constituted the formation of the 27th Dynasty, or the First Persian period (525–404 BCE). A much noted event during the reign of Cambyses was losing his large army in the Western Desert in a sandstorm. The quest to locate this army continues to engage archaeological curiosity. Herodotus (q.v.) believed that this remarkable loss sent Cambyses into a fit of insanity and despotic rule that might have resulted in the destruction of some important cultic temples. Herodotus also reported that an army of Cambyses ventured into Nubia as far as Napata (qq.v.). Presumably, this was on an intelligence-gathering mission, but no corroborating accounts of these events exist that would have been contemporary with the Napatan king Amaninatakalebe (q.v.; 538–519 BCE). On the other hand, William Y. Adams (1977:270) raises the intriguing issue that “Nastasen” (in the fourth century BCE) referred to a northern enemy with a name that could be rendered as “Cambyses.” But this would require a major reordering of Nubian chronology that has not taken place in the past three decades, and the George Reisner (q.v.) sequence still prevails.

The Persians were forced out by Egyptians and kept out until the end of the reign of Nectanebo II (q.v.) in 343 BCE of the 30th Dynasty, the very last native Egyptian to rule Egypt for 2,500 years. Immediately after, the Persians were able to return to Egypt under Artaxerxes III in what is termed the Second Persian period, or the 31st Dynasty (343–332 BCE). It was the demise of this much shorter Persian period that ushered in the relatively peaceful “liberation” of Egypt by Alexander the Great (q.v.) and the rise of the three centuries of Ptolemaic (q.v.) rule.

PETRONIUS. Following the defeat of the Ptolemies by the Roman navy at Actium (q.v.) in 31 BCE and the subsequent deaths of Cleopatra VII (q.v.) and Anthony, Caesar Augustus (q.v.) claimed Egypt as a part of Rome. In negotiations with the Meroites, the Roman limes (borders) were set at Aswan (q.v.), and initially they had no additional territorial ambitions into the lands of the Barabra (Nubian Barbarians), to use a pejorative Roman reference. The Meroites probably were inclined to accept this boundary, but the
Romans apparently abrogated the understanding. By projecting the Nubians as a tributary population, they tried to install a Roman authority over the Nubian Dodekaschoenos or more. This was completely unacceptable to the Meroites, who were ruled either by Amanirenas or perhaps by Akinidad (qq.v.).

Caesar Augustus soon returned to the politics in Rome, and he appointed Petronius as the Roman prefect of Egypt before 24 BCE. The Roman geographer Strabo (q.v.) reported that while Roman troops were diverted in a punitive mission in Arabia, the Meroites saw this as an opportunity to redress their grievance in 24 BCE. They attacked Philae, Elephantine, and Aswan (qq.v.) with a Nubian army of some 30,000. Much booty was seized, including a bronze head of Augustus that made its way back to the royal town at Meroë (q.v.).

Strabo and Pliny the Elder (qq.v.) reported a Roman reprisal raid by infantry and cavalry into Nubia in 23 BCE, in which Petronius was able to seize Dakka (q.v.) and try to negotiate a new understanding. When this failed, the Romans advanced farther south to the very strategic citadel of Qasr Ibrim (q.v.), which they seized and occupied from the contemporary Meroites. Claims are made that from this base the Roman infantry and horsemen advanced as far as Napata (q.v.), and the so-called Roman tower with archer loopholes just downstream from Napata hints that this might be the case. But little remains of whatever presence the Roman army may have achieved in Nubia at this time, and the forces of Petronius mostly withdrew back to Aswan and Alexandria. Apparently, they did keep a temporary military presence at Qasr Ibrim to use in bargaining with the Meroites.

The final stage in this rough beginning in Romano–Nubian relations took place on the Aegean Island of Samos. Meroitic envoys were able to meet there with Augustus and settle this discord by a mutual boundary line at Maharraqa (q.v.; or Hieraskyminos), where a temple there would represent the temporary southern limit of Roman Egypt along the Nile.

PHILAE. The ancient site at Philae is no more; the rising of the Low Dam at Aswan (q.v.) subjected this nearby island to annual flooding and caused damage to the colors of the famed temples there. Luckily, the renewed interest in Nubia (q.v.) generated in the 1960s was translated to Philae, which unfortunately was above the Low Dam but
downstream of the High Dam. In the context and using new technologies for relocating so many Nubian monuments, the temple of Philae was also selected for removal and relocation, with remarkable care and precision, to the nearby island of Agilka (about 500 meters away), some 400 meters long and 135 meters wide. One may now visit this new site and have a profound sense of its former condition and orientation.

The area of Philae and nearby islands were visited throughout Dynastic times, as they lie on this key corridor to Africa. However, the oldest known evidence in the vicinity is at Biga and Seheil (q.v.) Islands in New Kingdom times. During the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), some shrines were built on Philae, although few traces of this period remain, except for the small granite altar of Taharka (q.v.) at the southwestern corner of the inner, eastern colonnade. This is the very oldest time period still represented at Philae. Overwhelmingly, Philae represents the Greco-Roman period as well as some important Meroitic and Christian episodes of Nile valley history.

Nectanebo I (q.v.) of the 30th Dynasty built an airy kiosk or pavilion in the southwestern corner of Philae. Its fourteen columns and Hathor (q.v.) capitals represent the oldest extant portion of the Philae complex. Nectanebo I also built the portal in the first pylon, certainly long before the additions of Ptolemy XII (q.v.). Even though the record of periods earlier than the Ptolemies is sparse, the links to the past are still profound in the iconography and deities who received special attention at Philae. For example, the ruined west-facing Temple of Arensnuphis (q.v.), with its three vestibules and inner sanctuary, ties Philae to Nubian deities, although it was built in Greco-Roman times. The same may be said for the nearby foundation of the small Mandulis (q.v.) chapel on the outer, eastern colonnade. This south-facing chapel, built in Roman times had one vestibule and an inner sanctuary.

One approach explaining Philae is with a chronological list of the architectural contributions to Philae by successive pharaohs. Ptolemy II (q.v.) is credited for the construction of the oddly oriented gate just outside the first pylon (eighteen meters high and almost forty-six meters wide). This suggests that the temple was redesigned and reoriented on more than one occasion. Ptolemy VI (q.v.) built the marvelously illustrated Mammissi, or birth house, in the inner courtyard, which apparently necessitated its own retrofitted entrance through the first pylon. This gave him the chance to add the lovely relief...
scenes in this passageway. A text on the Mammissi’s outer facade carried references known from the Rosetta Stone and thus added in significant part to its decipherment. A great granite stela buried into the second pylon celebrated the land donation of Ptolemy VI to Isis (q.v.), who is, in fact, the central deity for Philae temple. Ptolemy VI was also responsible for the Hathor/Bes music sanctuary on the eastern side of Philae.

Ptolemy VIII (q.v.) is associated with the construction of the second pylon, which took advantage of the natural granite outcroppings on Philae to integrate the stone mass of the Ptolemy VI stela into the second pylon. The inner, ten-column hypostyle hall is noted for its having been painted by David Roberts (q.v.) in 1838. While the former glorious colors are now completely gone, the excellent capitals remain to be enjoyed. This hall, with its open roof, is something of a compromise between a standard hypostyle hall and an outer court, probably because of the limited construction area available on Philae. Ptolemy VIII was also responsible for the construction of the eastern colonnade between the first and second pylons and for some additions to the Hathor/Bes music sanctuary. The innermost scenes of Philae offer illustration of Isis’s effort to collect the dispersed body parts of her husband Osiris (q.v.) and thereby prepare for his funeral and resurrection.

Ptolemy XII (q.v.) was involved in either the construction of, or at least the reliefs on, the outer wall of the first pylon. These show huge images of this pharaoh smiting the heads of prisoners for the glory of Isis, Horus, and Hathor. He also decorated sections of the second pylon and commissioned reliefs of a Sokar procession along sections of the eastern colonnade.

Roman times saw exterior wall reliefs of the Isis temple added by Augustus (q.v.) and Tiberius. Augustus also built a badly ruined temple on the north side of Philae. He also decorated the Hathor/Bes temple. Diocletian (q.v.) added a gateway and dock that are still to be seen. These provide an example of a Roman arch that is not known otherwise for the site. Important contributions of Hadrian (q.v.) include the western gateway, or bastion, which has many important late reliefs of Isis, Osiris, Horus, and Nephthys. The image of Hapy living under the stones of the neighboring island is rich in symbolism. The inscriptions a few meters away are reckoned to be among the very last in hieroglyphics. One of the most impressive and lovely Ro-
man works is the huge “Pharaoh’s Bed” of kiosk of Trajan (q.v.). Its fourteen columns with screen walls still support huge architraves and have richly decorated capitals. Presumably, the annual river processions of the Isis figurine would begin at this building.

In Meroitic times, Philae becomes a depository of numerous Meroitic inscriptions, graffiti, and an especially long and intriguing text in the “storeroom” in the eastern side of the inner courtyard known as the “Ethiopian chamber.” This appears to represent very late Meroitic visitors to Philae who are still devoted to the worship of its deities after the temple was formally closed.

Christian times did terrible damage to the reliefs of Philae, and it is believed that most of the systematic defacement took place in this era. The Blemmyes (q.v.) and Meroites had been allowed some access to Philae in the early Christian era, but during the reign of Justinian (q.v.), in 551 CE, as Philae was finally closed a temple of Egyptian deities. After 553 CE, it was officially transformed into the church of Saint Mary and Saint Stephen.

PHILO JUDAEUS. Philo was a commentator and historian of early Christianity, especially in Alexandria. Philo believed that the translation of the Hebrew Septuagint into Greek was divinely assisted along with the seventy translators sponsored by Ptolemy II (q.v.). Philo noted the importance of celibacy for the Essene community of early Christians. He was noted to have a tolerant attitude for Jews (q.v.) and was somewhat influential to the writings of Origen (q.v.).

PHOENICIANS. Generally, the relations between the Phoenicians and ancient Nubians is not significant, but during the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), both were temporarily linked in the common but ultimately failed effort to block Assyrian expansion. Under Pharaoh Shabaka (q.v.), efforts were made to foment a diversionary rebellion in Phoenicia with their king Luli (q.v.). Perhaps Prince Taharka (q.v.) was engaged in this sensitive assignment. Once Luli fled and the northern Jewish kingdom of Samaria fell, little more could be done in this respect. Another small linkage between Phoenicians and Nubians in Meroitic times is that a few of their letters have a similar morphology and pronunciation. Since several eastern Mediterranean alphabets have common ancestry, it would be going too far to say that Meroitic morphology is derived from
the more ancient Phoenician writing system. Under Necho II (q.v.) Egypto-Phoenician relations were close.

PIANKHY, HIGH PRIEST OF AMUN AT THEBES (1074–1070 BCE). It is critical to distinguish the High Priest of Amun Piankhy from King Piankhy of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). They are clearly different people at different times. The identical names may have added confusion to the early but mistaken claim that two Piankhys of the 25th Dynasty may have existed. On the other hand, it does seem possible that the later king Piankhy might have selected this name to legitimate his effort to regain Egypt as if he was serving an honorable role similar to the High Priest Piankhy, who may have been of Nubian origin. It was common throughout the 25th Dynasty for Nubians to use all available icons and beliefs of Thebes to justify themselves as not-so-foreign conservators of Egyptian religion and values; thus, he may have turned to this figure from the past.

Piankhy, the High Priest, was also a military man who followed Herihor (q.v.), in about 1060 BCE, to continue the movement that led to the virtual autonomy of Thebes. Herihor may have been the father of Priest Piankhy, whose concern was to stabilize or recover control over Nubia, which had broken away under the leadership of Panehesi (q.v.) in the chaotic time following the death of Ramses XI (q.v.). In this respect, he acted as a viceroy of Nubia (q.v.). Even when Priest Piankhy died and was followed by his son Pinudjem I, the conflict continued. Indeed, the depth of this dispute over territorial control between Upper Egypt and Nubia was so great that the Third Intermediate period was to last for two centuries and would not be fully resolved until the Nubian 25th Dynasty finally gained control over all of Nubia and Egypt combined. On the other hand, knowledge of this Nubian “Dark Age” is poor, as is the time of Pinudjem I, until the Kurru (q.v.) kings began to reassert Nubian control of Upper Nubia (q.v.).

PIANKHY, PIANKHI, PI, PIYE, PIYI, PIANKH, KING (747–716 BCE). Although variant forms of his name have appeared, the glyphs in his cartouche can accurately be rendered as “Piankhy.” This Nubian king was the son of Kashta (q.v.), who had managed to gain control of all of Nubia and possibly of Thebes. Piankhy apparently was married to Tabiry (daughter of his uncle Alara and Kashta’s brother),
perhaps Abar (daughter of another aunt), and Peksater/Pekareslo, Khensa, and Neferukekashta, who were his "sisters." The case of Tabiry provides an ancient example of the still preferred Nubian form of marriage to one’s father’s brother’s daughter. Kensa was buried at the Kurru (q.v.) royal cemetery, where a silver vessel (MFA 21.3091) was found inscribed with her name. Another “sister” of Piankhy was Amenirdis (q.v.), the God’s Wife of Amun at Thebes.

Although no inscriptional evidence has been found, circumstantial reason exists to believe that King Piankhy might have been named for Piankhy the High Priest of Amun (q.v.). The Nubian tendency to seek legitimacy with reference to earlier times and persons is not uncommon. Any thought that two kings of the 25th Dynasty were named Piankhy is without foundation.

King Piankhy of Kush (q.v.) managed to achieve control of Upper Egypt up to Herakleopolis by about 728 BCE. Under his generals Purem, Lanersekenny, and Purma, Piankhy sent his Nubian soldiers to advance farther northward and achieve full control of a reunified Egypt by about 726 BCE after defeating rival kings in the western delta. The precise chronology and dates for Piankhy are disputed, but this event took place late in his reign (perhaps the twenty-first year). Piankhy’s father, Kashta (q.v.), had started this initiative, and Piankhy’s conquest appears to have been somewhat reluctant. At first, he seems to have been satisfied just to control Kush and Thebes. However, Tefnakht (q.v.), the prince of Sais in the western delta, headed southward to regroup with his ally Nimlot (q.v.), king of Hermopolis, and drive out the Nubians. Under this challenge and perhaps with new Nubian troops and boats, Piankhy left his secure base at Thebes to attack and defeat the combined forces of Tefnakht, Nimlot, and Herakleopolis. Nimlot temporarily escaped to the delta but later returned to Hermopolis, thereby representing a serious challenge to Piankhy. He personally resolved to return to this conflict after celebrating the next year’s Theban Opet festival. His advance military troops likely had already isolated Hermopolis, so Nimlot’s position was precarious, and he begged to surrender on favorable terms and with offers of gifts negotiated by his own queen. With the surrender of Nimlot, Piankhy could again claim the entire delta to be under his authority, but he still had to dispose of Tefnakht once again. However, the defeat of Nimlot hastened the surrender of Peftjaubastet (Pefnefdibast), who had been the king of Herakleopolis. Then, one after the other, the local
kings fell under Piankhy’s advance, except for the local rulers of Crocodileopolis in the Fayum and in Aphroditopolis on the eastern bank of the Nile (q.v.) at Meidum. But these places were perceived as unnecessary diversions while Piankhy sent his soldiers in hot pursuit of Tefnakht. Surveying his booty and tribute, Piankhy saw that the stables of Nimlot were in deplorable condition, and as a horse-loving Nubian, he noted this on his stela.

Meanwhile, Tefnakht had created a strongly fortified position at Memphis and exhorted his followers to hold out against the Nubians. Taking Memphis was to prove a challenge to Piankhy, and he had to determine his tactics. Would a long siege, undermining walls, or use of siege ramps succeed in breaching the walls of Memphis? He determined that the western, desert-facing walls of Memphis had been raised and strengthened for Tefnakht’s since he anticipated that Piankhy’s cavalry forces would attack by land. Instead, Piankhy estimated that the weakest defense of Memphis was on the eastern side, in the river port area, which may have been even more vulnerable during the annual inundation. Thus, Piankhy’s flexible strategy used his riverboats to make a raid against Tefnakht’s poorly defended port and shipping. Memphis was quickly captured after his soldiers broke through the eastern walls. The defenders were slaughtered, and the ancient capital fell to Piankhy’s rule.

This impressive strategic move and powerful show of force had a desired effect among holdouts around Memphis and across the delta, where some may have hoped for victory by Tefnakht. Piankhy advanced to Heliopolis (to the east of modern Cairo) to give thanks at its venerable temple for the Old Kingdom (q.v.) sun god. Now Piankhy was the legitimate protector of the holy places of Egypt. It was in Heliopolis that Piankhy received Osorkon IV (q.v.) to acknowledge Piankhy as the king of Egypt. Near Athribis (modern Benha), the numerous humbled delta princes and kings now gave their loyalty to Piankhy. The prince of Athribis, Pediese recognized Piankhy’s love of horses and offered him the very best from his stable.

Meanwhile, Tefnakht had still escaped the grasp of Piankhy’s forces and managed to kill General Purem’s son Bonakhta before fleeing deeper into the western delta and destroying his supplies and vessels as he went to prevent them from falling into Piankhy’s hands. Fearing that it was just a matter of time before he would be captured
and slain, Tefnakht finally capitulated to Nubian General Purem along with the kings of Crocodilopolis and Aphroditopolis, who heretofore had been spared in the conflict.

His military and political mission in Lower Egypt now complete, Piankhy returned to Upper Egypt and back to Nubia, having accepted the word of the delta princes that no further aggression would take place. Much of this information was recorded on the tall military stela raised by Piankhy at the Amun temple at Napata (q.v.) to record these conquests and his famed love of horses that he thought had been mistreated in Egypt. In this way, he may have also hoped to demonstrate his compassion and humanity. Presently, the stela rests in an uncelebrated side hallway of the Egyptian National Museum.

Piankhy’s tolerant hope in the loyalty of the delta princes was mistaken. Tefnakht waited for Piankhy to retire to Napata so that he could reclaim his own ambitions to rule the delta from Sais. Even after Tefnakht’s death in 720 BCE, his son Bakenranef (q.v.; Bocchoris) made an attempt to formulate the 24th Dynasty. By 718 BCE, Bakenranef controlled most of the delta and Lower Egypt and claimed that he was the “Lord of Two Lands.” His reign is not well known, but an Apis bull of Memphis was buried in the sixth year of his reign. Thus, Piankhy’s claim to control the entire Nile was again being challenged. Despite this resistance and uncertainties in the delta, Piankhy never lost control of the region between Herakleopolis and Thebes, where he made a modest addition to the Mut temple at Karnak. Piankhy celebrated the ritually significant Opet festival and procession at Thebes. Also at Thebes, he incorporated himself into the Theban priesthood by having his sister Amenirdis I (q.v.) “adopted” by Shepenwepet (daughter of Osorkon III [q.v.]) as the God’s Wife of Amun. The precise dynamics in Thebes are not fully clear, but Piankhy’s chief adviser was Nalsken, and his treasurer was Khalibu. Perhaps in his early period in Thebes, Osorkon III may still have played some role in that glorious capital, judging from a chapel he built there in these confusing times.

Since Amun was the central god of Thebes and at Jebel Barkal (q.v.), this religious metaphor helped cement political relations between the people and lands of Nubia and Egypt and legitimate Piankhy in both. In fact, the decision to “voluntarily” return to Napata by Piankhy may have been less “free will” than it was a means to
avoid Theban intrigue and the threatening presence of Osorkon’s allies. Perhaps even a brief coregency with Takelot III was formed to recover Thebes while Piankhy was away. Certainly the lack of an effective central government in Egypt gave economic and military precariousness and opportunity to those with ambitions to rule.

If the delta princes were not enough of a distraction, the Assyrians (q.v.) under King Sargon II had turned their attention to the Judaean king Hezekiah (q.v.). Judaean fears of Assyria were realized when the neighboring northern Jewish kingdom of Samaria, under Hoshea, fell in about 722 BCE. Jewish captives were taken back to Assyria in humiliation. Hezekiah was much shocked by the news of this defeat, and he began an active campaign of military defense, politicoreligious reform, and alliance building that is described in a number of biblical references. It was in this context that the Judaeans explored their need for a military and political alliance with the “Ethiopian” Piankhy, then ruler of Egypt. With Assyrian troops reaching Raphia in Gaza by 720 BCE, Piankhy had a great deal to fear.

On Piankhy’s death in 716 BCE, he was buried at Kurru (q.v.) in Nubia near modern Napata (q.v.) and not in the Egyptian soil for which he had struggled. His tomb likely was the first of the pyramid revival type at Kurru, although future excavations may show that this had been established somewhat before. It was likely that this was influenced by his experiences in viewing the Old Kingdom pyramids at Sakkara and Giza. As the centuries passed, Nubian pyramids became more numerous than those in Egypt, but they rise at an angle ten to twenty degrees steeper than the Giza type, and while very large, they are considerably smaller than those in Egypt. Continuing the process of legitimating themselves by Egyptian standards, the 25th Dynasty kings were embalmed and given shawabti “helper” statues to reside with them in their tombs. But following Nubian cultural traditions, some were buried on their royal beds or benches and with their beloved horses. In any case, Piankhy’s long reign over Egypt and Kush was the foundation of the Kushite 25th Dynasty, which then ruled over Egypt and Nubia.

It was not long before the treachery of the delta princes reemerged in about 715 BCE, when Piankhy’s successor and younger brother, Shabaka (q.v.), was compelled to return to the delta with military forces to try to deal with this once and for all.
PIHOR AND PIDISI, PEDESE. See DENDUR.

PINUDJEM I (PINEDJEM I). This High Priest of Amun at Thebes succeeded his counterpart Priest Piankhy (q.v.) in 1070 BCE, during the Late period (q.v.). Even though a unified Egypt was lost, Pinudjem ruled for a rather long period until 1032 BCE. But in Nubia (q.v.), this “Dark Age” began to allow Nubia to recover and come from its shadows to rule all of Egypt and Nubia in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.).

PINUDJEM II (PINEDJEM II) (990–969 BCE). This High Priest of Amun at Thebes controlled Upper Egypt during the time of the rival 21st Dynasty at Tanis in the delta. Pinudjem II was a contemporary with Amenemope (993–984 BCE), Osorkon (the Elder), and Siamun (978–959 BCE).

PLINY, THE ELDER (23–79 CE). Pliny the Elder is most known for his work in thirty-seven volumes, Natural History, which provided an encyclopedic inventory of historical events, practical knowledge, and very detailed records of botany and anatomy, especially as they related to medicine practiced in the Nile valley. His caravan traveled from Alexandria to Berenice on the Red Sea and provided an important contemporary travel reference during the perilous times of early Christianity in the region. It was Pliny the Elder who reported the Roman counterraid into Nubia in 23 BCE. Pliny the Elder, Josephus, and Philo (q.v.) also wrote about the early Essene Christian community in Judaea that would influence the regional development of Christianity. “Admiral” Pliny was also a Roman naval commander who died in a vain attempt to rescue the people of Pompeii from the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in 79 CE.

PLINY, THE YOUNGER (PLINIUS GAIUS) (61–113 CE). Pliny the Younger was a Roman governor and legal adviser in Asia Minor in 112 CE, when he asked Emperor Trajan (q.v.) for legal advice about the policy and treatment of early Christians (q.v.). He decided to execute some of those not having Roman citizenship, while those having a political tie to Rome were sent there for judgment. Apparently, Trajan was much less concerned about this than was Pliny the Younger. His numerous letters to his emperor provide a dynamic account of the functioning of the Roman Empire at this period. In letters to Tacitus,
Pliny the Younger recorded the volcanic eruption of Mount Vesuvius in 79 CE in which his uncle, Pliny the Elder (q.v.), was killed.

**PLUTARCH** (45/50–120/7 CE). This well known, productive Greek historian and biographer wrote on many prominent Greek and Roman figures, especially military, in the earlier centuries. His work on Alexander the Great (q.v.) and Augustus (q.v.) provides much basic information on these men and is of great historical significance to the Nile valley. These were collected in a work known commonly as Plutarch’s Lives. Plutarch was a contemporary of such Roman emperors as Nero and Trajan (qq.v.). He was a deeply reflective and scholarly man of leisure and probably of a devout religious orientation. He was often critical of the writings of Herodotus (q.v.), especially in trying to reconcile the fact, fiction, and mythology that sometimes became intertwined in the work of Herodotus.

It is from Plutarch’s work on Alexander that we can learn about his military activities in Phoenicia (book xxiv), Alexander’s crossing of Sinai into Egypt to Pharos Island (books xxv–xxvi), and his use of cavalry in fighting against Persian (q.v.) military elephants (q.v.; book lx). In his work on Anthony (books xxvii–xxviii), we learn that Cleopatra VII (q.v.) spoke many languages, including that of the “Ethiopians” (contemporary Meroites), and that she was the first of the Ptolemies (q.v.) to speak Egyptian. In book lxxxi of Anthony, we learn that Cleopatra sent her son Caesarion (cf. Ptolemy XV), her son by Julius Caesar, with much treasure to India by way of “Ethiopia” (i.e., Nubia).

**POTTERY.** See A-GROUP; C-GROUP; KERMA; KHARTOUM MESOLITHIC; MEROË.

**PSAMTIK I, PSAAMMETICHUS I, WAHIBRE** (664–610 BCE). Following the very short reign of Necho I (q.v.), Psamtik I of Sais of the 26th Dynasty may be considered a successor to the delta princes Tefnakht and Bakenrenef, if one considers the Nubian Dynasty to be interlopers as he projected. On the other hand, Psamtik I could also be considered a puppet king for the Assyrian (q.v.) king Ashurbanipal (q.v.), who sought to wield power in Egypt through this local appointment in 663 BCE. By 656 BCE, Psamtik I had in fact established control of the delta and of Thebes itself. Then, when other powers conquered Assyria, Psamtik I was able to reclaim a unified Nile.
His connection to the 25th Dynasty was concretized by forcing the “adoption” of his daughter Nitocris (q.v.) as the God’s Wife of Amun (q.v.) in Thebes to legitimate his presence there. He also accepted the continuing role of Mentuemhat (q.v.) as the “Lord of Thebes.” It had been Mentuemhat who formerly served Taharka and Tanutamun (qq.v.). Numerous 25th Dynasty cartouches and Nubian iconography of the double uraeus were defaced at the time of Psamtik.

According to Herodotus, a very large number of the soldiers of Psamtik I went unpaid for three years, and in frustration they fled in a huge group to offer their services to the king of Meroë. There they became known as the Sembrita, who are reported on some early maps. At his death, Psamtik I was replaced by Pharaoh Necho II (q.v.). See also PIANKHY, KING.

PSAMTIK II, PSAMMETICHUS II, NEFERIBRE (595–589 BCE). This pharaoh of the Late period (q.v.) sought to rebuild the glories of the former New Kingdom (q.v.). In particular, he sought to reassert unitary Egyptian control over Nubia. While Nubia was certainly weak at this time, it seems that Psamtik II was overly ambitious. In 592 BCE, he attacked deep into Nubia with his Carian and Greek soldiers, who made some famous graffiti on the legs of the towering figure of Ramses II (q.v.) at Abu Simbel (q.v.). Elsewhere, in Judaea, Psamtik II sought a much more cautious and conciliatory policy in fear of the strength of the Babylonians.

PSAMTIK III (PSAMMETICHUS III, ANKH-RE) (526–525 BCE). Psamtik III was the last pharaoh of the Third Intermediate period. He was the successor to Amasis (q.v.). The Persian king Cambyses (q.v.) ended the very brief rule of Psamtik III. This incorporated Egypt within the expanding Persian (q.v.) Empire.

PTOLEMEUS, CLAUDIUS. This second-century geographer and astronomer lived in Alexandria between 127 and 151 CE. The precise dates of his birth and death are unclear. It should be made clear that Claudius Ptolemaeus was not a Ptolemaic ruler of Egypt since this Hellenistic epoch was already completed. However, he did continue the rich traditions of the Alexandrian geographer Eratosthenes (q.v.), and this made Ptolemaeus the last great ancient geographer.
Ptolemaus studied astronomy, mathematics, and cartography at Alexandria despite the fact that the library there may have begun its deterioration. He proposed that the earth was stationary and was circled by the sun, but he also recorded the places and regions of the ancient world with more accuracy than formerly known. His *Guide to Geography* described solar and lunar movements, eccentric planetary orbits, and the earth’s motion.

The geocentric geography of Ptolemaus established latitudinal lines that depicted the known circum-Mediterranean world. These were to last through the Dark Ages and until the European Renaissance and the Age of Exploration. Then, active site exploration found and corrected many long-lasting errors.

**PTOLEMIES.** Following the reign of Alexander the Great (q.v.), his successors quickly divided into the Seleucids of Asia and the Ptolemies of Egypt and Nubia. All the subsequent rulers of Hellenic Egypt were titled “Ptolemy” (q.v.) with the exception of Cleopatra VII (q.v.), who ruled in her own name. The Ptolemies followed Egyptian traditions of art, architecture, and theology but with a variety of adjustments and additions. Such included the addition of Greek-language texts that resulted in the famed Rosetta Stone and several cases of religious syncretism in which they merged Egyptian deities or linked Egyptian deities with their own. A prime example was the emergence of the god Serapis and of the expanded worship of the Apis bull cult at Memphis, which included a vast catacomb for bull mummies. During the three centuries of Ptolemaic rule, they built extensively at Alexandria and Memphis as well as other important Upper Egyptian temples at Esna, Edfu, and Kom Ombo. In Lower Nubia, the Ptolemies built in many places, such as Dakka, Dabod, Kalabsha, and Philae (qq.v.). Relations with contemporary Meroë were mostly cordial and linked these people in science and trade. Hostilities emerged only in sometimes contested parts of Lower Nubia (q.v.). During Ptolemaic times, the distribution of the arts and theology of ancient Egypt dispersed throughout the Mediterranean world and into Europe. By the time the Romans took over this empire, Isis (q.v.) was worshiped as far away as London, and Cestius built a Ptolemy-inspired pyramid in Rome. Among these many influences, certainly the creation of the great library at Alexandria and the neighboring lighthouse at Pharos were among the most significant.
PTOLEMY I, MERYAMUN, SOTER I ("THE SAVIOR") (305–282 BCE). This first Ptolemy had been a personal friend of Alexander the Great (q.v.), and he began the new Lagide dynastic line of the Ptolemaic administration of Egypt. At Philae (q.v.) in Nubia, Ptolemy I may have been inspired by remnants of a shrine perhaps started by Taharka (q.v.) to build an even larger temple to the goddess Isis (q.v.). This important temple may have been started late in his reign, as it appears to have been constructed more by Ptolemy II (q.v.) and other Ptolemaic successors.

The capital of the Ptolemies was in Alexandria, where Ptolemy I began the library and museum in 285 BCE. Writing was done on papyrus and waxed tables for this collection. His other remarkable construction was the massive three-tiered lighthouse at Pharos. This edifice was said to have been 109 meters in height, and it long remained a wonder of the ancient world until the Eiffel Tower exceeded it. During his time, the Jews (q.v.) of Alexandria numbered at least tens of thousands if not over 150,000; they formed the first Jewish quarters in that new city, making this the largest Jewish urban population in the world. Jewish communities were also established in the Fayum. Depending on source, the Jews were deported to Egypt or welcomed and protected there at this point, and many served as his mercenary troops. The Greeks allowed the Jews to be ruled by their own council of elders (ethnarchs), unlike the local Egyptians. These elders were appointed to rule Jews in Alexandria and in Jerusalem at this time. The great geometrician Euclid died in Alexandria in 285 BCE during the life of Ptolemy I. When Ptolemy I abdicated, his son Ptolemy II began to reign. A huge statue of Ptolemy I was found underwater in Alexandria in 1996, amidst a new surge in the technology of underwater archaeology.

PTOLEMY II, USERKAENRE, PHILADELPHUS ("BROTHER LOVER") (285–246 BCE). The name of this Ptolemy is ironic since it is believed that he executed two of his brothers. It was during his reign that the Ptolemaic priest Manetho (q.v.) wrote his significant and lasting history and chronology of Egyptian pharaohs. A major expansion of the library in Alexandria took place under Ptolemy II. His father started this institution on a small scale. This famed collection hired seventy-two translators to collect all known books of the world, resulting in about 500,000 papyrus scrolls. A major addition to
the library resulted from the acquisition of the library of Aristotle, who had died in 322 BCE. These were the times of the noted cataloger Callimachus and the great scientist and geographer Eratosthenes (q.v.). It was during the reign of Ptolemy II that other areas of scientific research were broadly encouraged. This also included his creation of a great Alexandrian royal zoo that acquired a vast array of wild and domestic animals, birds, and reptiles from throughout his empire and from Nubia.

Ptolemy II took special interest in maritime trade for his fleet, said to number 4,000 vessels. To facilitate trade, he expanded the work on the canal system begun by Necho II (q.v.) and continued by the Persians (q.v.) to connect the eastern Nile delta with the Red Sea (q.v.). His wife and full sister was Arsinoë II, after divorcing his first wife of the same name. Arsinoë was also the name of his port at what is today the port of Suez. His naval and commercial fleet was huge. The Red Sea port of Berenice was named for his daughter and served the trade town of Aswan (q.v.) while the port of Quseir served Thebes.

These ports took on added importance for upgrading the maritime link to Meroë (q.v.) and other East African destinations. Meroë was significant for ivory (q.v.), slaves, livestock, and shipments of elephants (q.v.) for military purposes. The reign of Ptolemy II overlapped with that of Arkamani I (q.v.) of Meroë, who was able to speak Greek. This was during a heyday of Meroë, when cattle and elephant exports were significant and local iron (q.v.) production was at a high level. Arkamani I was the first king to be buried at Meroë, as the importance of this capital shifted the regional center of gravity from Napata (q.v.) to the Butana (qq.v.). Ptolemy II largely completed the Isis (q.v.) temple at Philae (q.v.) as well as the waterside entrance to this complex.

In 281 BCE, Seleucus I annexed Asia Minor, thus seizing a substantial portion of what Alexander had earlier won. The Seleucid and Ptolemaic rivalry for the eastern Mediterranean was long enduring. Some sentiment against the Jews (q.v.) in Alexandria continued under Ptolemy II.

PTOLEMY III, SEKHEMANKHRE, EUERGETES I (“THE BENEFACTOR”) (246–222 BCE). Ptolemy III was the eldest son of Arsinoë I, first wife of Ptolemy II (q.v.). His wife was Berenice II. It
was during the long reign of Ptolemy III that major expansion of the library of Alexandria took place under Eratosthenes (q.v.). That famed librarian–geographer later became the personal tutor of Ptolemy IV (q.v.). Ptolemy III’s constructions in Nubia appear to be limited to some final decoration to the antechamber of the forecourt at Philae (q.v.), which was done in his name and that of his wife Berenice, as well as installing a granite offering stand in the inner sanctum of the Isis (q.v.) temple.

Ptolemy III built on the maritime developments of Ptolemy II with expanded trade to Adulis (q.v.) on the Red Sea, for trade with Axum (q.v.) as well as Meroë (q.v.). Ptolemy III sent at least one expedition to Nubia (q.v.) that was led by Eudoxus. Although the trade to India was beyond the reach of Ptolemy III, commodities from the Far East were accessible in the port towns of Yemen. The ambitious projects of Ptolemy III came at a price of heavy taxation on Egypt, ultimately discrediting and weakening the subsequent Ptolemies.

PTOLEMY IV, SETEP-PTAH-USER-KA-RE, PHILOPATOR (“FATHER LOVER”) (222–205 BCE). Ptolemy IV was the eldest son of Ptolemy III and the brother of Ptolemy VI. His route to power included the murder of his mother, Berenice, since she had backed his brother as king. During his reign, on June 23, 217 BCE, the battle of Raphia (Rafah) took place at the border between Egypt and Palestine (i.e., the boundary between Seleucid and Ptolemaic Greeks in the modern Gaza Strip section of Palestine). This battle demonstrated the difficulties of the effective military use of Nubian elephants (qq.v.) that had, until that time, been commonly exported from Meroë (q.v.) to Ptolemaic Egypt via the Red Sea (q.v.) and the port of Berenice. The future Ptolemy IV had to be rescued by his father, Ptolemy III, during the battle. According to Polybius, even though victory fell to Ptolemy IV, the damage done by his elephants to his own troops meant that their import declined sharply thereafter. The narrow victory at Raphia was also achieved by the acceptance of Egyptian soldiers on the side of Ptolemy IV. They had been excluded from military service before, so this new level of Egyptian empowerment was soon to reverberate in increasing weakness for Ptolemaic rule.

The Hellenization of Jews (q.v.) increased to the extent that much Jewish literature was written in Greek at this time. In some instances,
this Hellenization was required, such as the demand that Jews recognize the god Dionysius and that threats and pressures were directed against Jews to encourage them to abandon their god in favor of the Greek pantheon. Various instances of state-backed intolerance of the Jews occurred at this point. One infamous case during the reign of Ptolemy IV was to cast a group of 500 Jews in the path of war elephants crazed by fermented drinks so that they would be trampled to death. These potential victims were delivered from this fate “by an angel.”

In Nubia (q.v.), Ptolemy IV completed the construction of the temple at Dakka (q.v.). It was during the last years of Ptolemy IV that a Theban revolt broke Ptolemaic control of the unified Nile (q.v.). The deteriorated relations with Jews were about the same as with the Nubians, who had taken some important leadership in the revolt. In 207 BCE, a Nubian king was reported as ruling from Thebes, as had been the case earlier in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). At this low point in Ptolemaic rule, a convergent interest arose between Jews, Nubians, and some Theban Egyptians to seek the expulsion of the Greeks.

PTOLEMY V, SEKHSEM-ANKH-AMUN, EPIPHANES (“THE MANIFEST”) (205–180 BCE). Officially, Ptolemy V came to power at the age of five as the son of Ptolemy IV (q.v.). His effective reign did not begin until 196 BCE, when he reached his majority. In 193 BCE, Ptolemy V married Cleopatra I (of Seleucid origins), who ruled for as long as four years before her son could rise to the throne. This established a model of female rule or coregency that continued until the very end of the Ptolemies under Cleopatra VII (q.v.).

Ptolemy V is probably most known for the fact that his coronation at Memphis was recorded on the famed Rosetta Stone, written in hieroglyphics, Greek, and demotic (q.v.), which had been erected along the Rosetta Branch of the Nile (q.v.). The French recovered the stone 2,000 years later, and its trilingual text became a central key for the decipherment of ancient hieroglyphics and, to a much lesser extent, for Meroitic (q.v.) writing. The library of Alexandria continued to thrive under Ptolemy V, and the monopoly on papyrus maintained this product as an important Egyptian export.

Relative to Upper Egypt and Nubia (q.v.), Ptolemy V spent considerable effort trying to reconstruct Greek control of these regions.
At Philae (q.v.), Ptolemy V and his wife Cleopatra I expressed their gratitude to the god Asklepius on the occasion of the birth of their son. At Seheil (q.v.) Island, using an archaic reference at the prominent “Famine stela,” Ptolemy V made his religiously based claim for ownership of Lower Nubia (q.v.).

In Jerusalem, Ptolemy V massacred and looted Jews (q.v.) in the context of Seleucid rivalries. The forceful repression of Jews and coerced obligation to worship the god Jupiter in their temple triggered the subsequent Maccabean revolt of the Jews. Ultimately, Ptolemy V represented a brief halt in the decline of the Ptolemies, as he did manage to hold on to Cyprus and thus stave off further Roman expansion, but at the same time his murder in 180 BCE began the final decline of weak Ptolemaic rulers and the final collapse of the Ptolemies and their replacement by Roman rule in 31 BCE.

PTOLEMY VI, SETEP-EN-PTAH-KHEPRI, PHILOMETOR (“MOTHER LOVER”) (180–164, 163–145 BCE). Ptolemy VI was the brother of Ptolemy IV (q.v.) and son of Cleopatra I. Similar to his predecessor, Ptolemy VI came to power at age seven, so his mother, Cleopatra I, ruled in his name. Following the model of his father, Ptolemy VI ruled as a coregent with his wife, Cleopatra II.

Relative to Nubia (q.v.) and Upper Egypt, control was forcefully reestablished by Ptolemy VI during his second reign, when the gold mines of Nubia were brought back into production. At Philae (q.v.), Ptolemy VI installed a temple to Arensnuphis (q.v.), and he began the hypostyle hall and antechamber reliefs of the temple of Kom Ombo, whose ruins are still seen today. In Lower Nubia (q.v.), he enlarged the temple of Dabod (q.v.).

Whatever strength he recovered in Nubia, he lost elsewhere. By the time of Ptolemy VI, control of Jerusalem had returned to the Seleucids. When the Seleucid Antiochus IV sought to require the Jews (q.v.) to worship Jupiter in the Jerusalem temple, this provoked the Maccabean revolt, which temporarily restored Jewish independence. In this context and because of the Jewish resistance to Ptolemy V, Ptolemy VI permitted the Jew Onias to construct a temple at Leontopolis. He also used Jews as soldiers and officers in his army. These acts recovered some lost trust between Jews and Greeks, but their relations were maintained in a state of mutual vigilance.
Added to this mixture were Greek–Nubian and Greek–Egyptian relations. While the intermarriage of Greeks, Egyptians, Nubians, and Jews was sometimes formally excluded, it is also known that this prohibition was not infrequently violated. Moreover, syncretic religious beliefs were common among the majority polytheists, but this excluded the more orthodox among the monotheist Jews. Almost always, the Ptolemies took formal Egyptian names, and they worshiped at Egyptian shrines, such as the Apis bull cult at Memphis, the Bochis bull cult at Hermontis, and the syncretic Serapis shrine in Alexandria.

In the distance, in 146 BCE, in the last year of the reign of Ptolemy VI, a major, threatening shift in Mediterranean power took place. After three Punic Wars, Romans finally managed to defeat their longtime Phoenician rivals at Carthage (modern Tunisia). In the same year, Romans destroyed Corinth and seized Athens. In this context, Roman pressure was rapidly mounting on a weak Ptolemaic administration in Egypt, and in about a century, Romans would be at war even with Nubia.

**PTOLEMY VII, NEOS PHILOPATOR (145 BCE)**. This Ptolemaic king ruled for only one year before he was murdered. Essentially, he served as an interregnum king between Ptolemy VI (q.v.) and the second reign of Ptolemy VIII (q.v.) as they passed into their last century of rule of Egypt. He completed some decorative detail at the Isis temple of Philae in Nubia (qq.v.).

**PTOLEMY VIII, EUERGETES II (“THE BENEFACCTOR”) (170–163, 145–116 BCE)**. A crisis period followed from the death of Ptolemy VI (q.v.) and the very brief rule of his nephew Ptolemy VII. Thus, Ptolemy VIII, nicknamed “Physicon” (“the Fat Stomach”), was returned to the throne to try to reach détente with the expanding and imperial Romans. His sudden flight to Cyprus from Alexandria in 130 BCE and rule by his wife Berenice suggest the instability of these times.

His constructions in Nubia (q.v.) include additions to the Dakka and Dabod (qq.v.) temples. At Philae (q.v.), Ptolemy VIII installed a pair of obelisks and some reliefs at the Mammisi there. Elsewhere in Upper Egypt, he continued work on the temple at Kom Ombo.

He was hostile to the Jews (q.v.) since they had backed his brother. On one occasion, he sought to have them trampled to death by milii-
tary elephants (q.v.), but they were spared by the intervention of his mistress. Some sources attribute this event to the time of Ptolemy IV instead. By the time of Ptolemy VIII, Greek ships regularly sailed on the Red Sea (q.v.) and to Meroitic ports. They began to sail beyond Yemen into the Indian Ocean to Pakistan and India for trade. Eudoxus of Cyzicus was specifically employed for this trade mission to India.

PTOLEMY IX, SOTER II (“THE SAVIOR”) (116–110, 109–107, 88–80 BCE). Ptolemy IX was the eldest son of Ptolemy VIII (q.v.), and he came to power with the death of his father. By this time, the Ptolemies had now lost Judaea and Cyrene (Libya) to Roman administration as the Greek Empire steadily withered. In Nubia at Philae (q.v.), Ptolemy IX added some reliefs to the third chamber of the Mammisi and to the Hathor (q.v.) temple. Reliefs were also added to the Kom Ombo temple. His death in 80 BCE saw the brief rule of his wife for several months until Ptolemy XI could assume power for another very brief reign.

PTOLEMY X, ALEXANDER I (110–109, 107–88 BCE). Periodically replacing his older brother, Ptolemy X came to power in 110 BCE. He was married to Cleopatra III from about 106 to 101 BCE. In about 102 BCE, Cleopatra III had some thought of recovering Israel, but the influential role of Alexandrian Jews (q.v.) managed to halt this initiative. It was during the reign of Ptolemy X that Julius Caesar (q.v.) was born in Rome in 100 BCE. The remaining decades for Greek rule of Egypt and peaceful Greco–Nubian relations were now numbered. The death of Ptolemy X in 88 BCE brought Ptolemy IX back to power for a third administration.

PTOLEMY XI, ALEXANDER II (80 BCE). Ptolemy XI replaced Ptolemy IX, who had been recalled to serve very briefly. On his death, Berenice ruled very briefly until her murder. This was followed by only a few weeks of the administration of Ptolemy XI, who was also murdered by the outraged elite of Alexandria. The changes and confusion of this late period of Ptolemaic rule were matched with temple epigraphy. Amidst this great political turbulence, only the general name “pharaoh” began to be inscribed in the royal cartouche in temples in Egypt and Nubia (q.v.). From the start to the end of brief
administrations, time was insufficient to complete large or complex
construction projects. In the case of Ptolemy XI, no clearly known
cartouche exists, and this confusion has sometimes resulted in con-
tradictions in the numbering system of the remaining Ptolemies.

PTOLEMY XIII. Ptolemy XIII temporarily blocked the spread of Ro-
man troops into Egypt once his father, Ptolemy XII (q.v.), declared
him as the joint heir of Egypt and Lower Nubia (q.v.) with Cleopatra
VII (q.v.). When civil war broke out in Rome in 49 BCE, between
Julius Caesar (q.v.) and Pompey, this gave some short-lived addi-
tional life to Ptolemaic Egypt. The death of Pompey in Egypt soon
provoked a struggle for power between Cleopatra VIII and Ptolemy
XIII. But when Caesar met Cleopatra VII in Alexandria, he supported
her claim to the Egyptian throne. This precipitated the Alexandrian
civil war, in which Ptolemy XIII lost his life and Cleopatra VII
gained her precarious and famed access to power.

PTOLEMY XIV (XV). Ptolemy XIV was a junior brother of Cleopatra
VII (q.v.), with whom she briefly ruled (and married) as the official
coregent. He quickly vanished from the political scene in Alexandria.

PTOLEMY XV (XVI), IWAPANNETJER, “CAESARION” (36–30
BCE). Caesarion was the son of Cleopatra VII (q.v.) and Julius Caesar
(q.v.). While he was the official Ptolemaic king, it was his mother
who certainly ruled. In the famed image of Cleopatra VII at Dendera
temple, she is shown presenting “Cesarion” to the goddess Hathor
(q.v.). In the bloody transition to Roman power in Egypt and Lower
Nubia (q.v.), Caesarion was a dispensable threat and link to the past
that Caesar Augustus (q.v.) clearly wanted to leave behind. Greek
rule in Egypt and Nubia was utterly terminated with the death of
Ptolemy XV.

PUNT, TO-NETER. Punt is a region along the western Red Sea
(q.v.) coast of northeastern Africa with which the Egyptians spo-
radically traded from as early as the 5th Dynasty (2498–2345 BCE)
on. Egypt relied on Punt as a source of numerous luxury goods, in-
cluding ebony, ivory, and incense (qq.v.), as well as slaves, gold,
and exotic animals, such as monkeys and baboons, and rare cu-
riosities, such as pygmies. This legendary territory in the “Land of the South” probably is along the modern Sudanese and Eritrean coast, and the port of Adulis (q.v.) may represent a remnant of this trading region. Others propose that it may relate to or be the neighbor of Khent Hunnefer, which is approximately the region from the Nile (q.v.) to the Red Sea. This is about the same region as the land associated with the Blemmyes (q.v.). It was once proposed that Punt was as far south as modern Somalia. Another argument, by David O’Connor, posits the location of Punt in the Pre-Axumite (q.v.) Gash delta of modern coastal Eritrea. Perhaps it was a general reference to both coasts of the southern Red Sea. Ancient ports at Adulis or Suakin may have been those visited on a voyage to Punt. In any case, Punt was conceived as being associated with Kush (q.v.), suggesting that it was not as far as modern Somalia, which is substantially farther south.

Punt was accessible by seafaring Egyptian boats throughout much of the New Kingdom (q.v.). The most celebrated voyage to Punt was undertaken during the ninth year of the reign of Queen Hatshepsut (q.v.; 1473–1458 BCE) of the 18th Dynasty. Punt is depicted on the second terrace of her mortuary temple at Deir al-Bahri in western Thebes. According to these inscriptions, Punt was a source of spices (cinnamon), perfumes and incense (gum and myrrh), ivory, exotic animals (monkeys, giraffes, leopards, dogs, and panthers), antimony, ebony, gold, animal skins, and live trees (fruit and sycamore). These trade items were valued in Egypt as much for their utility as for their unique origin. Overland routes may also have reached Punt from the Nile valley or from South Arabia.

The appearance of small round houses raised on platforms is clear in the Deir al-Bahri inscription, but such are known only in southern Sudan today. The flora and fauna depicted in Egyptian reliefs also correspond with those of southern Sudan. Another feature of the inscription is the presence of a very fat (steatopygous) woman who may have been in some honorific position. The possible movements of the coastal Puntites from their hinterland, and other ancient ethnographic and ecological changes, further complicate this picture. Thus, the precise location of Punt has been difficult to determine without reference to a modern place-name. [R. Lobban with k. rhodes]
PYRAMIDS. The funerary pyramid tradition of ancient Egypt started by Pharaohs Djoser (q.v.) and Senefru (q.v.) in Archaic times was dominant through the Old and Middle Kingdoms. Generally, this was abandoned in the New Kingdom, which favored rock-cut tombs except for such instances at the workers village of Deir al-Medina. In these last cases, the form and function of the pyramid differed from the earlier types, which usually had burial in the superstructure versus the form that had burial beneath.

When Nubians came to power in Egypt in the 25th Dynasty, they restored pyramid construction in Nubia but not in Egypt. Royal pyramids were then known from this time through Napatan and Meroitic times. They typically included an attached funerary chapel that was not an entrance into the tomb itself. The burials were in sometimes multiroomed chambers below. The pyramids were much steeper and very slightly stepped compared with those of Old Kingdom Egypt. In later Napatan and Meroitic times, a variant form of Nubian bed burial was restored, and mummification faded away. See also DEDUN; FERLINI; KURRU; LEPSIUS; MEROË; NAPATA; NASTASEN; NURI; TAHARKA.

QADAN. The Qadan complex is typical of the late Paleolithic (q.v.) from about 12,000 to 5000 BCE in Lower Nubia (q.v.). This megafauna hunting tradition has left numerous flakes and blade microliths and may represent a northern extension of a “Negro” race (q.v.) of people. One of the best-known and intriguing examples of the Qadan type is at Site 117 at Jebel Sahaba (q.v.).

QASR EL-WIZZ. The associated church, workshop, refectory, tombs, and small monastery at Qasr el-Wizz were active from the ninth to the twelfth century. This walled settlement was located just downstream from the regional capital at Faras (q.v.) within Lower Nubia (q.v.). Most of Nubian Christianity (q.v.) lacked a major monastic life, but this was a major element for this site. Thus, some of the treasures recovered included illuminated prayer books made and used by the local monks. One that is preserved in the Cairo Coptic Museum (Room
17) is written in Coptic and matches a parallel copy in Old Nubian. The Oriental Institute of Chicago documented the religious paintings of Qasr el-Wizz before they were lost under Lake Nasser.

**QASR IBRIM, PEDEME, PRIMIS, IBRIM, SHIMAL.** The remarkable site of Qasr Ibrim was situated on a lofty promontory point that was visited in the New Kingdom (q.v.) by the viceroys of Kush (q.v.) serving Amenhotep I, Seti I (q.q.v.), and other pharaohs of the 18th Dynasty (q.v.) and the 19th Dynasty. A stela of Seti I from Qasr Ibrim has been transported to New Kalabsha (q.v.). Its original location also offered visible places for the viceroys of Nubia to carve inscriptions into the rock face to record the tributes gathered under their administration. For example, the viceroy of Seti I noted 1,000 man-loads of ebony, ten men with live panthers, and 250 with perfume and aromatic woods along with the total of 2,667 bearers with gold, ivory (q.v.), minerals, dogs, oxen, and cattle. The great height of the original site gave a wide-sweeping view to the west as well as a very long stretch of the Nile, and a usual sandbar along the western shore pushed river craft closer to the base of Qasr Ibrim, giving it great strategic significance.

Taharka (q.v.) of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) reconstructed an Amun temple at Qasr Ibrim in his name, and it was used in subsequent Napatan times when this territory was under Nubian control. Brief use apparently was made of Qasr Ibrim in early and then late Ptolemaic times. After 23 BCE, the Romans made heavy military use of the easily defended fort, which sometimes served as their forward border point with the Meroites (q.v.). This was especially the case during the time of Caesar Augustus (q.v.), who based the troops of Petronius (q.v.) there in preparation for a counterattack against the Meroites who had earlier attacked Romans garrisons in Aswan (q.v.). Perhaps as early as the mid-first century CE until the fourth century CE, Meroitic and Blemmye (q.v.) peoples sporadically used the site when the Romans were not controlling the region. Later, Christians (q.v.) transformed Taharka’s temple into a church on the site.

In still later Islamic times, Qasr Ibrim continued to be used. For example, in his twelfth-century reign, Turanshah based his effort at Qasr Ibrim to force Islamic conversion on the local population of Nobatia (q.v.). In the early sixteenth century, Sultan Selim used the same small
location as a base for his Bosnian troops to guard the border with Nubia and shift the cathedral use to that of a mosque. Given the great length of its occupation, this site has a remarkable stratigraphy, and the hot, dry Nubian weather has resulted in excellent preservation of texts in a half dozen languages (including demotic, Meroitic, Greek, Latin, and Arabic), on papyrus, leather goods, and textiles. Its great elevation has meant that it has been somewhat protected from the flood of Lake Nasser, although the site is very much at risk from erosion and tourist boats. The once-high cliff is now reduced to a small island where very limited archaeological research continues at the present.

**QASR ICO.** Qasr Ico is a Christian site excavated by Martin Almagro and Francisco Presedo Velo of the Spanish UNESCO campaign to salvage Nubian antiquities from 1961 to 1962. It is located at the Second Cataract about sixteen kilometers from Wadi Halfa (q.v.) and consists of small square churches and a small associated settlement site. Both churches had a central domed ceiling, arched doorways, and traces of simple polychrome religious frescoes of angels, the Virgin Mary and Christ, and other themes painted on stuccoed walls. The houses and churches were made of stone and mud. Ceramics found at the site were typical for Christianity in Nubia (q.v.) and included bowls of various sizes and shapes and flat dishes. Both had simple geometric decoration. This small Christian village probably was begun in the mid-ninth century CE and may have continued until the fourteenth century. It was under the authority of Faras (q.v.).

**QUBAN, KUBBAN, BAKI, CONTRA PSELCHIS.** Quban was a strategic fort guarding the route to the rich copper and gold mines of Wadi al-Allaqi (q.v.), at least by the times of the Middle Kingdom if not before. Its importance was maintained through the New Kingdom (q.v.). Directly across from Quban was Pselchis, which became the site for the Greco-Roman Dakka (q.v.) temple. Stones from Dakka are inscribed with the cartouches of Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III (q.q.v.) and may well have come from temples built in their honor at Quban or its immediate vicinity. The relocated Wadi es-Sebua (q.v.) temple has some reliefs of Ramses II (q.v.) on the southern chapel offering food and incense to a seated Horus of Quban (Baki).
QUSTUL. Qustul is located in Lower Nubia (q.v.) on the eastern bank of the Nile (q.v.) approximately across from the Christian capital of Nobatia at Faras (qq.v). Its history is long and complex, as it enters the archaeological record as early as the A-Group (q.v.) and reappears during the New Kingdom (q.v.) as well as in Meroitic (q.v.) times (with small nonroyal pyramids and chapels). In A-Group times, Qustul cemeteries show a certain degree of social stratification, judging by tomb size and the quality of grave goods. It was especially interesting to note that some of the largest graves were devoted to females. This gave rise to speculation that this was an early example of Nubian state formation with regnant queens. Precisely what relation Qustul had with Archaic Egyptians is debated, but by the Old Kingdom (q.v.), either Qustul was rendered subordinate to Egypt or its Tasetiu (q.v.) population fled southward.

In X-Group or Ballana (qq.v.) times, Qustul features the large grave tumulae of post-Meroitic kings from the fourth to sixth centuries CE, found in the excavations by Walter Emery (q.v.). The biggest is over fifty meters in diameter and almost ten meters high. These tumulae show a resumption of funerary sacrifice of horses and numerous other animals and servants. Bed burials for the kings are like those in Kerma (q.v.) times. Its arid location has given rise to a high degree of preservation of human tissues and bones as well as textiles and leather clothing and shields. Well-made silver crowns, swords, spears, and horse trappings attest to considerable wealth at Qustul. Icons of Isis and Amun (in a ram form) are retained on the jeweled crowns. Since the flooding of Lake Nasser, Qustul is no longer available for investigation.

RACE. “Race” is considered to be a genetically inherited aspect of human society. However, with advances in the study of human biology and with the complex interrelations between all human groups, the categorization of humanity into discrete racial groups has lost considerable scientific meaning. Indeed, the anthropological “science of race” has become one in which the concept is seen more as a social construct than as biological, despite the fact that one’s genotype is the
foundation for the phenotype. In the case of Nubia (q.v.), the great antiquity and diversity of interactions in the Nile valley finds modern “racial” terms lacking. The people of Nubia certainly are African in the modern continental sense, but this can also include those of Middle Eastern, Asian, and European origins as well, since all humanity has African roots.

In ancient Egypt, Nubians were given a variety of names. These ranged from the probable ethnic label of Ta-Nehesi (q.v.) to the more problematic implication of the Ta-Setiu (q.v.), referring to the land of the “Bow People,” to the clearly pejorative reference to “the vile Nubians,” which was common during imperial Egypt in the New Kingdom domination of Nubia. The reference to the Nubian kingdom of Yam or Irem (q.v.) seems to be the kingdom of Kerma (q.v.) as a place-name rather than specifying anything racial. Other place-names in Egyptian hieroglyphics can be correlated with specific locations, but many cannot be determined with accuracy. Since Nubians did not use writing until their exposure to hieroglyphics, we can discover their reference to themselves only as coming from Kush (q.v.) or later with Meroitic writing (q.v.) as the people who followed their own deities.

Complicating the interpretation of the ancient racial picture to a great extent is that the term “Nubia” or “Nobata” (q.v.) probably is derived from the Egyptian word nb, for “gold.” Then, by an ethnic gloss, it became the sweeping reference for all peoples living south of Aswan (q.v.). Potentially more confusing in terms of “race” is that the ancient states of Nubia, such as Kerma, the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), Napata (q.v.), and Meroë, certainly were based on a slave trade conducted by their own raids in these regions. Thus, the millennia of the Nile valley slave trade has made the “race” concept in Nubia particularly evasive, since most Nubians have very plural “racial” origins, unlike those populations of Nilotics, Darfur (q.v.), or the Nuba (q.v.) Mountains, who are far more homogeneous in their genetic admixtures.

In Greco-Roman times, the picture was further clouded with the arrival of the racioethnic term “Aethiopia,” referring to all lands south of Egypt as the “Lands of the burnt-face people.” When Arab travelers entered the region, they simply translated this Greek concept to be the “Land of the Blacks,” or Bilad as Sudan in Arabic. By
this time, any ethnic precision was lost, and the phenotypical skin color was determinative of “race.”

Notions of being “Arabs” are also confounding in many ways, as this term has special sociopolitical connotations today, and the precise meaning in Arabic meaning “nomads” is anachronistic in the modern world. If one uses the term “Negroid” and perhaps has a Nigerian in mind, then most ancient Nubians do not comfortably fit this phenotype, and southern Nilotic peoples are also easily distinguishable. Some feel more comfortable with an “Afro-Arab” mélange for some northern Sudanese, but this does not work for Nilotic people in the south. This does not cover many other groups, such as Nubians, Nuba, some Bantu, Adamawa, pre-Nilotes, Nilohamites, Fellata, Fur, and Sudanic groups. Indeed, at this level, the confusion between language and race becomes even greater. In the Sudanese case, such admixture has occurred between indigenous and exogenous ethnic and linguistic groups for so long that “racial” phenotypes become most challenging to apply with any rigor or scientific meaning.

On the other hand, interesting genotypic studies of Sudanese people have been advanced in recent years. Ahmed Batrawi did one of the most systematic of such studies in 1945–1946 in a two-article series in the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. This seminal study was based on detailed craniometric studies of Nubian and Egyptian crania drawn from the Predynastic to Christian periods. Readers are referred to this work, but among his main findings were the following: “1) There was no evidence of a progressive change in variability corresponding to the chronological sequence of the populations. 2) The A-Group [Nubians] had the least variability. 3) The variabilities of the Nubian populations examined were close to the variabilities of ancient Egyptian populations” (Batrawi 1945:91). He also states that all the series represent variants of a single stock and that the A-Group is parental to the population that followed it (Batrawi 1946:154). Also of interest is his conclusion that “in Lower Nubia a slight infiltration of Negroid influence is observed during the Middle Kingdom times. In the New Empire period, however, the southern Egyptian type prevails again. After the New Empire, a fresh and much stronger Negro influence becomes discernable till the end of the Roman period” (Batrawi 1946:155). He also notes that the
abundant close connections between the grades of Nubian and Upper Egyptian series of those early kingdoms show clearly the persistence of the Predynastic cranial type in a large area over a long span of time (Batrawi 1946:144).

In short, the “race” of Nubians in earlier times is closely linked to that of Upper Egyptians, which can in turn be distinguished from Lower (northern) Egyptians. As time passed, the Nubian and Upper Egyptian distinction was blurred, with Nubians withdrawing or being pushed more into modern Nubia and more Egyptians occupying Nubia. As a result, the precise “racial” lines to be drawn today may only be clear in the extremes of Lower Egypt and Upper Nubia (q.v.) and not in the in-between grades of Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia (q.v.).

RAMSES I (1295–1294 BCE). Ramses I was a short-lived pharaoh, but father of Seti I (q.v.) and grandfather of Ramses II (q.v.). From his Memphis capital, Ramses I decreed endowments of food and servants for his priests at the Buhen (q.v.) temple in Nubia (q.v.).

RAMSES II, USER-MAAT-RE SETEPENRE (1279–1212 BCE). Few Egyptian pharaohs lived so long, had so many offspring, or ruled such as extensive empire as Ramses II. This red-haired monarch has been admired and feared for ages. Since his biography is quite well known, hardly any debate exists that he was the greatest pharaoh in the glorious age of the New Kingdom. He is even cited in the Bible (in Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers) and in the poetry of Shelley. His monumental constructions are found far to the north in Lebanon, in the delta, and at the vast Upper Egyptian temples of Karnak, Luxor, and Abydos, where bound Nubians are shown under his authority and where his additions were of unprecedented quantity and size. His battle at Kadesh against the Hittites, the purported Exodus of the Jews, the vast storehouse temple precinct known as the Ramesseum, his celebrated wife Nefertari, and his tomb (KV 7) in the Valley of the Kings are some of the features that are most noted by Egyptologists. His mummy is also well known, as it luckily was retrieved intact at the royal mummy cache in Deir al-Bahri in 1881.

Ramses II built in Nubia (q.v.) on the same huge scale as he had elsewhere. Here his monumental works are to be found at the majestic shrine Abu Simbel (q.v.), protected by Re-Harakhty at which is
guarded by his famous four colossal (eighteen meters) figures. This grandiose rock-hewn temple gives another account of his "victory" at the battle of Qadesh around 1274 BCE, the suppression of Libyans, and a rebellion at Irem (Kerma) in Nubia. The careful alignment of the temple with the sun on the solar altar focuses on the gods Amun, Ptah, Re-Harakhty, and the deified Ramses II himself. Near this great work is a somewhat lesser temple to Hathor (q.v.), built to honor his wife Nefertari. Probably in 1269 BCE, this monumental complex was initiated by Heqa-Nakht, his viceroy of Nubia (q.v.). The subsequent overseer was his viceroy Iuny. Iuny based his construction-foreman role from the vice-regnal town later known as Amara West (q.v.).

This complex was completed in about 1255 BCE, just prior to the death of his beloved Nefertari. At Abu Simbel, the Decree of Ptah announces a subsequent marriage to a daughter of the great king Hattusil. Iuny was also in charge of a temple for Ramses II at Aksha (q.v.).

A text at Quban (q.v.) in Nubia suggests that Prince Ramses II was officially given a military command at age ten. Much later, also at the strategic site at Quban, Ramses ordered his viceroy of Kush to build a series of wells to the Wadi al-Allaqi (q.v.) gold fields, probably to help increase gold production. Other Nubian temples built for Ramses II are numerous, including Bait al-Wali (q.v.), which likely was built early in his Nubian campaigns before he was deified at Abu Simbel. The mention of his senior son by Nefertari hints that he might have been preparing for coregency transition. Numerous inscriptions of Ramses II are to be found on Seheil Island (q.v.), where he invokes the Triad of Elephantine (q.v.): Khnum, Anqet, and Satet (qq.v.). It was also common in the temples of Ramses II to invoke the spirit of the god Hapi, who tied together the waters of the Nile (q.v.).

Ramses II’s viceroy Setau was in charge of the construction at the Gerf Hussein (q.v.) temple, which shows Ramses II and the god Ptah as united. In about 1236 BCE, at the rebuilt semi-rock-cut temple of Wadi as-Sebua (q.v.), Ramses II ordered Setau to inscribe the names of about thirty of his sons and portray a symbolic merger of himself with the god Amun. Both temples were built of poor-quality local Nubian sandstone and were built rather late in the rule of Ramses, so neither is considered of the same high standard as his other monumental works.

The Wadi as-Sebua temple was built with forced Tjemehu (Libyan?) labor under the direction of Setau. Perhaps these were captives from
raids against the Libyans at Dunqul and Kurkur Oases (q.v.) to the west of the Nile in Lower Nubia. Perhaps the raiding party of Setau even went as far south at the Selima Oasis (q.v.), which was in the desert hinterland of Ramses-Town at Amara West (q.v.). In any case, Setau performed faithfully for his lord Ramses II as a tribute taker from Nubia.

At Derr (q.v.) temple, Ramses II honored himself and the falcon god Re-Harakhty. At al-Lessiya (q.v.), Ramses II renewed the worship of Amun along with the Nubian deities Satet and Dedun (qq.v.). Even into Upper Nubia at Napata (q.v.), inscriptions are known for Ramses II. Ramses II’s foreign and military preoccupations lay mainly to the north and in the Levant, but punitive attacks against Kerma (q.v.) were led by four his sons in the fifteenth and twentieth years of his reign. This resulted in taking 7,000 captives back to Egypt.

Ramses III, User-Maat-Re Meryamun (1182–1151 BCE).

Ramses III probably was the last of the great New Kingdom (q.v.) pharaohs, as few afterward could control so effectively for so long. Perhaps his strength was a function of the regional chaos, especially among Mediterranean Sea powers. Generally, Nubia (q.v.) appears to have been a calm Egyptian colony. No constructions in Nubia can be attributed to Ramses III. However, Libyans and the so-called Sea Peoples were to require energetic military and naval intervention by the armies of Ramses III. His great palace at Medinat Habu records these exploits in graphic detail and makes the first note of the Jewish (Ib-er-ı) people in Egypt.

One Nubian campaign was noted, although scholarly skepticism exists about the importance or veracity of this account. On the other hand, the Harem Conspiracy Papyrus of Turin gives substantial documentation of an attempted mutiny against Ramses III. The charges, trial, and penalties are reported around the case that involved Tiy’s (a minor queen) hope to move her son onto the throne. The abortive plot apparently implicated Nubian members of his military staff. One may have been the brother of Tiya. Death penalties and mandated suicide brought this matter to a close.

Much later in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), Nubian pharaohs and their God’s Wives of Amun (q.v.) used Medinat Habu as a site for their temples to aid in their quest for Theban legitimacy. Included in this respect are the shrine for the God’s Wife of Amun, the “Ethiopian Pylon” at the small temple of Medinat Habu, and the gate of Taharka (q.v.).
RAMSES IV, HEQA-MA’AT-RE (1151–1145 BCE). This pharaoh of the waning New Kingdom during the 20th Dynasty had a short reign, but expeditions to Buhen (q.v.) were recorded. His mummy has been recovered but in the tomb of Amenhotep II (q.v.).

RAMSES VI, NEB-MA’AT-RE MERYAMUN (1141–1133 BCE). This poorly known 20th Dynasty pharaoh had a relatively short reign that he assumed from his even shorter-lived brother Ramses V. He likely was much troubled by attacks from Libyans, and his policy was one of cautious retreat throughout the empire. He did maintain a titled viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) named Siesse, but it clearly was not a time of great prosperity or solid authority. Ramses VI is associated with his usurped tomb 9 in the Valley of the Kings and with tomb 35, where his mummy was found. One may imagine that the severe desecration of his tomb was the result of aggressive tomb robbing followed by a feeble effort to restore his body.

RAMSES IX, NEFER-KHA-RE SETEP-EN-RE (1126–1108 BCE). The regnal length of Ramses IX suggests that some stability had been restored to the Egyptian Nile, but the main focus of his known monumental constructions appears to have been in the delta. The result of this was increasing isolation from Thebes and its priestly class, which felt more emboldened to take political decisions. Ramses IX did maintain a viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) named Wentawat, but it is not known how effective his control really was in these late years of the 20th Dynasty.

RAMSES X, KHEPER-MAAT-RE (1108–1098 BCE). The withering away of the 20th Dynasty was temporarily slowed in the unclear reign of Ramses X, but the Theban priests exercised a steadily increasing degree of autonomy. No doubt, the leaders of Nubia (q.v.) were beginning to question where their loyalty should be directed. An inscription of Ramses X is known at Aniba (q.v.).

RAMSES XI, MEN-MAAT-RE (1098–1070 BCE). Ramses XI was the last of the Ramesides of the 20th Dynasty. Considering the recently past glories, Egyptians had fallen on hard times. Theban priests frequently fought among themselves, as well as resisted the assertions
from Lower Egypt that the nation was still united. Officially, the viceroy of Kush (q.v.) still existed under the leadership of Panehesi (q.v.), who expressed his loyalty to the concept of a united Egypt by taking over control from the squabbling Theban priests. But this grasp at flickering power was likewise unstable. Soon, former Viceroy Herihor (q.v.) came to assert his rule of Upper Egypt and Nubia, which Panehesi did not accept, and Nubia went still another step toward its political independence. At the same time, Smendes (q.v.) became the effective ruler of the delta. Herihor had problems enough trying to keep the Theban royal tombs of Ramses II and Seti I (qq.v.) from being looted. All these events and struggles were undertaken during the very weak but nominal control of Ramses XI. With his death, the New Kingdom and the long lines of Ramesides concluded.

REHREH, RHRH. These people are known from Meroitic writing (q.v.) and are believed to have lived east of the Nile at least in the vicinity of Kawa (q.v.) or as far south as Meroë (q.v.). It is likely that they were a southern extension or local group of Blemmyes (q.v.). Apparently, the Rehreh disrupted Meroitic supply and security and sometimes were captured. The Rehreh may have also been ethnically related to the Adadas or Meded subgroups, who played a similar role against settled Meroites, especially under the reigns of Talakhamani, Irike-Amanote, and Harsiyotef (qq.v.).

REISNER, GEORGE ANDREW (1867–1942). This American-born Harvard University professor of Semitics was a major figure in Egyptology at the Museum of Fine Arts (MFA) in Boston at the time of its move from Copley Square to the present Huntington Avenue location. Reisner received his Ph.D. from Harvard in Semitic studies in 1893, coached football at Purdue University in his home state of Indiana, and studied Assyriology in Göttingen, Germany, with a stint at the Berlin Museum.

In the first three decades of the twentieth century, Reisner excavated extensively at about two dozen important sites throughout the Nile valley, including Nubia (q.v.), Dashur, Middle Egypt (the Archaic site of Naga ed-Der), and the Near East (Samaria and Palestine). His chronology of the A-, B-, C-, and X-Groups for Nubian cultures was truly pioneering and is current today, with some modifications.
Reisner sought to strike a balance between the science of Egyptology he loved and the fascination for ancient Egypt by the art-loving public and museum trustees. For example, he managed to stay clear of the contemporary issues surrounding the tomb of Tutankhamen (q.v.). Luckily for Reisner, Egypt was a semicolon of England, and Egyptology was under French control, so he was given many liberties in excavation that are no longer available. Likewise, his Nubian Archaeological Expeditions in 1907–1909 and 1913–1916 at Kerma (q.v.), 1916–1920 at Napata (q.v.), and 1920–1923 at Meroë (q.v.) generated a great number of impressive antiquities from Nubia, especially from Kerma, Lower Nubian (q.v.) cemeteries, Jebel Barkal, and the Napatan (q.q.v.) cemeteries of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) and thereafter. This fieldwork was undertaken just after British military conquest of Sudan under General Lord Kitchener, who had fought his way up the Nile to Omdurman and Khartoum. On occasion, Kitchener and Reisner interacted to determine the division and disposition of Reisner’s finds in the first two decades of the century. Even though the Nubian collection was assembled “with the permission of the government of the Sudan,” this government was British, and no Sudanese authorities were empowered to regulate or resist the excavation and collecting by Reisner. Dows Dunham noted that some of the workforce at Napata was actually formed by slaves. Some have criticized the MFA for keeping much of the Nubian collection in basement storage until recent years. Others have also noted that Reisner was inclined to view Sudan just as an outpost of Egypt and not on its own terms in either antiquity or during his excavations. In the case of Kerma, he viewed its architecture and styles through Egyptian eyes rather than seeing Kerma as an ancient African kingdom in its own right.

His work on the first Nubian salvage project of 1907–1910 was in response to the British construction of the Low Dam at Aswan (q.v.) that threatened the regional antiquities. His published references to Sudan as late as 1925 used the now outdated term “Ethiopia,” and he referred to the Nubian tombs at Kurru (q.v.) as belonging to the “Egyptian XXVth Dynasty.” Reisner was a cautious competitor of Flinders Petrie (in London), who was another major figure in Egyptology of the time. Reisner was a meticulous fieldworker and was strong in the use of photography in archaeological excavation. Reisner was a colleague of Dunham, who succeeded him at the MFA and long continued to
process Reisner’s unpublished excavation notes and thereby kept this chapter of the archaeology of Nubia in Euro-American hands.

ROBERTS, DAVID (1798–1864). Roberts was a famed nineteenth-century lithographer of the holy lands and the Nile (q.v.) valley following his travels in 1838. His romanticism of the region was strongly featured in his work and still remains an artistic inspiration. He traveled throughout Lower Nubia (q.v.), and he reached Abu Simbel (q.v.), his southernmost point in the region. His work began to appear in 1841, and between 1846 and 1849, he published 123 images of Nubia and Egypt in a set of three volumes of extensively printed pages. His prints typically featured Victorian nuance and subtlety rather than detailed style. Aside from his lithographs of Lower and Upper Egypt, Roberts depicted the Nubian temples at Abu Simbel (four prints), Dakka, Kalabsha, Kertassi, Maharakka, Philae (q.v.; four prints), Tafa, and Wadi es-Sebua (qq.v.; two prints). Since Egyptology was growing quickly in the wake of the decipherment by Jean-François Champollion (q.v.), the excellent works of Roberts only made this fascination deeper.

ROMAN INFLUENCES IN SUDAN (30 BCE–476 CE). Caesar Octavian (q.v.; Augustus) consolidated the Roman conquest of Egypt in 30 BCE. Augustus sent Cornelius Gallus (q.v.), a Roman prefect, to meet Meroitic (q.v.) envoys at Philae (q.v.) in 28 BCE. In 27 BCE, the geographer Strabo (q.v.) was sent to Nubia (q.v.) to report on conditions there. From a sense of opportunity or alarm, the Meroites raided Elephantine and Philae Islands at Aswan (q.v.) in 24 BCE. At this time, they probably seized a bronze bust of Caesar Augustus as booty; this reappeared in the archaeological investigation of Meroë 2,000 years later.

In retaliation, Caesar Augustus sent the Roman general Petronius (q.v.) to invade Nubia in 23 BCE as far as Napata (q.v.). In about 21 BCE, a nonaggression pact was reached between the Romans and the Meroites (q.v.). It was in 14 CE, during the reign of the Meroitic king Natakamani (q.v.; 0–20 CE), that the rule of Caesar Augustus of Egypt came to an end. Some decades later, the first Christians (q.v.) entered Nubia, perhaps as early as 37 CE, but this was as a “secret religion.” During the reign of Emperor Nero (q.v.; 54–68 CE), “explorers” were sent to Nubia in 60 CE to gather information for a military campaign planned
for 64 CE, but this was not carried out because of Nero’s assassination. Other reports of Roman activity in Nubia are sketchy, but such would include the 70 CE reports on Nubia by the writer Pliny (q.v.).

Since the spheres of influence of Meroë and Roman Egypt were generally respected, a measure of peace was realized for much of this period. One may point to the period from about 100 to 300 CE, when Kushites were permitted to reoccupy parts of Lower Nubia, such as Qasr Ibrim (q.v.). This policy of mutual respect was certainly well established during the reign of Emperor Diocletian (q.v.; 284–304 CE), who withdrew his forces from Nubia to Aswan. In the third century CE, perhaps the most frequent problem troubling both Romans and Kushites consisted of recurrent attacks by the Blemmyes (q.v.). Sometimes Romans blamed the leaders of Kush (q.v.) for “allowing” this to happen.

After the acceptance of Christianity as the state religion by Emperor Constantine (q.v.) in 324 CE, the chief effect of Roman rule in Nubia was the subsequent increase of Christian missionary activity. This trend was well established by the time of the fall of the Roman Empire in 476 CE, and with no clear successor, the Christian movement deepened its roots in Egypt and Nubia.

**ROSELLINI, IPPOLITO.** Rosellini was a joint member of the 1828–1829 Franco-Italian (Tuscany) expedition with Jean-François Champollion (q.v.). From 1824, Rosellini had been professor of Oriental languages at the University of Pisa. He removed many reliefs from the temples and tombs for European collections. In 1832, he was the author of *Monumenti dell’Egitto e della Nubia*.

--- S ---

**SAHABA.** Sahaban sites date to the Upper Paleolithic or Lower Mesolithic and are just prior to or about contemporary with Sebilian and Qadan (qq.v.) sites. Sahaban sites include a number of microliths that suggest they should be classified with the Mesolithic period, but the portion of microliths is still low in the total for known assemblages. Some sites were dated to a range between 13,000 and 10,000 BP.
SAHURE (2491–2477 BCE). This 5th Dynasty Egyptian pharaoh apparently was the first to send direct trading missions to Punt (q.v.) by way of the Red Sea. His trade officials left inscriptions at the First Cataract as they entered Lower Nubia (q.v.), although King Djer’s (q.v.) forces had certainly gone much farther into Nubia at an earlier time, and Harkuf and Pepinakht (qq.v.) followed in this tradition of Egyptian trading with Kerma (q.v.).

SAI ISLAND. Sai Island has multiple levels of occupation. Evidence for early Kerma (q.v.) suggest a substantial but perhaps seasonally repeated occupation in about 2600 BCE. Sai may have represented the southernmost point of the Egyptian Empire during the time of Amenhotep I (q.v.). Later, Sai Island was the location of the ruined town site fortress of Shaat (Ado), attributed to Tuthmosis I and Tuthmosis III (qq.v.) in the 18th Dynasty (q.v.) and Napatan times. It was reoccupied in Meroitic (q.v.) times and by X-Group (q.v.) peoples. At the northern end of the island, at Sai-sab, are the ruins of red brick church with granite columns.

SANAM. Ancient Sanam or modern Merowe, which is built around and on top of its ruins, served as the commercial and logistic capital of ancient of Kush (q.v.) just below the Fourth Cataract at Napata (q.v.). Merowe survives today although it is of minor importance given its relative isolation. One must distinguish (New) Merowe from its ancient Nubian capital namesake Meroë (q.v.) far across the Bayuda (q.v.) Desert near the modern town of Shendi.

Archaeological interest is abundant in this area, with the remains of a huge temple to Amun (q.v.) at the base of Jebel Barkal (q.v.), the extensive pyramid burials at the modern town of Kareima and at nearby Kurru (q.v.) across the river, and the pyramid field of Nuri on the western bank of the Nile with Sanam. All together, these sites could be grouped as the ancient Napata capital region. These places were significant in the New Kingdom during the reigns of Tuthmosis III and Amenhotep II (qq.v.), but this religious and economic center continued in use during the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), and through the subsequent Napatan period, until the end of Meroë.

It is believed that Sanam functioned as the commercial capital of ancient Kush, as it commanded the northern end of the Bayuda cross-
ing. Stores of ebony and ivory (qq.v.) were found in situ at a burned warehouse in Sanam. Probably an ancient ferry crossed the Nile at Sanam to head across the Nubian Desert and come out above the Third Cataract at Kerma (q.v.), thus avoiding the long southward loop of the Nile.

SARAS, SARRAS. Saras is near Wadi Halfa (q.v.) and opposite to the Middle Kingdom fortress of Shalfak (q.v.). It is noted for rock drawings of elephants (q.v.) as well as quartz pebble tools and Chellean stone tools. Saras shows some A-Group (q.v.) occupation.

SATET, SATI, SATIS. Votive statues of this Nubian goddess are found at Elephantine (q.v.) associated with a Predynastic cavern or crevice between the huge granite stones that registered the early flood of the Nile (q.v.). Initially, she was mainly a local rather than national goddess, but as the Old Kingdom (q.v.) occupied Lower Nubia (q.v.), Satet was celebrated Egyptian-controlled areas. Satet was often termed “the lady of Elephantine” and typically was viewed as a member of the Triad of Elephantine along with Anqet and Khnum (qq.v.). During the 12th Dynasty of the Middle Kingdom (q.v.), she commonly was depicted in the Egyptian fortresses in Nubia (q.v.). In the New Kingdom, Tuthmosis III and Ramses II (qq.v.) worshiped Satet in the temple at al-Lasiya (q.v.). In Meroitic times, she appears on the southern wall of the lion temple at Musawwarat es-Sufra. At the Greco-Roman temples of Dendur and Debod (qq.v.) in Lower Nubia (q.v.), Satet was worshiped as the consort of Amun (q.v.).

Sources disagree whether Satet was the daughter or the cowife of Anqet, and thus she could be either the cowife or daughter of the creator god Khnum. This conflict may also be the basis of a view that Satet took over the position as wife of Khnum, which formerly had been occupied by Heket (in the Hermopolis theogony) so that Satet could become the second member of the Elephantine triad. Another important cult center for Satet and the Triad was at Seheil Island (q.v.) just upstream from Elephantine.

The meaning of her name is “to sow seed,” and images exist of her pouring water on the land of Egypt. Satet was also the giver of water, especially in purification rituals for the deceased (see The Pyramid Texts No. 1116). She is depicted as a human rather than zoomorphic
goddess, and she usually wore the white crown of Upper Egypt. The crown was adorned with two curved antelope horns on the sides and a single vulture uraeus. The antelope probably was sacred to Satet, and it may have been offered to her as a temple sacrifice. She could be considered a goddess of hunting and is shown with a bow and arrow (q.v.) as the southern counterpart of the goddess Neith. Sometimes, Satet holds a tall papyrus scepter. She was also known as the “eye or daughter of Re” and as a goddess of fertility and love, thus parallel to Hathor and Nephthys, both of whom had attributes of love and womanhood.

**SAYALA, SEYALA.** Sayala is an archaeological site in Lower Nubia on the western bank of the Nile (q.v.) across from and between Wadi al-Alaqi and Wadi es-Sebua (qq.v.). The earliest occupation shows a rather rich A-Group (q.v.) cemetery (no. 137) and some rock shelters that some thought supported a case for early Nubian state formation, presumably aborted by the expansion of Old Kingdom (q.v.) Egypt. In a large pit grave with stone slab covering were found gold-handled maces, copper chisels, and Egyptian-style palettes that were similar to the high-status grave goods at Qustul (q.v.), which were about contemporary. Alternatively, these Nubian (?) chiefs may already have been in Egyptian service or were local merchants profiting from Egyptian trade. The houses apparently were round, with thatch roofs following Nubian traditions, but the hair of the naturally mummified bodies is straight and black or brown, more like Egyptians. Thus, the evidence is fruitful for speculation but does not provide as many answers as one might like.

Later and early C-Group (qq.v.) reoccupation is known at Sayala. With limited evidence, it appears that they were semisedentary pastoralists. Much later reoccupation of this site took place in late Meroitic (q.v.), offering a cemetery and settlement site that appears to have had a wine tavern or guest house, judging from the numerous cups and beakers and a nearby winepress.

**SEB, GEB, KEB.** Seb could be a Meroitic (q.v.) name for the very ancient deity known better as Geb or Keb. By Meroitic times, the reference had been transformed into Seb, as noted in some Meroitic texts. It seems that the "cakes or bread of Seb" were placed on offer-
ing tablets as a gift to be transferred by Seb to Horus, his grandson.
Seb as Geb was the son of Shu, the god of the air. Re, the sun god,
called Shu to be joined with Tefnut, his consort and the goddess of
moisture. A result of this joining was Seb or Geb, the god of earth and
his sister consort Nut, the goddess of the sky. As the god of universal
earth, Seb became the god of the cardinal points or all directions of
the earth, or the house of Seb. According to the Egyptian and Nubian
theogony, Seb was thus the father of Osiris, Isis (qq.v.), Nephthys,
and Seth.

Seb is presented as an anthropomorphic deity wearing the plumed
atef crown and may also be associated with the white crown of Up-
per Egypt and with the sacred goose (“The Great Cackler”). The
Great Cackler goose was also a form of Re. Seb, which may also be
associated with the Bennu bird (the “Phoenix”), which was a mani-
festation of the primal mound or pyramid of earth from which land
emerged from the primal waters of Nun. As god of earth, Seb was tied
to funerary as well as agricultural rituals, especially in Meroë.

SEBILIAN. The Upper Paleolithic or Mesolithic Sebilian period in Nu-
bia is approximately contemporary with Qadan or Sahaban (qq.v.)
times. Sites are known from below Abu Simbel (q.v.) to above Wadi
Halfa (q.v.). The Sebilian assemblage includes a variety of Levallois-
type points, borers, scrapers, flakes, and blades made at about 11,000
BP.

SEBIUMEKER. This red-faced Meroitic (q.v.) deity is usually shown
at a temple entrance to offer supernatural protection. Apparently, Se-
biumeker was a royal creator god and for this reason can be closely
associated with Osiris (q.v.), thus making both the sons of Geb or Seb
(q.v.). Monumental sandstone sculptures of Sebiumeker are found at
Musawwarat es-Sufra (q.v.), portraying him with a man’s head and a
double crown, false beard, beaded necklace, and a single cobra
uraeus. He also appears on the southern wall of the Lion Temple at
Musawwarat es-Sufra. Very often, Sebiumeker is paired with Aren-
snuphis (q.v.), such as at the doorway of Temple “C” or “300” at the
same site. Their close association suggests that they may have been
brothers, having an apparent parallel with Seth and Osiris. Even
though Sebiumeker is clearly a Nubian god, the form, theogony, and
symbolic placement of his images indicate very substantial Egyptian influences in his related iconography and architecture.

SEBNI, SABNI, AND MAKHI, MEKHU. Sebni was a “Governor of the South” serving Pepi II (q.v.) at the close of the 6th Dynasty. His father, Makhi, was killed while on a trade expedition to Wawat (q.v.) (some accounts say Punt [q.v.]). After receiving the sad news, Sebni returned south with a substantial punitive military force as well as with a priest and embalming supplies. The trip of Sebni was lauded as a prime example of filial piety. When Sebni returned from Nubia (q.v.) with his father’s mummiﬁed body, it was buried in the First Intermediate tombs at Gubbat al-Howa in Aswan (q.v.). His spacious rock-cut shrine tomb was the final resting place for Sebni, Makhi, and many other family members. In subsequent centuries, it became a much venerated pilgrimage site for those respecting the duties of sons to fathers.

SECOND INTERMEDIATE PERIOD (1782–1570 BCE). This is the conventional reference to the two centuries between the end of the 12th Dynasty (q.v.) of the Middle Kingdom and the start of the 18th Dynasty (q.v.) of the New Kingdom (q.v.). Thus, it contains the 13th Dynasty (1782–1650 BCE), the 14th Dynasty (ca. 1700–1663 BCE and overlapping with the 13th Dynasty), the 15th Dynasty (1663–1555 BCE; the Hyksos [q.v.]), the 16th Dynasty (1663–1555 BCE), and the 17th Dynasty (1663–1570 BCE) according to the dates offered by Clayton, which vary considerably with other chronologists of this particularly confusing epoch.

As with the First and Third Intermediate periods, this represents a loss of the unitary Egyptian state despite continuing references to king being “Lord of Two Lands.” In the typical balance of regional power, the peoples of Nubia (q.v.) were thereby liberated from Egyptian occupation while the Hyksos invaders occupied the Egyptian delta and parts of Lower Egypt. Kerma (q.v.), just beyond the Third Cataract, could thrive when this occupation lifted.

SEDEGNA, SADEGNA, SEDEIGNA. Sedegna is best known for the much ruined temple to a Hathor (q.v.) form of Tiy, wife of Amenhotep III (q.v.), who built there on the western bank of the Nile (q.v.).
This is below his great temple at Soleb (q.v.) built during the 18th Dynasty (q.v.) occupation of Upper Nubia (q.v.) as seen also at the small nearby temple at Jebel Dosha (q.v.) for Tuthmosis III (q.v.). At Sedenga, some building blocks were found with the name of Taharka (q.v.). This launched speculation that he was buried there rather than in his Nuri (q.v.) pyramid. This speculation is quite unlikely, and it is more probable that the stone came either from a local temple of Taharka or from Kawa (q.v.) or Napata (q.v.), where many more inscriptions were found bearing his name. During late Meroitic (q.v.) times, Sedenga was also occupied, and a number of ruined pyramids and reused tombs are also found at a large cemetery at the site.

SEGERSENI. The transition from the 11th Dynasty to the 12th Dynasty (q.v.) in the Middle Kingdom was not smooth. If it is correct to assume that Mentuhotep II (q.v.) of the 11th Dynasty was quite possibly of Nubian origin, then a struggle for power may have occurred to shift to the Egyptian-based 12th Dynasty, led by Ammenemhat I (q.v.). Amidst this period, Segerseni apparently sided with the descendants of Mentuhotep II in his battles with Inyotef and Ammenemhat. While Segerseni is poorly known, he apparently had a Lower Nubian (q.v.) territorial base that suggests he may have been a Medjay, a C-Group, or even an early Kerma (q.v.) chief. His short-lived role in this transition is terminated when Ammenemhat I defeated him by sending twenty boats into Lower Nubia, where Segerseni apparently had ruled.

SEHEIL, SEHEL, SAHEIL, ISLAND. This island lies amidst the First Cataract just downstream (north) of the Low Dam at Aswan (q.v.) and upstream (south) of Elephantine (q.v.). It is famed for its many rock inscriptions spanning many centuries. Occupying this strategic location, Seheil has long been part of the history of ancient Nubia. Seheil was long considered as the center for the cult of Anqet and Satet (q.v.), who were important Nubian (q.v.) deities linked to the ram god Khnum (q.v.), who, with the two Nubian goddesses, formed the holy Triad of Aswan. The first written reference relates to a visit by King Djoser (q.v.) of the 3rd Dynasty of the Archaic period. Believing that the source of the Nile was within the First Cataract and that the creator god Khnum resided there, Djoser ordered offerings to be
made at Seheil to celebrate the end of a protracted drought in Egypt when the inundation had failed. Evidently, he erected a famine stela to commemorate the welcome restoration of the annual Nile (q.v.) flood.

During the 6th Dynasty of the Old Kingdom, some effort was made to remove rocks from the main channel of the Nile at Seheil Island as an aid in navigation and for the rapid movement of Egyptian troops for campaigns in Nubia to secure its natural and human resources.

A Middle Kingdom inscription of the pharaoh Senusret III (q.v.) of the 12th Dynasty states that he was engaged in improving river navigation somewhere to the west of Seheil Island by deepening and enlarging a canal for deeper draft vessels. Another inscription attests to the completion of this project.

During the New Kingdom, when Lower and Upper Nubia (qq.v.) were entirely under Egyptian control, it became very common to inscribe greetings to the Triad on the numerous granite stones of Seheil, Elephantine, and elsewhere in the First Cataract region as Egyptians traveled on with perilous missions to Nubia. Inscriptions at Seheil were especially numerous in Rameside times and particularly for Rameses II (q.v.). These inscriptions were tribute to the “Triad of Aswan” or the “Triad of First Cataract.”

In Greco-Roman times, the long-established tradition of invoking the Triad of the Cataracts at Seheil was continued, and stones continued to be inscribed on many voyages to Nubia. The famous Seheil Island “famine stela,” done in Ptolemaic (q.v.) times, contains commentary about King Djozer worshiping the “Triad” in the late Archaic period. At present, Seheil has a modern community of Kanuz (q.v.) Nubians. On the adjacent western bank of the Nile is the ethnically related Kenzi community of West Seheil.

SEIF ED-DIN 'ABDALLAH EN-NASIR. This Muslim leader was credited with the conquest of Dongola (q.v.) in 1317 and the conversion of its church into a mosque. For this reason, he often is credited with bringing the era of medieval Nubian Christianity (q.v.) to a close. However, history is rarely so simple, and certainly many Christian-Muslim interactions occurred long before, as seen in both the *baqt* agreement between these two religions and cross-border attacks by both. Moreover, numerous local examples exist of Christianity
persisting much farther to the south at Soba (q.v.). Christianity ruled as a state power until 1504 CE.

SEKHMET. According to her mythology, this unpredictable lion goddess of Egypt was stolen by a gazelle and taken to the Nubian Desert. Sekhmet was the wife of Ptah, who was worshiped as a form of the Apis bull in the 26th Dynasty. Sekhmet was also a goddess of the “Triad of Memphis.” She was the “Mighty One,” who could violently defend the “Divine Order.” She would bring destruction to those who defied this order. Hathor (q.v.) took the form of Sekhmet in the “Destruction of Mankind,” which was halted only when Ra made her drunk. A statue of Sekhmet was removed from some Middle Kingdom fortress in Nubia (q.v.) and taken to Kerma (q.v.), where it was found broken in many pieces but was restored at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston.

SELIMA OASIS. The Selima Oasis (q.v.) is situated in the Sahara Desert west of Amara West (q.v.). Selima was and is a critical link on the desert track known as the Darb al-Arba‘in (q.v.), which comes up from northern Kordofan through the Laqia Oasis. The desert route was commonly used for northbound Nubian livestock and southbound Egyptian traders and raiders who wished to bypass Lower Nubia (q.v.) and the Second Cataract. It is likely that Harkuf (q.v.) passed through Selima during his famed trading missions to Kerma (Irem). Just north of Selima, the track splits to the northeastern route toward Dunkul and Kurkur Oases (qq.v.), and another track heads north to Kharga Oasis (q.v.) and on to Middle Egypt.

SEMNA EAST. The Middle Kingdom fort at Kumma was the eastern bank counterpart of the major fortifications of Semma West on the opposite shore about sixty kilometers upstream from Wadi Halfa (q.v.). Semna East was one of seventeen related military structures in Lower Nubia that were first built during the Middle Kingdom by Egyptians fearing attacks from Kerma (q.v.) and wanting to control Nile (q.v.) trade. Semna East is also noted for rock inscriptions recording the level of the Nile and for an 18th Dynasty (q.v.) temple. In the fifteenth century BCE, Hatshepsut, Tuthmosis II and Tuthmosis III, and Amenhotep II (qq.v.) built or added to a small sandstone temple to Khnum (q.v.) at Kumma. The god Khnum was linked to Nubia (q.v.) by his
marriage to Anqet and Satet (q.v.), Nubian goddesses of the First Cataract and Seheil Island (q.v.). No doubt these New Kingdom rulers believed that a temple in honor of Khnum would endear them to their colony of Kush (q.v.). The stone for the temple was quarried at Sai Island (q.v.) about 112 kilometers farther upstream. Three sides of the temple were in mud brick that may have been painted.

The temple was entered through a modest colonnaded court with square pillars built into the mud walls. On entering, one sees Tuthmosis III receiving life from Dedun (q.v.), another Nubian god, and making tribute to Khnum. The scribe god Thoth notes the age of Tuthmosis III. On an inner wall, Tuthmosis III sits between Khnum and a deified Senusoret III (q.v.), whom he is honoring. Other depictions in the temple repeat these themes by Tuthmosis and by Amenhotep II. Another figure in the inner hall was clearly Hatshepsut, who was replaced by Tuthmosis III. Two small innermost chambers preserve some original paint. Following the flooding of Lake Nasser, the temple was removed and now stands in the garden at the Sudan National Museum in Khartoum.

SEMNA WEST. The fort and temple at Semna West was the counter-part of Semna East (q.v.), noted in the previous entry. Likewise, its origin dates to the period of Middle Kingdom fortification. The site held the boundary stela of Senusoret III (q.v.), who was later deified. Like other boundary stela, it proclaimed strict controls for Nubians (q.v.) to pass through the area. The fort at Semna West was larger than that in Semna East or at Mirgissa (q.v.; in Iken district) and controlled the Second Cataract itself. The fort at Semna West was reused during the New Kingdom (q.v.), when Tuthmosis I added a small stone and brick temple to the fort. Reconstruction undertaken by Tuthmosis III was even more significant. He replaced the ruined Middle Kingdom mud bricks of Sesotris III with stone, and he expanded the temple that celebrated the gods Amun, Dedun, Khnum (qq.v.), and a deified Senusoret III in many fine variant scenes inside and outside the temple. The importance of Dedun (a god revered by the Medjay [q.v.]) suggests that these people were central to the regional military defense. The religious metaphors are similar to the temple of Semna East. The temple is heavily adorned with relief and inscriptions of high quality. Taharka (q.v.) renewed this temple in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.).
The partial structure that remains is a single room with some adjoining features. It was dismantled and relocated in the Sudan National Museum in Khartoum. The Semna West temple gives inscriptive reference to Queen Katimala (of Meroë?), who is communicating with Isis (q.v.) and projects herself as queen of Upper and Lower Egypt. She is otherwise unknown. The original roof slabs still show the stars of the night sky.

SENFEFERU, SENEFERU, SNEFRU, SNOFRU (ca. 2613–2589 BCE/alt. ca. 2575–2551 BCE). Seneferu was the first king of the 4th Dynasty and thus the founder of the Old Kingdom (q.v.). This early Egyptian king was the first to launch the standardization of the Old Kingdom pyramid in Meidum and Dashur. His reign was long and prosperous. His prosperity grew in part from his effective administration of the Egyptian surplus but also from his military conquests in Nubia (q.v.), following the example of Djoser (q.v.).

During his administration, he recorded a major invasion of Nubia in his quest of slaves and cattle. Once his control of Lower Nubia (q.v.) was settled, he proceeded to build a series of fortresses and open mines and quarries for Nubian (q.v.) minerals, especially including gold and hard stones for building and sculpture. His military rule in Egypt also depended on Nubian conscripts for his army. His conquests in Nubia may have actually involved his personal presence, as noted in the Palermo stone that described his warfare against Nubians of Wawat (q.v.) to the south and Libyans to the west. This engagement supposedly resulted in the capture of 7,000 Nubians and some 200,000 “large and small cattle/livestock.”

Seneferu is also famed for embarking on sea voyages to Lebanon to acquire much valued cedar used in mortuary functions and temple sculpture. Seneferu built a stepped pyramid at Meidum, a bent pyramid at Dashur, and the red pyramid also at Dashur. As such, he usually is credited with finally perfecting the classic pyramid architecture, which his son, the great Khufu, used to make the greatest of all pyramids on the Giza plateau. His significance grew to the point of his deification by the 12th Dynasty (q.v.), and his archaic style of pyramid construction was rejuvenated in the conservative design of the temple complex of Mentuhotep II (q.v.) and in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) in the royal cemeteries at Napata (q.v.) and later at Meroë (q.v.).
SENKAMANISKEN (643–623 BCE). Senkamanisken is believed to be a grandson of Taharka (q.v.). Senkamanisken probably completed temple B700, near the main Amun (q.v.) Temple at Jebel Barkal (q.v.). The preceding king Atlanersa (q.v.) started this temple before Senkamanisken.

SENNACHERIB (704–681 BCE). While the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) was ruling in Egypt, this Assyrian (q.v.) king was militarily engaged with Shabaka, Shabataka, and briefly Taharka (qq.v). Preoccupied with military affairs elsewhere in the expanding Assyrian Empire, Sennacherib apparently put off an Egyptian campaign from fears of being overextended. Diplomatic relations with Shabaka gave way to outright war with Shabataka, who had been allied with the Phoenicians and Jews (q.v.); this annoyed Sennacherib greatly. Probably Shabataka had asked the Nubian crown prince and his younger brother, Taharka, to support the efforts of Tyre, Sidon, and the Judeans under Hezekiah (q.v.) to resist further Assyrian expansion. This was noted in the Bible in II Kings 19:9 and Isaiah 37:9. After putting down these insurrections, Sennacherib next turned against the Philistines and Judeans.

When Hezekiah’s capital at Jerusalem came under siege by Sennacherib in the summer of 701 BCE, the Assyrians failed to take the well-defended city. Nevertheless, they did succeed in capturing other Judean towns, and Sennacherib bragged that he shut up Hezekiah “like a bird in a cage.” However, the story in the same year was quite different at Lachish (about forty-five kilometers away to the southwest of Jerusalem), which also came under siege. The siege and defeat of Lachish is remarkably well recorded in numerous military scenes carved in Sennacherib’s fabulous palace at Ninevah, which was begun shortly after his victorious return. One quarry scene shows a large group of men moving stone for construction and sculpture. Other depictions of Lachish show bowmen, slingers, storm troops, siege engines with ramps, and the nature and quantity of the booty seized. Still another scene at Nineveh shows prisoners from Caanan or Phoenicia depicted playing lyres in the palace of Sennacherib.

As a possible result of the Assyrian military victory at Lachish, Sennacherib forced Hezekiah to pay a symbolic tribute of 30 talents of gold and either 300 or 800 talents of silver and a team of singers and dancers. An alternative view is that this payment was for release
from the Sennacherib’s siege of Jerusalem. Whatever the case, whether by naked pressure or by clever political tactics, the fortunate Hezekiah was left intact at Jerusalem despite the Judaean defeat at Lachish. This was as Isaiah had foretold. The mystery of these quickly unfolding events was deepened when suddenly a plague swept through the Assyrian forces, causing some 5,180 deaths and their precipitous withdrawal from Jerusalem.

Another dimension of these dynamic times may include the fact that Sennacherib’s forces were getting spread too widely. Some were left at Libnah and Lachish, while others were engaged in the siege at Jerusalem. Sennacherib may have received intelligence reports of a renewed offensive by the forces of Prince Taharka. Consequently, Sennacherib quickly regrouped toward Ashkelon on the coast while Taharka retreated to Egypt. The final result was that the siege of Jerusalem was lifted, and its king Hezekiah was spared. Even though Prince Taharka and Pharaoh Shabataka had little to celebrate at El-Tekeh and they withdrew when Sennacherib regrouped, they could say with some satisfaction that Sennacherib was no longer harassing their Judaean ally, nor did Assyrians then advance farther into Egypt. In retrospect, it was not a very damaging defeat, and it was a rather aggressive defense.

Nevertheless, Hezekiah was left as a weakened vassal king, and starting in about 696 BCE, Hezekiah ruled with the assistance of his son Manasseh as coregent. Shabataka continued to rule in Egypt for nine more years, and the early years of Taharka were contemporary with the Hezekiah/Manasseh coregents. However, when Manesseh ruled alone, he was compelled to pay tribute to the Assyrians during the later reign of Sennacherib’s son Esarhaddon (q.v.). The temporary withdrawal of the Assyrians under Sennacherib may have been a great relief to the Levantine powers and to the Nubians, but it did not last.

Because of these military conquests, some scholars give Sennacherib a reputation for being a “ruthless barbarian” for his conquest of Babylon, then a center of culture, and Phoenicia and Judaea, small trading states. However, he was also interested in technological progress, and some credit him for a new method in metal casting, new irrigation equipment, and finding new mineral resources. Certainly he is also famed for the rock cliff sculptures that were precariously investigated by Ledyard in 1846–1847.
Sennacherib is highly credited for laying out Nineveh as his new capital, where he located probably the largest of Assyrian palaces at the Kuyunjik mound. Although this palace was badly damaged by fire, it is easy to see its original beauty, including parks and the Jerwan Aqueduct, which provided a regular and adequate water supply. The corbeled structure of the Jerwan Aqueduct was an ancient engineering marvel that brought water from its head at Khinnis, where it was guarded by a winged bull, all the way to his palace at Nineveh. In 681 BCE, Sennacherib’s son Essarhadon (q.v.) probably assassinated him to come to power and continue the regional struggles with Taharka.

**SENUSORET I, SENWOSRET I, SENUSORET I, SESOSTRIS I**

(1971–1926 BCE) This Egyptian king of the 12th Dynasty (q.v.) of the Middle Kingdom campaigned extensively in Nubia (q.v.), especially beyond the Second Cataract. As such, he was a contemporary and Egyptian rival of the Nubian state at Kerma (q.v.). He ruled for a decade as a coregent with his father, Amenemhat I (q.v.), and as a sovereign later. In order to secure his military and commercial presence in Nubia, he constructed or improved the fortress at Semna (q.v.). His “Governor of the South” (i.e., Nubia) was Sirenput I (q.v.). Warned by his father to take firm control of Egypt, he had a long reign. He shared the throne again with his own son Amenemhat II (q.v.) at the end of his rule. He was buried at his pyramid complex at Lisht in Middle Egypt.

**SENUSORET II, SENWOSRET II, SENUSORET II**

(1879–1878 BCE). The very brief rule of Senusoret II allowed for little time in construction. However, he tried to refortify the Lower Nubian (q.v.) fortresses to secure Egyptian interests there. His improvements to the fortress of Aniba (q.v.) date to this period. Later, the New Kingdom (q.v.) pharaohs heavily plundered his constructions for building material, thereby further obscuring his brief rule.

**SENUSORET III, SENWOSRET III**

(1848–ca. 1841 BCE). Senusoret III, also of the Middle Kingdom, resumed the mission of his father, Senusret II (q.v.). In addition to economic reforms in Egypt, he continued with the substantial militarization of Lower Nubia (q.v.). In his eighth regnal year, his program included the renewal of the clogged
canal (of Weni) at Seheil Island (q.v.). The canal had first been opened in the Old Kingdom, but it had not been maintained. Senusoret II had his engineers expand it to 150 cubits (78 meters) in length, 20 cubits (13 meters) wide, and 15 cubits (7.8 meters) deep to accommodate his warships and gain rapid access into Wawat (q.v.). He also made major improvements to the huge Egyptian fortresses at Kumma and Semna (qq.v.) to protect Egypt from an attack from Kerma (q.v.). Relying on Medjay (q.v.) soldiers, Senusoret II erected a shrine to Dedun (q.v.) in the fort at Semna to honor their god. A stela of Senusoret III proclaimed strict controls on Nubian commerce and travel beyond this point, which was established as his southern boundary. But in his sixteenth year, Nubians raided across the border, thus prompting a retaliatory counter raid by Senusoret III and renewed stela and inscriptions proclaiming his territory, including one at Uronartı (q.v.). Senusoret III was buried at Dashur in an impressive pyramid built from wealth derived from Nubia, Sinai, and Egypt.

SENUWY. Senuwy was the wife of Hepzefa (q.v.), who was an ambiguous governor of Nubia (q.v.) for Egypt and who may have been of Nubian (q.v.) origins himself. A life-size statue of Senuwy was probably first installed in a Middle Egyptian fortress and then removed to Kerma (q.v.), where it was buried in a central place next to the nameless king. During the Reisner (q.v.) excavation of Kerma under British colonial rule of Sudan, it was removed to Boston, where its many fractured pieces were assembled for public display in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston.

SEPEDHOR, SEPEDHER STELA. This modest stela is not in good condition, and its mere nine lines of text in Egyptian hieroglyphs suggest that it would not have great significance. However, the Sepedhor stela from Buhen (q.v.) relates to the task of rehabilitation of the Buhen temple for the “heka of Kush” (i.e., the king of Kerma [q.v.]) rather than the former Middle Kingdom pharaohs. Thus, the Sepedhor stela reveals the changing balance of power in this phase of the Second Intermediate period (q.v.). It is not clear whether this stela was before or during the period when the Middle Kingdom forts were sacked and occupied by Kerma peoples. It was also during this period that Egyptian sculpture from the Middle Kingdom forts made its way...
back into Kerma grave tumulae. Thus, this stela gives proof that Upper Egypt no longer controlled Lower Nubia (q.v.) and that it had also lost control of Lower Egypt to the Hyksos (q.v.) intrusion.

SERRA (EAST AND WEST). See AKSHA.

SESIBI. This New Kingdom (q.v.) town and temple site is located in Upper Nubia (q.v.) on the eastern bulge of the Nile between Soleb and Kerma (qq.v.). The iconography of the temple to the Aton cult indicates construction by Amenhotep IV (q.v.) of the 18th Dynasty (q.v.) and by Seti I (q.v.) of the 19th Dynasty.

SETAU, SETAW. Setau was the last viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) under Ramses II (q.v.). He coordinated the construction of the pharaoh’s uninspired temple at Gerf Hussein (q.v.) in Lower Nubia (q.v.).

SETI I, SETHOS I (1291–1278 BCE). Seti I was father of the great Ramses II (q.v.). Seti attacked Nubia (q.v.) in the eighth year, the third month of winter, the thirteenth day of his reign (i.e., ca. late January 1287 BCE). A Nubian revolt against the Egyptians was reported in an inscription from Qasr Ibrim. Seti I put down a one-week revolt of the “despicable” people of Kerma (q.v.; Irem). A number of oasis wells were plundered, and 600 captives were seized, along with livestock from the towns of Tipaw, Tabnuta, Taïrosu, Kurokasa, and Tusaru. Another raid on Nubia under Seti I is recorded in the thirteenth year of his reign. Seti I also maintained control of the Nubian gold mines of Wadi al-Alaqi (q.v.). In this case, his son Prince Ramses II was the leader of this very brief chariot-carried raid. The tribute gathered from Nubia in this case is recorded at the temple at Bait al-Wali (q.v.), which Ramses II built when he became the pharaoh.

SETI, SETIU. See TA-SETIU.

SHAAT. See IKEN; SAI ISLAND; TEHKHET.

SHABAKA, SHABAKO, SHABAO, SABTA, NEFER-KA-RE (r. 716–701 BCE). After Piankhy’s (q.v.) death, his younger brother, Pharaoh Shabaka, assumed the double crown of Egypt and Nubia
Shabaka is given biblical reference in I Chronicles 1:9. As with his senior brother, Piankhy, Shabaka was also engaged in recurrent conflict with aspiring princely rivals in the delta. For example, Manetho (q.v.) reported that Bakenranef (q.v.) claimed to found the 24th Dynasty but was seized by Shabaka, who burned him alive in 712 BCE. Piankhy had tried and failed to gain the loyalty of Bakenranef, but apparently enough was now enough. Manetho considers that it was Shabaka, not Piankhy, who was the true founder of the 25th Dynasty.

As with Piankhy, Shabaka took pains to legitimate his position in Egypt, and under his orders his craftsmen prepared a careful copy of the Memphite creation myths from an old papyrus text still extant in the temple of Ptah. The very abused “Shabaka stone” still survives in the British Museum as an important source of this mythical and religious tradition. Shabaka’s control of Egypt is also apparent in the extensive construction projects throughout the Nile (q.v.) valley from the delta to important religious centers at Memphis, Abydos, Dendera, Esna, Edfu, Karnak, and naturally Napata (q.v.). His common political and military capital was at Memphis, from which he orchestrated his conservative reforms.

At the northern side of the central enclosure at Karnak, Shabaka built a temple to Ptah at the second gate and also built the fourth gate, which was augmented in Roman times by Tiberius (q.v.). Judging from stylistic images, it is possible that some of the construction of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) temple adjacent to the sacred lake was also done by Shabaka but was reused by either Shabataka or Taharka (qq.v.).

For Piankhy, legitimacy was also achieved by marrying his brother’s daughter and by reinstalling his sister Amenirdis (q.v.) as the God’s Wife of Amun (q.v.) in Thebes. Amenirdis was briefly removed by Osorkon III (q.v.) but returned with greater personal authority over the High Priests of Amun (q.v.). A stela at the Metropolitan Museum in New York is attributed to Shabaka in the sixth year of his reign (ca. 710 BCE); on this stela, he invokes Horus and Wadjet in a land grant to Bakenatum. Another undated stela of Shabaka at the Metropolitan Museum is from the eastern delta and invokes Horus and Hathor in an offering of nu jars to Patjenu.

After stabilizing the western delta at Sais, Shabaka was persistently distracted by the territorial ambitions of the Sargonid Assyrians.
(q.v.), led first by King Sargon II (721–705 BCE) from Khorsabad and then by his crown prince, King Sennacherib (q.v.; 704–681 BCE), from Nineveh. The Assyrians were far from their homeland when attacking Egypt, but their armed forces used horse-driven chariots, mule-carried baggage and supplies, sapper engineers, and strong infantry—a formidable combination of military technology. Having the common military and political objective of blocking the Assyrians, Shabaka supported the neighboring Judaeans king Isaiah at the battle of El-Tekeh. This was recognized in gifts sent from Isaiah to Shabaka, as subsequently noted in the Old Testament.

Meanwhile, Sennacherib was diverted at first in his 703 BCE subjugation of a restive Babylon. His twenty-four-year reign had eight military campaigns. With Babylon under some control, Sennacherib’s offensives then took him to Phoenicia (q.v.), which had long had commercial and military importance to Egyptians, and so it was also while Egypt was under Kushitic rule. It was also true the Assyrian ambitions had long bedeviled the commercial autonomy of the Phoenician city-states.

The inexperienced and remote Nubian support and the internal divisions of the Phoenician city-states made the military work of Sennacherib relatively easy in Phoenicia. There he seized the cities of Sidon, Ushu, Tyre, and Akko. The Phoenician king Luli (q.v.) of Tyre or Sidon did manage to escape from the Assyrians to Cyprus in 701 BCE. This was much like the former tactical retreat from Assyrians by the Tyrian queen Didon to faraway but secure Carthage a century earlier. Thus, this year proved pivotal in regional ancient “world war,” and the balance of power tilted toward Assyria and away from the Nile valley and the Levantine powers.

As the Nubian king of Egypt, Shabaka sought to strengthen the northeastern flank of Egypt in his foreign policy of supporting Hezekiah, the king of Judah. It was also in his strategic interest to support the simmering revolts of neighboring Philistines at Ashdod that were destabilizing the Assyrians. Just as the Assyrians were a threat to all Levantine nations, the Nubians ruling Egypt also viewed them with alarm. Shabaka sent his nephew Taharka to assist in their insurgency. Sargon II was annoyed by these not-so-secret alliances of Hezekiah to link up with Piankhy and Shabaka and to give at least tacit support to the citizens of Ashdod.
Anti-Assyrian protests in Ashdod, just north of Ashkelon, were neither joined nor opposed by Hezekiah (q.v.), who was a “secret” but passive supporter. At least since 712 BCE, Ashdod (e.g., under King Yemeni) had mounted sporadic revolts against the same Assyrians who were threatening Hezekiah. In response to the restive situation, Sargon II and his successors conducted at least three military campaigns between 712 and 705 BCE under Assyrian field marshals, or *turtanu*, in an effort to subdue the Ashdod revolts and to plunder its icons, women, livestock, and other treasures.

When Ashdod was finally captured and an Assyrian victory stela was erected, the local Philistine leader Yemani managed to escape to Egypt. There he sought refuge with Shabaka, who was then in power. However, not wanting to antagonize the Assyrians further, Shabaka arranged for Yemani to be extradited to Assyria as a captive. This approach to Shabaka’s foreign policy earned him a measure of peace although perhaps a sense of betrayal for those citizens of Ashdod. The murder of Sargon II in 705 BCE left the same regional struggles to fall to Sennacherib, his successor.

Fresh from earlier Phoenician victories, Sennacherib launched his third campaign in 702–701 to defeat the Philistines/Canaanites. At the battle of El-Tekeh (Al-Taqu), a modest number of Egyptian and Nubian bowmen, horsemen, and chariots of Pharaoh Shabaka, probably led by Prince Taharka, clashed with the Assyrians. While some are inclined to judge this as a defeat since they did not remain at El-Tekeh, one may also note that the Assyrians did not then pursue the Nubians. A temporary draw might be a better reckoning of this indecisive skirmish. From the battles at El-Tekeh, Timmnah, and Ekron, Sennacherib moved on to his famous siege and victory at Lachish but his unexpected withdrawal from Judaea as it was about to capitulate.

Precisely why the reign of Shabaka comes to an end at this time is still not clear. One might wonder whether the approximate synchrony of his death and the battle of El-Tekeh were related since he could easily have been on that battlefield. Or was there a coup in the Nubian royal family, who felt that Shabaka was not up to the task at hand? The Bible (II Kings 18:21) refers to his reign as “a bruised reed” that would just pierce the hand of those who might rely on him. We do not know the answer, but nevertheless Shabaka’s body and his
chariot horses were returned to Nubia for burial at Kurru (q.v.). Sha-
bataka followed his paternal uncle Shabaka (q.v.).

SHABATAKA, SHEBITQO, SHEBITQU, SHEBITQO, SHEBITKO, SEBICHOS, SEBTECHA, SHABITKU, DJED-
KAU-RE (r. 701–688 BCE). The Nubian (q.v.) pharaoh Shabataka
came to power immediately on the death of his uncle Shabaka (q.v.).
Immediately following his coronation, Shabataka plunged into the
turbulent political and military arena. The conciliatory, even collabo-
rationist, policies of Shabaka were abandoned, and Shabataka sought
to engage in direct combat with the Assyrians (q.v.). He apparently
thought that the best defense would lie in bold offensive actions.
During the Shabataka administration, the Nubian/Egyptian forces
had offered political and military support to the defeated Phoenicians
and Judeans; this greatly annoyed the Assyrian king Sennacherib
(q.v.). Probably Shabataka had asked the Nubian crown prince and his
younger brother, Taharka (q.v.), to support the efforts of Tyre, Sidon,
and the Jews (q.v.) under Hezekiah (q.v.) to resist further Assyrian ex-
pansion. This was noted in the Bible in II Kings 19:9 and Isaiah 37:9.
Within the few years of breathing space during the Piankhy–Shabaka
and Ahaz–Hezekiah interregnums, we have seen that Hezekiah ex-
tended his control of the Philistines. He also made strategic alliances
with the Babylonians and with the Kushites (q.v.) of Egypt then ruled
by Shabaka. However, Hezekiah’s skeptical adviser Isaiah opposed
Jewish ties with Babylon and Egypt. Perhaps most significant of all was
his improvement of the national defense systems. This included the for-
tification of Jerusalem and the remarkable 531-meter-long tunnel from
Gihon Spring that provided a critical water supply to the Pool of Siloam
just beyond the southern wall of Jerusalem. This important hydraulic
engineering enabled him to resist the later siege of Jerusalem by Sen-
nacherib. Even today, waters still flow through Hezekiah’s tunnel. A
famed Siloam inscription, found in 1880 CE, notes the completion of this
tunnel during his time. When Hezekiah’s capital at Jerusalem came un-
der siege by Sennacherib in the summer of 701 BCE, the Assyrians failed
to take the well-defended city. Even though Prince Taharka and King
Shabataka had little to celebrate about the aggressive defense at the bat-
tle of El-Tekeh, and they withdrew when Sennacherib regrouped, they
could say with some satisfaction that Sennacherib was, for a time, no
longer harassing their Judaean ally, and the Assyrians temporarily sus-
pended their further advance into Egypt.

Hezekiah was left a weakened vassal king, and starting in about 696
BCE, Hezekiah ruled with the assistance of his son Manasseh as core-
gent. Shabataka continued to rule in Egypt for nine more years. Like-
wise, the Hezekiah/Manasseh coregents witnessed the early years of
Taharka. However, when Manesseh ruled alone, he was compelled to
pay tribute to the Assyrians during the later reign of Sennacherib’s son
Esharhaddon. The temporary withdrawal of the Assyrians under Sen-
nacherib may have been a great relief to the Levantine powers and to
the Nubians, but it did not last. Shabataka is given reference in the Bible
in I Chronicles 1:9.

Perhaps Shabataka took a wife from the royal female line, that is,
from a sister of Shepenwepet II (q.v.), a daughter of Amenirdes I
(q.v.). The exact circumstances of Shabataka’s death and Taharka’s
rise are shrouded in mystery, and allegations by Manetho suggest that
Taharka may have dethroned or killed him as an ineffective leader
during this critical time. At least the death of Shabataka in 688 BCE
likely was welcome news to the Assyrians, but this only meant a new
Nubian pharaoh with whom Sennacherib would have to contend. Sha-
bataka’s body was carried 1,600 kilometers back to his beloved Nubia
to be buried at the Kurru (q.v.) royal cemetery near Napata (q.v.). At
his tomb were also buried his standing horses in full-dress bridles and
tack and his wife Qalhata. Some of her faience necklaces and
menat
necklace counterweights are in the Museum of Fine Arts collecti-
on (21.11809a-p) in Boston. A bronze brick stamp for some of the con-
struction projects of Shabataka is also known.

SHABLUL. Shablul is well known for its Meroitic (q.v.) cemetery and
settlement sites that were among the early sources of funerary inscrip-
tions for Francis Ll. Griffith’s (q.v.) work in translating some early el-
ements of Meroitic language (q.v.). These discoveries resulted in some
titularies, personal names, and place-names and some elemental idea of
kinship. Some of the tombs appear to show significant social stratifi-
cation for the ranked Meroitic officials who occupied this post.

SHAHEINAB. Shaheinab is an early Neolithic site on the western bank
of the Nile (q.v.) north of modern Khartoum. The site is on a gravel
ridge almost five meters above the modern floodplain of the Nile, suggesting considerably more rainfall at the time. No evidence of plant domestication exists, but some does for the domestication of animals, especially a dwarf goat and perhaps dogs (q.v.). The advances in the local technology included detachable harpoons or spearheads of bone with a perforation for attaching a fiber line. Also included are stone net weights, borers, stone maces, curved and barbed fishhooks cut from shells, bone axes, adzes, partially ground stone gouges with very good secondary flaking, and stone lip plugs. Wattle and reed domestic construction is also known from the Shaheinab site. Their burnished red or black pottery had repetitive impressed or incised designs around thickened rims. The earlier wavy-line or dotted pattern associated with the Khartoum Mesolithic (q.v.) persists in the Neolithic with some zigzag decoration.

These people were still major hunters of wild Nile valley megafauna while also making extensive use of diverse species in the river. Domestic animals played only a small role in their diet. Other examples of the Neolithic in Sudan are found at Haj Yusef, Sheikh al Amin, and Gereif East near Khartoum. This cultural horizon has some affinities to cultures found to the west in Tibesti and Fayum in the Sahara. Carbon dates for Shaheinab materials from 3500 to 3100 BCE have been determined, thus making this site contemporary with late Predynastic Egypt. The site was also occupied in subsequent Meroitic (q.v.), Christian (q.v.), and Islamic (q.v.) periods.

**SHALFAK, SHELFAK.** This Middle Kingdom fortress was on the western bank of the Nile between Uronarti and Askut (qq.v.). It was known as the “Curbing the Countries” fortress and served as a part of the major military defense organized by Egyptians against the perceived threat of Kerma (q.v.) and the Egyptian desire to have stiff control of this region of Upper Nubia (q.v.). The main twinned forts at Semna (q.v.) and Kumma farther upstream were at the front line, but Shalfak gave additional backup protection and perhaps had some role in the regional administration in the total defensive line. Shalfak was most heavily defended, having buttressed walls and watchtowers on the desert side. Only two heavily defended entrances were provided in its sturdy mud-brick walls.
SHAMARKIAN, SHARMAKIAN. This archaeological typology dates to the closing period of the Paleolithic in Lower Nubia (q.v.) with some dates ranging from 5750 to 3270 BCE. As such, it has denticulate microliths in its assemblages that could be compared with Mousterian assemblages in North Africa or almost like Mesolithic tools farther upstream in Nubia.

SHANAKDAKHETE, SHANAKDAKHETO (170–150 BCE). This stout Meroitic (q.v.) queen was a contemporary of Ptolemy VI (q.v.) in Egypt. Although regnant, she was depicted and termed as a (male) “Lord of Two Lands.” She was either the first or the second Meroitic queen to achieve this status. She also has the first dated example of Meroitic hieroglyphs (q.v.) at the Amun Temple (F) at Naqa (q.v.). It is believed that she is buried in the Bejrawiya north pyramid 11, where potsherds were found with Egyptian and Meroitic demotic, suggesting the point of origin of this writing style. There her funerary chapel shows her protected by Isis (q.v.) and presented to Osiris (q.v.). Behind her is a prince.

SHAQADUD. The site at Shaqadud Cave belongs to the Neolithic tradition along with Kadada and Kadero (qq.v.) just downstream from the confluence of the White and Blue Niles (q.v.). Shaqadud is located at an improved natural pool, or hafir, well into the Butana (q.v.), away from the eastern bank of the Nile. Its location suggests a regular pastoral economy with water provided from this pool. Its mixed economy allowed for semisedentary occupation. However, following its early use, it appears to have been abandoned until about 2600 BCE, a time when early Kerma (q.v.) was in formation.

SHEEP. Among the family Ovidae is the sheep (Ovis orientalis) that was ancestral to those having great domestic importance in the Nile valley. In this case, the two most important species are Ovis longipes palaeoaegyptiaca and the later Ovis platyura aegyptiaca. The O. longipes variety is the earlier of these two sheep to arrive in Egypt. These long-legged, long-tailed, heavy-shouldered rams have a sparse fleece and rather horizontally corkscrew twisted horns. The O. platyura variety was also introduced later than O. longipes. The type O. platyura is hairy, thin-tailed, and lop-eared, with forward-curving
(not corkscrew) horns for rams. It is important to note that because of the historical difference in their time of introduction, because of their different horn structure, and because they are associated with different deities, one may determine the historical context in which both sheep and their associated deities have emerged.

Images of sheep in Egypt appear in Naqada times (4000–3100 BCE) in Upper Egypt. In the case of the Predynastic Naqadan II (or Gerzean) horizon (3500–3100 BCE), one finds images only of corkscrew-horned sheep (*O. longipes*) on pottery and cosmetic palettes. Meanwhile, in the Khartoum Mesolithic (q.v.) or the so-called wavy-line pottery culture of Sudan (ca. 3330 BCE) at the site of Shaheinab (q.v.), some remains have been found of domesticated sheep and goats as a small part of their otherwise fishing, hunting, and gathering economy. At the somewhat later sites at Kadero and Kaduda (qq.v.), the presence of sheep and goats had already increased substantially.

When Kerma (q.v.) arose, it established military alliances with the “shepherd kings” of the Hyksos (q.v.), who occupied the delta and Lower Egypt. Perhaps it was then that the *O. platyura* also became much more widespread. Although virtually no textual evidence exists, the presence of highly decorated sheep in burials and of painted stone sculpture of sheep certainly suggests that they were of great symbolic and ritual importance. The sheep found as funerary offerings and depicted at Kerma are the later, forward-curving horned (*O. platyura*) rather than the corkscrew-horned variety (*O. longipes*).

Until this time, the Egyptians had settled for worship of the two ram gods Harishef and Khnum, both of whom were representations of *O. longipes*. Thus, the fascinating question is raised about why the New Kingdom Egyptian conquerors of Kerma not only adopted the *O. platyura* ram as their own but also elevated it to their high state god, that is, the ram god Amun, who typically is depicted as *O. platyura*. From the New Kingdom on, Amun is never shown with only the corkscrew horns. It appears that in conquering Kerma, the Egyptians incorporated this deity of this conquered people to assist in the legitimization of their colonial rule. By the 19th and 20th Dynasties, the ram wore the double plumes of the conflated god Amun-Re, the father of all pharaohs.

The case of the famed Middle Kingdom (12th Dynasty) tomb 280 model of livestock reckoning for the Theban overseer Meketre shows
an abundance of cattle, but sheep are not indicated. Nor do sheep appear in tombs of the wealthy in Old and Middle Kingdom times despite the abundance of other types of foods. The rock-hewn tomb 3 of the nomarch Khnumhotep III at Beni Hassan during the 12th Dynasty contains one of the first depictions of both varieties of sheep being herded together. Appropriately, the name of this nomarch may be translated as "the one who makes tribute to Khnum" (the ram god). In this case, an impressive ram is used as a triconsonantal glyph or syllable in the name. Just prior to the New Kingdom in Upper Egypt during the early 17th Dynasty, the tomb of the nomarch Renni of El-Kab records that he owned or received as tribute 122 cattle, 100 sheep, 1,200 goats (or sheep?), and 1,500 pigs. During the New Kingdom (1568–1080 BCE), the woollier, heavy-maned, curved-horn rams had apparently taken over in actual animal husbandry. In an effort to reconcile these images for these two types, instances are seen of ram images shown sporting both horn structures, something that, naturally, never happened at all.

Still another form of ram worship is seen with the four-headed ram amulet first seen in Rameside times. The four heads captured the notion of “doubling,” or rebirth, and one also finds a double-ended or doubled-headed faience ram that carried a moon between these ends. The link to resurrection (or doubling of the soul) is suggested by a ram amulet with a solar disk and the wings of a ba bird of the reborn soul. This recurs in the Late period, when the ram becomes identified as the god Ba-neb-djedet or the ancient ram god of Mendes, where an ancient graveyard for sacred rams is known. During New Kingdom colonization of Nubia, at the holy mountain of Jebel Barkal (q.v.), the Egyptians built an immense Amun temple to honor the ram god. Once Nubians recovered their political autonomy from Egypt, they continued with the ram as a form of the god Amun, where it was believed that his spiritual manifestation of the ram Amun (O. platyura) actually resided. Since the ram was so important, it appears in many forms of iconography, epigraphic inscriptions, and religious sculpture. For Pharaoh Shabaka (q.v.), a double-headed steatite ram seal is known with a solar disk, uraeus, and wadjet eyes.

Among the famed images of rams in the 25th Dynasty is that from the temple of Taharka at Kawa (qq.v.), where he is shown standing between the protective forelegs of the ram. These images are rams in the form of the heavy-wooled, lop-eared, forward-curving type. Other ram
forms of Amun during the 25th Dynasty have the characteristic Nubian double cobra uraeus. The significance of the ram as Amun is further underscored in the two highest appointments after the pharaoh himself with the God’s Wife of Amun (often the pharaoh’s sister) and the High Priest of Amun (often the pharaoh’s brother). An image of Shepenwepet II shows her holding a libation vessel with its lid in the form of a ram of Amun.

The ram continued to be popular in some of the magnificent royal jewelry known from Meroë (q.v.). This is well illustrated in the lovely gold rings, pendants, and inscriptions of Queen Amn-ishakhete (q.v.), among others. In the Late period, the atef crown evolves to become an ornate triple atef or hemhem(t) crown with corkscrew sheep horns and usually two cobra uraei. Since hemhem means to “shout” or “cry out” in ancient Egyptian, it seems that the hemhem crown may represent a horn for use as war or battle cry. Apedemek (q.v.), the Meroitic lion-headed war god, is shown wearing the hemhem crown at the Apedemek temple in Musawwarat es-Sufra (q.v) and at the Lion Temple at Naqa (q.v.). At the same temple is one ram-headed deity wearing the Ostride crown, while another has the crown of Amun. The Meroitic kings Natakamani and Arnekhamani (qq.v) and even the Christian king Silko (q.v) also wear the hemhem when they invoke Apedemek or appear in a combat or military context. This military association reinforces the understanding that the hemhem icon in the form of the corkscrew horn is a military battle trumpet. The same is true in gold jewelry for Meroë in which a ram form has the double plume of Amun, while the god Apedemek wears the hemhem crown. Both sometimes have their crown on a corkscrew horn base while sporting the forward-curving horns as well. The atef persists on some royal crowns at Ballana.

From Meroë, another rare ram depiction is of a semikneeling curved-horn ram shown preparing to fire an arrow. This unique military theme for this deity resonates with Meroitic military interests and their important state god of war, the lion-headed Apedemek. From Gemai in Meroitic times is an incised bronzed bowl that has a scene of an apparent seated ram form of Amun but also an image of what seems to be a mummified ram behind him. Ram amulets in faience, lapis lazuli, and even gold also appear in the Saite 24th Dynasty. These are either couchant or standing rams, sometimes in a
sphinx form carrying a solar disk and uraeus. Ram sphinxes were also incorporated as scarab bases and in ring bezels. In the 26th and 30th Dynasties, some use was made of ram amulets in funerary heart scarabs that have ram’s heads that appear to be the Khnum or Harisef ram—forms invoking a spirit of resurrection with Osiris.

By Ptolemaic times, the worship of Khnum had become even more widespread, and by then he was projected to be the god who fashioned human beings and animals from clay spun around on a potter’s wheel. The association of rams and kingship continues dramatically in the case of Alexander the Great. In seeking legitimacy, he visited the Amun temple at Siwa Oasis, and in a coin that was minted in his honor, Alexander is shown with a forward-curving horn of a ram wrapped around his ears.

Aside from the Jebel Barkal pilgrimage site for rams, the other location is at Aswan, the site of one of the most celebrated cults for the worship of rams, both living and mummified, in the form of the early ram-headed Khnum with his two Nubian consorts Satet and Anqet. Together they made the Triad of Elephantine, one of several ancient holy trinities. A temple there was built in his honor, and many privileged royal rams were pampered, decorated, adored, and actually mummified with gold-covered cartonage wrappings. In the Aswan cataracts was Seheil Island, where scores of inscriptions invoke the Nubian/Egyptian god Khnum and his two wife-goddesses. Khnum is consistently shown as the *O. longipes* species.

An incident involving Khnum took place at Elephantine when some Jewish mercenaries were hired during the first Persian occupation of Egypt sometime around 525 BCE to be stationed at the strategically placed border fort there. To serve their own religious needs, they constructed a temple that apparently damaged the existing Khnum shrine located nearby. Perhaps local priests were opposed to Jews eating rams, and they held Khnum in such reverence that the Jewish temple was an affront. In about 410 BCE, they attacked the Jewish temple and caused considerable destruction.

Another role of sheep relating intimately to Judaism is the use of the shofar, which is a central feature of rituals held at Rosh Hoshanah and Yom Kippur. In ancient times, the blowing of this ram horn wind instrument was important for military communication, and the shofar is now essential in the synagogue as a valued tradition for calling Jews together for worship. As noted, the Meroitic and late Egyptian
use of the hemhem to symbolize a horn or trumpet for battle and the Jewish shofar may have evolved from this tradition, since much of Judaic culture was heavily Hellenized as it emerged in Egypt. For Jews, the appropriate form of the shofar is the older corkscrew variant (O. longipes) of the ram’s horn, as in the hemhem crown.

The association of rams with the high god Amun persists clearly with the Coptic use of “amoun,” who was still a recognized deity, and one may speculate that that use of “Amen” to conclude prayers for Jews, Christians, and Muslims may perpetuate this eternal reverence even when the historical and theological reference has been lost. Given the early and deep linkages between Judaism, Christianity, and ancient Egypt, it is not surprising that the height of Amun as a ram for Theban priests is echoed by the fact that Christ is projected as the “lamb of god.” As a parallel to the crucifixion of Christ, the Eucharistic slaughter of sheep is an established ritual. This is especially true at Passover and Easter dinner meals, where lamb is commonly served as a symbol of the sacrifice of the mortal body of Jesus. Since the death of Christ was to atone for the sins of subsequent humanity, the sacrifice of a lamb continues this metaphor. Western Christians prefer a green garnish or green (mint) jelly with their Easter lamb. The color green is also associated with Osiris and Islam.

In tabulating animal references in the Bible, as many as 553 notations are made to sheep, with 188 references to lambs and 165 to rams. This is far and above the most cited animal in biblical reference. Lions are a distant second at 176 citations, oxen 166, horses 164, bullocks 152, asses 150, goats a mere 138, and the all-important Middle Eastern camel only 62. Images of sheep and shepherds abound in the Old Testament, and again the shepherd staff attributed to Jesus and to popes has its counterpart shepherd staff as a symbol of pharaonic authority. Both Jesus and God are reckoned as “shepherds” to their “flocks,” and in John 21:15, Jesus referred to his followers as his “lambs.” Medieval Christian iconography in Nubia always places (Vantini 1981:150) two shepherds, Arnias and Lekotes, in Nativity paintings. Apparently, these do not have a parallel elsewhere.

SHEIKH SULEIMAN. This site held the rock carving of King Djer (q.v.) of the 1st Dynasty in the Archaic period, showing the first recorded Egyptian raid into Nubia (q.v.) for cattle and probably
slaves. It was located not far from Wadi Halfa (q.v.), but the stone inscription has been moved to the National Museum in Khartoum. The King Djer carving is also among the first depictions of Egyptian boats (q.v.) in Nubian waters.

**SHELLAL, SHALLAL.** Shellal is a Kenuz Nubian (qq.v.) word referring to “cataracts”; thus, it is located just above the First Cataract at Aswan (q.v.) and sometimes serves as a port for Nile (q.v.) steamers to Wadi Halfa (q.v.) at the southern end of the railway in Egypt. The waters of Lake Nasser have eliminated its original location, but still reference is still made to the term “Shellal.” With the construction of the Low Dam at Aswan, Shellal and its vicinity were explored extensively. At the time of SenusRET III (q.v.) in the Middle Kingdom, a defensive wall may have been constructed at Shellal to support the canal improvements he also made to allow more rapid troop and commercial movement to Nubia. In Roman times, two military camps at Shellal protected Aswan from Nubian attack and provided a base from which to launch attacks on Nubia.

**SHENDI.** Shendi lies just upstream from the ancient Meroitic (q.v.) capital and its neighboring pyramid fields. To the southeast of Shendi are the important Meroitic ruins at Naqa (q.v.) and Musawwarat es-Sufra (q.v.). As with ancient Meroë, the local produce of Shendi included items such as local foodstuffs, pottery, baskets, livestock, rope, grains, wood, and dates. Slavery was another important aspect of Shendi’s trade. Slave merchants were mostly middlemen and a few slave hunters. In 1814, it was estimated that as many as 5,000 slaves passed through Shendi each year. In 1823, Shendi was the site of the murder of Isma’il Pasha by Mek Nimr, the local ruler.

**SHEPENWEPET I, SHEPENUPTE I.** This noblewoman of the Libyan 23rd Dynasty was the daughter of King Osorkon III (q.v.) in the delta in the Third Intermediate period. He appointed her as the God’s Wife of Amun in Thebes. Osorkon III revived this office so that his celibate daughter could travel to Thebes to assist her father in gaining legitimacy with the Theban Amun cult (q.v.). She was associated with a small temple at Karnak and was given high titles to cement her political and religious ties to this significant Theban body.
This approach was relatively successful, but when the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) gained control of these rivals in the Third Intermediate period, they compelled Shepenwepet I to “adopt” Amenirdis I (q.v.) to fulfill the same capacity for the Nubian king Piankhy (q.v.), who was the brother of Amenirdis I. [by M. Ayad and R. Lobban]

SHEPENWEPET II. This noble Nubian (q.v.) woman of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.) was the sister of Shabaka and Taharka (qq.v) and served in the high-ranking position of God’s Wife of Amun or Divine Adoratrice of Amun to continue in the same way that her Libyan namesake had done in the 23rd Dynasty. Amenirdis II (q.v.), also in the 25th Dynasty, served as the God’s Wife of Amun, and in the 26th Dynasty, Nitocris (q.v.) followed Shepenwepet II in the same tradition. [by M. Ayad and R. Lobban]

SHESHONK I, SHOSHENQ, SHISHAK (945–924 BCE). This 22nd Dynasty pharaoh of the Libyan (Mashwesh [q.v.]) dynasty ruled from the eastern delta in the Third Intermediate period. With his appointments to the rulers of Upper Egypt, he reconstituted a unitary authority for the Lower Egyptian Nile. Sheshonk raided Judaea in 930 BCE, and, according to Karnak inscriptions, he also received tribute from Nubia (q.v.). Later in this dynasty, the kings of Egypt lost their hold on Nubia, and this began to make way for the subsequent emergence of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.), when Nubians came to rule Egypt.

SHET. During the 12th Dynasty (q.v.) in the Middle Kingdom during the reign of Senusoret I (q.v.), a stela was erected at Wadi Halfa (q.v.) offering the first list of ten conquered Nubian place-names or ethnic names that he had conquered. Most have vanished either from the surface of the earth or from memory except for Shet, which was above the Second Cataract about fifty-six kilometers south of Wadi Halfa or near Kumma (q.v.).

SHORKAROR, SHERKARER (20–30 CE). King Shorkaror is known from a rock carving at Jebel Qeili (q.v.) in the central Butana (q.v.) east of Meroë (q.v.). He was the third son of King Natakamanmi and Queen Amanitare (qq.v.). At Jebel Qeili, he is depicted defeating his regional enemies and making offerings to his Hellenistic (?) sun god with a staff of sorghum, which was the staple crop.
SHUKRIYA. The Shukriya are a great section of the Juwayna Arabs, who are concentrated in the Blue Nile (q.v.) and Kassala areas and are a major camel-herding (q.v.) people. They may have some links with the earlier nomadic groups of the southeastern Butana (q.v.), such as the Blemmyes, and they also have major Arab admixture with some residual Meroitic (q.v.) stock.

SILKO, KING. King Silko was the author of a famed inscription in poor Greek in the northern forecourt at the Roman temple at Kalabsha (q.v.). Probably sometime between 536 and 540 CE, he proclaimed himself king of the Nobatae and of all the “Ethiopians” by his “final” military defeat of the Blemmyes (q.v.), who may well have been a late form of the X-Group (q.v.). Perhaps he was encouraged in this task by missionary Julian (q.v.) or by the military objectives of the Romans, who had varying relations with the Blemmyes. But these questions are not resolved. The Silko inscription is often taken as the start of Christianity in Nubia since he uses the word “god” in a singular form.

SINGA SKULL. This Paleolithic (q.v.) skull found at Singa along the Blue Nile is the earliest example of human remains found in Sudan. This dates to about 17,000 years BP, and the skull is thought to belong to the “proto-Bushman,” “Rhodesioid,” or Stillbay (q.v.) culture of Sudan. The skull has pronounced supraorbital ridges, small mastoid processes, and parietal bosses. Some affinity has been alleged to Predynastic Egyptian peoples. Others claim that it is an ancestral Nilotic type that led to the Khartoum Mesolithic (q.v.), while still others think it to be an aberrant “Bushmanoid” type. In short, the lack of other fossil remains of this type or from this period has meant considerable argument about just how and where to place this evidence. These prehistoric residents of the Blue Nile struck crude flake tools from cores of poor-quality rock. Fossils of large bulls or buffalo are also found at Singa.

SIPTAH (1193–1187 BCE). Ruling briefly almost at the end of the 19th Dynasty in the New Kingdom (q.v.), Pharaoh Siptah struggled to assert his waning power. J. H. Breasted believed that Siptah had a Nubian (q.v.) power base from which he could establish his rivalry to Thebes, although the data to support this are not strong. In any case,
he was able to establish a viceroy of Kush (q.v.) named Seti, who maintained a regular flow of Nubian tribute during his short reign.

SIRENPUT I. Sirenput I served under Pharaoh Senusret I (q.v.; 1971–1926 BCE). Sirenput I resided in Aswan (q.v.) and was titled “the Governor of the South” and of Elephantine (q.v.). Thus, the temples of Khnum and Satet (q.v.) were under his authority. He was en-tombed in the cliffs of Gubbat al-Howa at Aswan. He was the grandfather of Sirenput II (q.v.). The six-columned court and three-room rock-cut tomb (no. 36) of Sirenput I show detailed painted scenes of his family and daily life.

SIRENPUT II. This “Governor of the South,” High Priest of Elephantine’s Khnum Temple (q.v.), and “Commander of the Troops” served during the 12th Dynasty (q.v.) of the Middle Kingdom. Sirenput II is known mainly from his well-preserved rock-cut tomb (no. 31) at the Gubbat al-Howa in Aswan (q.v.). This tomb has a narrow entrance hall followed by a six-pillared chamber and then a gallery with niches for the display of Osiride (q.v.) forms of the deceased. The incomplete, innermost chamber has four pillars that frame a lovely, fresh polychrome image of Sirenput II seated on a lion-footed stool and being presented with offerings of food (duck, grapes, and meat) and drink by a lotus-bearing son or servant. He is shown with a fine kilt, bracelets, pectoral necklace, and a small beard. Above his head are two cartouches inscribed as Neb-Kau-Re (i.e., Amenemhet II, 1929–1895 BCE [q.v.]) of the 12th Dynasty (q.v.) as well as an image of an ivory-bearing elephant (q.v.), suggesting his interest in Nubia (q.v.). The neighboring right wall shows his wife, who was titled “Priestess of Hathor” (q.v.), also receiving food gifts. He was the son of Satet-hotep and the grandson of Sirenput I (q.v.).

SMENDES (NESBENEBED) (1069–1043 BCE). In the wake of the death of Ramses XI (q.v.) and the collapse of the New Kingdom (q.v.) after the 20th Dynasty (q.v.), Smendes was the coregent of Lower Egypt, while High Priest Herihor (q.v.) ruled in Upper Egypt and Viceroy Panehesi (q.v.) ruled Nubia. This Late period allowed Nubians the autonomy that finally led to their conquest of all of Egypt in the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). It is probably during this time that
the famed but incomplete story of the traveling merchant Wenamun was written.

SOBA. Soba East is along the Blue Nile about twenty kilometers southeast of modern Khartoum. As an archaeological site, its known history dates to Meroitic (q.v.) times, when it controlled a river crossing and southern entryway into the Butana (q.v.) trade routes. Soba East shows its late Meroitic history by Meroitic potsherds, a temple, some Meroitic inscriptions, and a Meroitic stone lion. Recent excavations by the British Museum staff have revealed the foundation of a Meroitic pyramid that was apparently destroyed to make way for a post-Meroitic temple, and mixed burial orientations and extensive postholes also suggest ethnic and religious diversity in the transition to Christianity.

However, Soba is far better known for its regional dominance in medieval Christian times, when it served as the capital of Alwa. This probably large trading town was considered affluent, with homes and churches made of burnt red brick plastered over. The missionary Longinus (q.v.) visited Soba in 580 CE, sometime shortly after its conversion, having been invited by the king for this purpose. Longinus gave testimony to the Soba/Dongola (q.v.) rivalry since he had to travel by a long, dangerous desert route to get to Soba with the aid of Blemmyes (q.v.) and avoid the king of Dongola (q.v.) of the kingdom of Makurra (q.v.).

Immediately after Islam (q.v.) reached Egypt in the seventh century, relations between Muslim Egypt and Soba were initially favorable and nonthreatening since a huge swath of land separated the two. As the archaeology of Soba has advanced, a layer of Islamic-style glassware and ceramics attests to substantial interregional trade. In 970 CE, the Egyptian traveler Ibn Selim al-Aswani reached Soba and reported that its wealth was greater than that of the Christian kingdom of Makurra. He reported that it had extensive meadows for grazing large herds of livestock, horses were plentiful and popular, and the king had an impressive standing army. Extensive gardens, gold-covered church decorations, and a Muslim rest house were also featured. Written records from Soba are sparse, but a tombstone dated to 1015 CE testifies to a King Daud who died in that year. As Christian Nubia deteriorated, the local ’Abdallab Muslims from Qerri (perhaps a corruption of the Meroitic word qor for “king”) became a threat to
more isolated Soba. In 1504 CE, these 'Abdallab joined the nascent Funj sultan Umara Dunqas from Sennar to conquer Soba and disperse its people and wealth. When the Jewish traveler David Reubeni passed through in 1523, he saw only ruins and some scattered huts at this site. During the Turkiya, apparently some considerable amount of building materials, such as stone and burnt brick, were removed from Soba to build Khartoum in the 1820s. The archaeological excavation of Soba began in the 1950s, and others have followed, but not yet with the extensive survey methods needed for such a large site.

SOLEB, SOLB, SULB. This site in Upper Nubia is noted for a great New Kingdom (q.v.) temple for Amenhotep III (q.v.). On the temple were closed lotus capitals for remaining columns, some of which show bound Nubians (q.v.). An outer doorway relief at the outer hypostyle hall shows Amenhotep III embracing and making offerings to his deified images. A New Kingdom cemetery of the same time suggests some persistent population for the site or region, with other New Kingdom constructions at nearby Jebel Dosha (q.v.) and Sadegna (qq.v.). A granite lion that was started by Amenhotep III at Soleb was finished by Tutankhamen (q.v.) and was later removed to Jebel Barkal (q.v.) by King Amanislo (q.v.).

STEINDORF, GEORG A. (1861–1951). This German Egyptologist studied under Adolf Erman in Berlin and was a founder of the Egyptian Institute in Leipzig. He excavated and traveled in riverine and desert Egypt and Nubia. During 1910–1912, Steindorf worked with the Siegelin Expedition at Aniba (q.v.) in Lower Nubia studying the C-Group (q.v.) and a pharaonic fortress. He worked again at Aniba during the 1929–1933 Nubian salvage campaign, this time turning to A-Group (q.v.), C-Group, and pharaonic cemeteries. He was particularly skilled in his studies of the Coptic and Egyptian languages. He fled to the United States with the rise of German Nazism and made another productive American career in the leading Egyptological museums, especially in Boston and Baltimore.

STILLBAY. The term “Stillbay” represents the general “Bushmanoid” (Xhosan, or “click,” language) group that is documented from southernmost Africa to the base of the Ethiopian highlands. It is presumed
to have existed, in relatively homogeneous forms, across the continent in prehistoric times and to the present in certain cases. They were hunters and gatherers of the late Paleolithic (q.v.) and thereafter with a stone tool technology, especially with chipped flakes. In Sudan, the Stillbay type is known from Singa (q.v.) on the Blue Nile, only 480 kilometers from Khartoum; their distribution is reasonably presumed to have been extensive in Sudanese grasslands and river valleys.

While their record is sparse indeed, it is worth noting that no archaeological record exists of Nilotic or Niger-Congo people in Sudan until about the time of Christ or even much later. Of course, Arabic speakers came well after this time. However, a variety of Cushitic and Nubian speaking (?) Sudanic groups were present in these late Mesolithic or early Neolithic times. Hunting and gathering was still significant to Stillbay people and their Cushite contemporaries, represented by Capsian culture, similar to North Africa, with the use of stone blades and microliths.

As the Cushites acquired the domestication of plants and animals from 2000 BCE on, they began an explosive dispersal south and west. Probably Bushmanoid populations were left in desirable areas, but they finally disappeared in Sudan without leaving a clear trace as Nilotics and others subsequently arrived.

STRABO. The famed geographer Strabo was born around 63 BCE in Amasia, Greece, to a wealthy, well-educated family. He spent a great deal of his life in Rome, and his travels and writings were conducted during the period of the Roman Empire that followed conventional contemporary sources, such as Polybius. By 49 BCE, he found himself as a young contemporary of the famed Cleopatra VII, ruler of Ptolemaic Egypt. In 44 BCE, Strabo traveled from Corinth to Rome to advance his Roman education; he was reported in Rome again in 35 BCE. Following the suicide of Cleopatra in 31 BCE and the rise of Roman rule under Augustus (27 BCE–14 CE), Strabo traveled to Alexandria in about 26 BCE to study at the major center of science and learning for the circum-Mediterranean region. He stayed in Egypt for three to five years, mostly studying at the great museum and library of Alexandria, but he also traveled widely in Egypt, and it is believed that he reached as far south as Aswan (Syene) and perhaps into the Dodekaschoenos region of Lower Nubia.
The most significant work of Strabo is his eight-volume/scroll *Geography*, which was written between 9 and 5 BCE. This work was composed partly in Alexandria and partly in Rome, his adopted capital city. This was not only a comprehensive and integrated volume but also one of the primary links to previous Alexandrian scholarship, which is largely lost. Similarly, the work of Strabo became the state of the art for many centuries to follow, especially in the writings of Claudius Ptolemeus, with whom numerous similarities and differences exist. Strabo died sometime between 19 and 23 CE.

Still benefiting from the reports of Phoenician (q.v.) circumnavigation of Africa, Strabo’s map of the inhabited world shows Africa surrounded by water. This fact was to be lost within two centuries. Apparently, the coast-hugging Phoenicians knew of the “Aethiopes Hesperii,” or coastal sub-Saharan Africans. The term “Libya” was the general continental reference. The large S-shape of the Nile is more accurately drawn for Strabo than for the more impressionistic shape given by Ptolemeus. Meroë is identified as lying on the same longitude (meridian) as Aswan and Alexandria as Eratosthenes had assumed, with more or less accuracy. The incorrect notion of Ptolemeus of an “island” of Meroë was not indicated.

Strabo also reported on the military engagement between Roman troops and the Aethiopians (who were ruled by a one-eyed queen Candace) that finally ended in mutual raiding and a peace accord. He also recorded the refugees from the rule of Psamtik, who fled into Nubia (Meroë) to the land termed “Tenessis” (possibly a corruption of Nubian “Ta-n-Essi”), “Land of the (joined) Waters,” where the Astapus and Astasobas Rivers met (i.e., the modern conjunction of the White and Blue Niles). Strabo advances a sort of protoethnography with references to the ethnic region of “Aethiopia” described by his references to the *Elephantophagi* (elephant eaters), *Struthophagi* (ostrich eaters), *Ichthyophagi* (fish eaters), *Rhizophagi* (root eaters), *Acridophagi* (locust eaters), *Anthropophagi* (cannibals), and *Helei* (marsh men). Strabo reports that the Blemmyes (Beja) are subjects of the Aethiopians but that the Nubae to the west of the Nile are not a subject population. Strabo also offers the nomenclature for the River “Astaboras,”
which survives in the present Atbara River. His reference to the Blue Nile is the “Astatobas,” and the White Nile is the “Astapus.” Possibly, the common prefix to these three rivers is derived from a corruption of the Nubian word essi (water).

Strabo credits Eratosthenes for describing the backward N-shape of the Nile and that the earth is sphere-shaped; he then measured its various segments in stadia, which he debated as somewhat different from Eratosthenes. For example, he made the following claims:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Places</th>
<th>Distance in Stadia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diameter of Earth</td>
<td>252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aswan to Equator</td>
<td>16,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meroë to Athens</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meroë to Alexandria</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aswan to Meroë</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confluence to Meroë</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 stadium equals 0.16 kilometer; 10 stadia equal 1.6 kilometers.

STRATEGOI. This Greek term was a reference to the regional generals put into place during the Ptolemaic administration. The strategoi were overseers of their subordinates, the epistrategos and the nomarchs of large towns. In turn, the epistrategos headed the administration of oikonemes (treasurers), epistates (regional commanders), and his phylakitai (police militias) as well as the epimeletes (court guards or bailiffs). Each nomarch also had a hierarchical administration of komarchs (village scribes) and toparches (town scribes). Because the Blemmyes (q.v.) commonly were placed in the position of strategoi, the Meroitic or Greek term pelemos may be rooted in this term.

SUAKIN. This is a fascinating but essentially abandoned town on the Red Sea. Its history probably dates back to pharaonic times, when New Kingdom pharaohs used this area in their trading and exploring missions along the Red Sea and to the “land of Punt” (q.v.). In very early times, Suakin’s immediate hinterland was occupied by Beja people (descendants from the ancient Blemmyes). In Christian times, Suakin’s strategic location also attracted both Axumites from Ethiopia and their Sabaen relatives from Yemen.
The main part of the town is located on an island connected by a short causeway to the mainland. This was guarded by a fortified gate and could offer a good defense to the inhabitants, traders, and pilgrims to Mecca. For much of this millennium, Suakin was the main point of access to the interior of Africa from Arabia. The famed Arab historian Ibn Batuta (1303–1377 CE) reported that the sultan of Suakin had a Beja mother and a father who was the emir of Mecca. Such notes help place Suakin in its historical and social context.

Certainly by the thirteenth century and perhaps much earlier, Suakin was also an important outlet for the export of slaves from Sudan. It was faster to come down or across the Red Sea and then enter Sudan from Suakin than take the much slower overland and upstream routes along the Nile. After the sixteenth century, Muslim pilgrims from West Africa would also come to Suakin on their way to Mecca. During the Ottoman rule in Egypt, particularly that of Sultan Sulayman (1520–1566 CE), control was exercised over Suakin’s shipping and commercial interests, especially that derived from the trade in slaves coming from Shendi and Sennar. In later times, Suakin would see merchants from India, China, and Portugal coming to purchase slaves, ivory, ebony, incense, gum arabic, and other Sudanese goods. In the early eighteenth century, Suakin was a town of about 8,000 people and functioned as the main ocean port for the Funj sultans at Sennar. At present, hardly a building stands, and Suakin may reappear only in the reports of future archaeologists.

SUDANIC LANGUAGES. Using the principles of historical linguistics to guide a genetic classification of the languages of Africa, the Sudanic language subgroups have been reconstructed by Joseph Greenberg (1966). He placed the Sudanic languages in the family of Nilo-Saharan (q.v.) languages as a subgroup of the Chari-Nile. Sudanic languages are further delineated as Central Sudanic and Eastern Sudanic. Eastern Sudanic languages are found in the eastern Sahara, including parts of Chad, Uganda, the Lake Victoria region of Kenya, and Sudan. In Sudan, Eastern Sudanic languages are found in Upper and Lower Nubia, in pockets in the Western Desert, and in the south in the savanna and in the Sudd. This subgroup consists of seven branches: Nubian, Beir-Didinga, Barea, Tabi, Merarit, Dagu, and Southern Branch.
The large Southern Branch is further defined to include Nilotic (Burun, Luo, Budama, and Dinka-Nuer) and Great Lakes (or “Nilo-Hamitic”—Nandi-Suk, Bari, Fajulu, Nyangbara, Kakwa, Masai, Teso, Turkana, Topotha, Karamojong, and Latuka). Central Sudanic languages are found in parts of Uganda, southwestern Sudan, the Central African Republic, and Zaire. This subgroup includes the languages of Bongo-Bagirmi, Efe, Mangbetu, Berta, and Kunama.

Attempts to place ancient Meroitic into the Sudanic language family using historical linguistics have so far been only marginally successful. However, in some of the very few words that are positively known, some with cognatic lexical relations exist with Old Nubian, modern Nubian dialects, and a few survivals in the modern Sudanese lexicon. [R. Lobban with k. rhodes] See also APPENDIX; LANGUAGE AND CULTURE.

SUDD. This is a large swamp “barrier” region in southern Sudan, mainly in the Bahr al-Jebal part of the White Nile (q.v.). The vegetation in the Sudd makes navigation of the river difficult without constant clearing activity. In antiquity, no evidence has been found that this barrier was penetrated, and the only external reports of ancient explorers heading this far south were during the Greco-Roman period, but even then the details are sketchy. Thus, the Sudd represented the most southerly possible extent of Nubia.

– T –

TABO, TEBO. Tabo is located on Argo Island (q.v.) in the Kerma (q.v.) basin in Upper Nubia (q.v.). Some burials and potsherds date back to Kerma times, and the presence of pottery and reused building blocks from the New Kingdom (18th and 19th Dynasties) shows occupation at that time as well. Tabo has a temple to Amun and Thoth, Satet, and Anqet (q.q.v.) that was built by Taharka (q.v.) of the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). Tabo continued in use in Napatan times probably for coronation and purification rituals. The Meroitic (q.v.) period represented the largest cemetery at Tabo, having the typical offering tablets, some statuary, and examples of Meroitic demotic and some hieroglyphics. Dating to this period are also two colossal granite statues that are
considered to represent the Meroitic brother deities Sebiumeker and Arensnuphis (q.v.).

**TAFA, TAFFA, TAPHIS.** Originally, this site on the western bank of the Nile (q.v.) in Lower Nubia (q.v.) had two temples built in the Roman (q.v.) period or perhaps as early as the Ptolemies (q.v.). The southern temple was in poor condition and is lost. The simple northern temple was dismantled in 1960 and relocated in Leiden, Holland, at a courtyard in the Rijksmuseum. These two temples originally were located between the Kertassi (q.v.) kiosk and the Bait al-Wali (q.v.) rock-cut temple to the god Amun (q.v.), about fifty kilometers south of the High Dam at Aswan. The Tafa temple was drawn by David Roberts (q.v.) and reproduced by lithograph.

**TAHARKA, TAHARQA, TARCUS, TAHARQO, NEFERTUMKHURE (r. 690–664 BCE).** This very important “Ethiopian,” 25th Dynasty (q.v.), Kushitic (q.v.), or Nubian king was the grandson of Pharaoh Kashta (q.v.), the son of Pharaoh Piankhy (q.v.), and the younger brother of Pharaoh Shabataka (q.v.). Precisely how he came to power is uncertain, but Manetho (q.v.) alleges, with no known evidence, that he killed Shabataka. The date of Taharka’s birth is not known, but one may guess that it was before 720 BCE. As a young man and the crown prince, Taharka was asked by his brother to join the forces of Hezekiah (q.v.) of Judaea (Palestine) and King Luli (q.v.) of Tyre and Sidon (Phoenicia) in their joint struggle against the Assyrian (q.v.) expansion then led by King Sennacherib (q.v.; 704–681 BCE). Luli escaped to Cyprus in 701 BCE, and Hezekiah was trapped by the Assyrian siege. Prince Taharka and Pharaoh Piankhy were able to withdraw to Egypt. These years gained him practical, firsthand experience in combating the Assyrians, which he was to do for the rest of his life. Taharka is noted in the Old Testament (II Kings 19:9), as are two other Kushite pharaohs.

Around 689–690 BCE, with his mother present as a witness, Nefer-tumkhure Taharka was crowned “Pharaoh of the Two Lands” at Memphis, but his Egyptian rule was mainly from Tanis or Memphis in Lower Egypt. He fought continuously to protect the unity and sovereignty of the Nile (q.v.) valley from the Assyrians. His other main goals were to restore the religious values and architectural styles of
earlier Egyptian dynasties. He was famed for monumental works throughout the Nile valley from Tanis and Memphis in Lower Egypt and to Edfu, Karnak, and Medinet Habu in Upper Egypt. In Nubia, Taharka’s constructions are known, in part, at Buhen, Jebel Barkal, Kawa, Nuri, Philae, Qasr Ibrim, and Semna (qq.v.).

At Karnak, Taharka constructed or rebuilt the small 25th Dynasty temple adjacent to the sacred lake. Inscribed blocks at a gate at the Khonsu temple at the southern Mut enclosure at Karnak are attributed to Taharka. Along with the Nubian God’s Wives of Amun, Taharka also built at the Montu temple just outside the northern enclosure at Karnak. In addition, he reconstructed two New Kingdom Osiride temples at Karnak.

At the lovely Philae temple, attributed mainly to the Ptolemies and Romans, are foundation stones with the cartouche of Taharka. Normally, one might be inclined to dismiss these as being removed from another site and moved here for construction. This might still be the explanation, but the presence of a small bark stand, also inscribed to Taharka, inside the forecourt at Philae suggests that this temple site might have had earlier forms with the 25th Dynasty.

Farther south at Qasr Ibrim, now struggling to keep above the high waters of Lake Nasser, is the mud-brick temple at the acropolis that was also used by Taharka as well as earlier New Kingdom kings and generals, not to mention later Romans, Meroites, and Christians. It was Taharka’s huge, famous temple of Amon (q.v.) at Jebel Barkal that would permit Taharka to be termed a “Nubian Ramses.” Military campaigns from Nubia to the Levant and constructions throughout Egypt and Nubia demonstrated the scope of Taharka’s influence. A stela from the third year of his reign is in the Cairo Museum.

His talent for great construction was often challenged by his military preoccupation with the Assyrians—first in Palestine as a young man fighting Sennacherib and then, for much of his reign, fighting against King Esarhaddon (q.v.; 680–669 BCE), the Assyrian successor to Sennacherib, who had been assassinated in 681 BCE. Now the Assyrian imperialist Esarhaddon came to the Nile with much military ambition and experience, hardened and well-trained troops, new siege tactics, and an effective camel cavalry. Indeed, it was Esarhaddon who is credited with introducing camels to Egypt at this time. Later, camels became important in trans-Saharan trade as perfect
beasts of burden for the desert. In order to distract Esarhaddon away from the Nile, Taharka supported revolts by the king of Sidon and by King Ba’alu of Tyre in Phoenicia. However, these revolts were brutally crushed and provoked Esarhaddon to strike at Taharka at Tanis.

In about 673 BCE, Esarhaddon sped across the Sinai with his fast camel cavalry but was blocked by the Nubian and Egyptian forces of Taharka in the delta. Taken by the speed of the attack, Taharka withdrew from the eastern delta capital of Tanis and retreated to a more secure Memphis citadel. However, it was not a victory for Esarhaddon, who could not complete his conquest of the delta as planned. The following year, Taharka regrouped his troops and reoccupied the eastern delta. Again countering this move, the Assyrians under Esarhaddon returned, in around 671–670 BCE, to retake the delta and push on to siege and sack Memphis. During the battle at Memphis, Taharka was wounded, and his son Ushanahuru was captured and taken to Assyria, where these events were recorded in Nineveh on a mural of permanent humiliation. Esarhaddon appointed a score of vassal princes to govern the delta and keep it out of Nubian hands. Among these was Necho I (q.v.), who is considered a founder of the rival 26th Dynasty.

Shocked by the military defeat and by the capture of his son, Taharka resumed his tactical harassment of Esharhaddon by continuing to support Phoenician unrest. In 669–668 BCE, Esarhaddon was again stirred to another round of fighting and planned still another conquest of the delta and Memphis. However, this time Esarhaddon died en route to this battlefield in Egypt. Apparently, Taharka and his forces again reoccupied the delta, but any relief felt by Taharka was very short lived. By about 669–666 BCE, Ashurbanipal (q.v.; 668–627 BCE), son of Esarhaddon, resumed the revenge campaign and badly defeated Taharka in the delta, once again sacking Memphis and causing Taharka to withdraw southward to a more remote and secure Thebes.

But this time, Ashurbanipal pursued Taharka to Thebes, and one imagines that Taharka had a brief and depressing visit to the shrines and temples there. The soldiers and mercenaries of Ashurbanipal were too much of a match for the now tired Nubians. The Assyrian king commanded the surrender of Thebam “Mayor” Mentuemhat (q.v.), and Taharka sought still fuller security of retreat to his beloved Napata (q.v.) in about 666 BCE. The delta princes who either had betrayed
Taharka or, at least, had not been adequate to face the forces of the Assyrians called in vain for Taharka’s return, but his losses were too great for him to make another personal attempt to purge Egypt of the Assyrians. From about 666 to 665 BCE, Taharka apparently ruled as a coregent of Nubia with Tanutamun (q.v.). But in 664 BCE, Taharka died and was the first to be buried with later Kushitic kings in the Nuri pyramid cemetery. The idea that he might have been buried at Sedegna (q.v.) in Lower Nubia is without substantial evidence. The National Museum in Khartoum and the Nubian Museum in Aswan contain some of the monumental works and smaller objects that testify to Taharka’s greatness. Among his tomb treasures are 1,070 shawabtis, most of which reside at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston and in many other museum collections along with his canopic jars, and it is understood that some fragments of his mumified organs are at Harvard University. The end of his reign was not precisely the end of the 25th Dynasty because some of its life flickered again when his coregent Tanutamun resumed the Nubian occupation of Egypt for about one year. Outraged by these endless Nubian insurrections, Ashurbanipal’s forces returned to Memphis and Thebes a second time to loot and destroy this great center, which had briefly returned to the control of Mentuemhat and Shepenwepet II (qq.v.). Then, at long last, the effective Nubian administration was truly at an end.

TAHELOT II (r. 850–825 BCE). While the start of the 22nd Dynasty by Sheshonk I (q.v.) had been rather smooth, by the middle of this dynasty, stability in Upper Egypt was in question. Takelot II followed Osorkon II within the 22nd Dynasty. He ruled from Tanis in the strategic eastern delta. King Takelot II maintained his rule in Lower Egypt, while his divisive half brother ruled as the High Priest of Amun in Thebes. This division of power gave notable strength but blocked the full political unification of the Nile. It appears that Nubians backed some of the succession disputes in Thebes or at least may have given refuge to those struggling for Theban power. In any case, it was this political context that gave the opportunity for Nubians to begin thinking about consolidating their own sovereign power in the comparative security of Napata or Kurru, which was geographically removed from Egypt, particularly while Theban and Tanite power was in dispute.
When Takelot III (23rd Dynasty) came to occupy the position of Theban High Priest in 764 BCE, a virtual civil war erupted in Egypt that provided a responsibility or an opportunity for Nubians to come to power from their Napatan (q.v.) enclave. The precise names of the eighth-century BCE Nubian kings still evade us in this fog of history, but Alara and Kashta (qq.v.) ultimately emerge as the founders of what would become the 25th Dynasty (q.v.).

Following their Egyptianized traditions, these Nubian kings would make conservative reference to their devotion to Amun (q.v.) and perhaps propose their responsibility or desire to assume Theban power during its apparent collapse. The model of responsibility to Thebes under the viceroy of Nubia under Herihor and Panehesi (qq.v.) was probably still fresh. By the time of Nimlot (q.v.) at the end of the 23rd Dynasty, full-scale warfare broke out between the Libyans and Nubians to determine who would rule Egypt and restore the unity of the Nile in the name of Amun.

**TA-NEHESI, TA-NEHESIU, TA-NEHASYU, NEHESI.** This Middle and New Kingdom Egyptian reference to Nubia means the “Land of the Nehesi.” Unlike the word “Ta-Setiu,” or “Land of the Bowmen,” this appears to be an ethnic reference and may represent a term used by Nubians for themselves. Some speculate that the word “Nehes” survives in modern Nubian ethnic nomenclature as the “Mahas.” One delta king, Nehesy (q.v.), is known in the Second Intermediate period, and one late viceroy of Nubia, Pa-Nehesi (qq.v.), is believed to have been of Nubian origin, judging from this root in his name.

**TANIS.** See TAHARKA; TAKELOT II.

**TANQASI CULTURE.** This is a post-Meroitic (q.v.) cultural typology found in Upper and southern Nubia between Dongola (q.v.) and Sennar. It is contemporaneous with the Ballana (q.v.) and X-Group (q.v.) culture of Lower Nubia (q.v.) but generally simpler in organization.

**TANUTAMUN, TANWETAMANI, TANUATH-AMEN, UR-DAMANI, BAKARE, URDAMANI (r. 664–653 BCE).** Tanutamun was the grandson of Kashta, who started this dynastic line, as far as is known at present. But in about 665 BCE, nearing the end of the 25th
Dynasty (q.v.), Taharka (q.v.) appointed his sister’s son Tanutamun as his coregent of Kush (q.v.) and Egypt, according to a stela showing both rulers. Taharka’s wish was to maintain Nubian control over these lands and ensure continuity of the ruling dynasty.

When Taharka died at Napata (q.v.) in 664 BCE, his nephew Tanutamun assumed the full title of “Lord of Two Lands.” Effectively, the 25th Dynasty was almost over, at least in terms of controlling all of Egypt, yet Pharaoh Tanutamun placed the Egyptian double crown on his head with the blessings of Amun (q.v.) of Jebel Barkal (q.v.) and set out to avenge the defeat of his maternal uncle Taharka. He is shown offering wealth and Ma’at (“and her true and correct order”) to Amun in a human and ram form. Behind him is his royal sister–wife Qalhata, reckoned as the Queen of the Ta-Setiu (q.v.), holding a sistrum and offering libations. On the left side he is shown with his Egyptian royal sister–wife Kerar, who presumably resided in Thebes. On this stela, Tanutamun is also termed “the Lord of the Nine Bows,” that is, all the joined lands formerly held by the 25th Dynasty, which he hoped to restore.

This mission was envisaged in a prophetic dream he had while coregent with Taharka. Tanutamun’s granite dream stela had been erected at Jebel Barkal among other commemorative monuments for the 25th Dynasty. It now rests as object 691 in the Egyptian Museum in Cairo after being published by Mariette in 1865. His priest advisers indicated that his dream of “the two ladies” (the serpent and vulture of Upper and Lower Egypt) was an omen that he would recover Egypt, at which point he celebrated greatly at Napata, slaughtering cattle and drinking quantities of beer, and returned to Egypt via Aswan (q.v.), where he paid homage to the ram god Khnum (q.v.) and his shrines at Elephantine (q.v.) Island, believing that this would ensure prosperity for the entire Nile. From there, he went on to Thebes, which was officially under his authority, and made his homage to the shrines of that city before sailing on to Memphis. Along the way, throngs were said to greet him along the banks of the river. Apparently, it was smooth going until this point, but moving his forces farther into the delta, Tanutamun’s capacity to stave off the Assyrian threat and repeated attacks was much riskier.

Thus, with some illusions, Tanutamun did succeed in restoring Nubian control to Thebes for a short time and even briefly to Memphis.
far to the north. But the same unreliable delta princes who had annoyed and frustrated the Kushitic predecessors also came to haunt Tanutamun and make his position precarious. It may well be that the duplicitous Assyrian vassal prince Necho I (q.v.) was killed in combat by Tanutamun. Necho’s son Psamtik I (664–610 BCE) fled to safety in Assyria, and Tanutamun imagined that he had won. But Psamtik I promptly returned to the delta, while Ashurbanipal was diverted to the east in his 664 invasion of Elam. When this campaign was concluded, Ashurbanipal was free to conduct his second Egyptian campaign. Thus, the old threat against Nubian rule of Egypt from Assyrians continued to be another hard reality to be faced by Tanutamun in 664–663 BCE, and his very brief administration was driven from Memphis after hearing that Ashurbanipal was mounting still another punitive expedition.

In fear or frustration, Tanutamun initially withdrew to Thebes to control Upper Egypt and Kush, but by 661 BCE, he found himself defeated in both Memphis and Thebes. Tanutamun withdrew to Kipkigi and then on to Napata, never to set foot again in Egypt.

In circumstances that are unclear, the transition from Kushite to Assyrian rule of Thebes is symbolized by Psamtik I (q.v.) inheriting or forcing the daughter of Shabaka (q.v.) to become his own Theban God’s Wife of Amun. The persistent administrator of Thebes, Mentuemhat, who had been closely associated with the 25th Dynasty, managed to stay in Karnak, but he was now demoted to the lesser position of the fourth priest of Amun. Some speculate that Thebes was further destroyed and ransacked at the time of the second invasion of that city under the command of Ashurbanipal. Gold and silver temple treasures were seized, children killed, and men of rank taken in chains as slaves. Certainly Psamtik I made substantial effort to eliminate and deface the Kushite presence in Thebes.

Tanutamun died in about 653 BCE, and while he failed to fulfill his dreams or those of his uncle Taharka, he was the first king of the Napatan epoch that descended directly from the 25th Dynasty. Tanutamun was buried in a large pyramid at Kurru, where his image may be seen along with its standard funerary iconography. Never again did ancient Nubians make an effective effort to rule all of Egypt, although in the ensuing centuries several controlled Lower Nubia and some attacked Aswan.
TANYIDAMANI (r. ca. 120–100? CE). Tanyidamani followed the Meroitic (q.v.) queen Shanakdakhete (q.v.) and is much famed for his lengthy Meroitic inscription on a phallic (?) stela at the Nubian exhibition in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. It is an early case of a royal inscription in Meroitic demotic (q.v.). The stela depicts bound prisoners and gratitude expressed to Amun (q.v.) in raised relief and a military proclamation. Presumably, this was issued after these Meroites defeated enemies such as the Blemmys (q.v.). A bronze cylinder with his name was recovered from the Amun temple at Jebel Barkal (q.v.). Tanyidamani is also known from a votive sculpture (Louvre E. 11657b) found at Meroë that shows his name with the lion god Apedemek (q.v.) wearing a hemhem crown. Another votive stele (Baltimore, 22.258, WAG 213) of Tanyidamani that probably came from the same Apedemek temple at Meroë shows the king making a ritual offering and has a Meroitic inscription above his head. Perhaps these two stelae faced each other at a temple doorway. Tanyidamani was buried at the northern royal cemetery to the east of Meroë city.

TAREKENIWAL (r. 85–103 CE). This king of Meroë (q.v.) ruled during the first century of the Roman occupation of Egypt. He was buried in the Northern Royal Cemetery at Meroë.

TA-SETI (sing.), TA-SETIU, TA-SETJIU, TA-SETJU, ZATJU (pl.). This is the general ancient Egyptian term for Nubians (q.v.), that is, (people of the) “land (Ta-) of the bows (Setiu).” This was used commonly in the Egyptian references to Nubia from the earliest Dynastic times. It is not always clear whether this was a specific territorial reference or a more general term. Sometimes, Ta-Setiu was differentiated into Lower Nubia (q.v.), including Wawat (q.v.) and Irtet (q.v.; near the Second Cataract), and Upper Nubia (q.v.), including Yam or Irem, now known generally as Kerma (q.v.). In the earliest Dynastic times, Ta-Setiu was essentially some contemporary A-Group (q.v.) Nubian polity based at Qustul (q.v.) and Sayala (q.v.), where some political stratification existed.

The term “Ta-Setiu” relates to the famed prowess of Nubians in using bows and arrows (q.v.) for hunting and in military service in their own defense and as hired mercenaries. An excellent example of Nubian archers appears in the famed tomb models of the Egyptian Middle
Kingdom. Such archers probably assisted Mentuhotep II (q.v.) in his rise to power in the 11th Dynasty that restored unity to the Egyptian Nile (q.v.). At times, the reference to “bow people” was even more general and was glossed as “the nine bows,” with the implication that it included all three enemies/neighbors of Egypt—that is, the Libyans to the west, the Nubians to the south, and the Asians to the east—and with “three” being plural for each of these three people, it was rendered as “the nine bows” in total.

**TATTOOS.** Tattooing is a permanent form of body art in which deep layers of the skin are painted or tinted to produce aesthetic patterns. This is done by piercing or cutting the skin with a needle, thorn (acacia), sharp bone, or other such instrument to introduce the color. The tattoo may then be medicated with charcoal in order to promote a delayed healing, resulting in keloid scarring, which is an excessive growth of scar tissue that effects a raised pattern on the skin.

From the earliest evidence, the custom of tattooing seems to have been reserved only for women. The oldest archaeological evidence comes from the Egyptian and Nubian Predynastic period (about 5000–2950 BCE). The patterns of tattoos on female figurines, the preservation of geometric designs on some mummies, and the depiction of patterns on some women in tomb paintings all attest to the practice. Evidence of tattooing in Egypt after this period is sparse. In fact, the practice seems to have been spurned by the Egyptians in general. However, in the Middle Kingdom (1970–1640 BCE), the practice resurfaces as a Nubian (q.v.) custom. Evidence of tattooing in Sudan, roughly contemporary with the Middle Kingdom, is found in the C-Group (q.v.; 2400–1550 BCE) of Lower Nubia (q.v.). Patterned markings on small, pottery female figurines have been interpreted as representing the actual decoration of women’s bodies with tattoos and scars. In Egypt, the bodies of three female mummies from this period, believed to be Nubians living in Egypt, were tattooed with geometric patterns of dots and dashes. This same pattern is also tattooed on a female mummy found in the C-Group cemetery at Kubban (q.v.). Indeed, some scholars maintain that the reintroduction of the custom into Egypt in the Middle Kingdom is due to influences from Nubia.

By the New Kingdom (q.v.; 1539–1075 BCE), the tattoo became a firmly established form of Egyptian art. Still reserved exclusively for
women, the patterns of dots and dashes yields to the representation of popular figures. The most common represents the god Bes, who often adorns the thighs of female figures in Egyptian art. An ostracon from the New Kingdom depicts a female dancer whose thigh is tattooed with the same design. During the Meroitic (q.v.) period (300 BCE–450 CE), some female mummies are also tattooed. However, these mummies are decorated with geometric designs similar those popular among C-Group women. Tattoos, like cicatrices (q.v.), may also serve to indicate social status or signify rites of passage. Unfortunately, little ethnographic work has been undertaken on this topic. [by k. rhodes]

**TEFNAKHT, TEFNAKHTE (ca. 725–717 BCE).** Tefnakht was one of two regional princes of the 24th Dynasty whose capital was at Sais in the western delta. He descended from the family known as “the Great Chiefs of Ma.” Delta princes of Libyan origin had ruled previously during the time of Kashta (q.v.), who tolerated their local authority while the Nubian consolidated his control of Lower Nubia (q.v.). Fearing further Nubian expansion, Tefnakht created a military alliance with Osorkon IV, a 23rd Dynasty king of Tanis in the eastern delta, and the kings of Hermopolis and Leontopolis of Middle Egypt. Thebes had been under the authority of the Takelot III, High Priest of Amun, also of the 23rd Dynasty, until at least 757 BCE.

After the death of Kashta sometime before 747 BCE, the confused relationship between the delta princes, the Theban priests, and the Nubians continued in a stalemate for the first twenty-one years of Piankhy’s (q.v.) rule. In about 725 BCE, the relationship between the delta and Middle Egyptian princes reached a crisis that compelled Piankhy to use military force. The respective armies were engaged at Herakleopolis, but Tefnakht retreated to Hermopolis and regrouped in Memphis. When they conceded defeat, Piankhy allowed them to remain in office as tributary princes in his policy of indirect rule. But Tefnakht’s loyalty to Piankhy apparently was not deep, and he reestablished his sovereignty into the western delta for about eight years, until Piankhy smashed his rule. The defeat of Tefnakht formally gives the date for total Nubian control of the Egyptian and Nubian Nile that can be said to start the 25th Dynasty (q.v.). The relationship between the Nubians of the 25th Dynasty and the delta prince Bakenrenef (q.v.), son of Tefnakht, continued to be problematic for Shabaka (q.v).
Indeed, remnants of this family lingered through the rule of the 25th Dynasty and reentered Egyptian history in the form of the 26th Dynasty under Pharaoh Psamtik I, under the protection of the Assyrians.

TEHKHET. See DEBEIRA.

TERITEKAS, TERITEQAS. This Meroitic king of the late first century BCE is known from Meroitic inscriptions at the temple Dakka (q.v.) and in a stela from Meroë (q.v.). In the first case, he must have been close to the reigns of Candace Amanirenas (q.v.) or Akinidad (q.v.), when this region was accessible to Meroites. Teritekas most likely was the king just prior to Amanirenas. Conceivably, he was her husband. The location of his tomb has not been determined, but presumably it would have been at the royal cemetery of Meroë.

TEQERIDAMANI (246–266 CE). This king ruled in the declining period of Meroë (q.v.). One may assume that conflicts arose with the Blemmyes (q.v.) to the northeast and with Noba (q.v.) to the west and south (?) that weakened his kingdom at this time. Teqeridamani is known from Meroitic graffiti at Philae (q.v.), where he records sending a message to Rome. This is the last datable inscription in Meroitic at Philae. Teqeridamani was buried in a pyramid in the northern royal cemetery at Meroë at least some decades before its final collapse.

THIRD INTERMEDIATE PERIOD. The Third Intermediate period of Egypt began with the death of Ramses XI (q.v.), the struggles between Herihor and Panehesi (qq.v.), and the collapse of the 20th Dynasty in the New Kingdom (q.v.). In other words, the period is defined as the time between the 21st and 25th Dynasties. As with all Intermediate periods, the inherent reference is to the collapse of a unitary state in Egypt. Since Egyptian strength often is at Nubian expense, the Egyptian Intermediate periods represent a relaxation of the relationship and an opportunity for Nubian recovery or even an ironic moral obligation for Nubians to assist in the reunification of the Egyptian and Nubian Nile. This complex, dialectical relationship is one of the essential dilemmas in Egypto–Nubian relations in all of Dynastic time and to the present.

Not all authorities agree with the placement of the 25th Dynasty within the Third Intermediate period since this dynasty unified the
entire Egyptian and Nubian Nile under Nubian control; thus technically one may say it was no longer an Intermediate period at this time. But since Nubians could be viewed as “foreigners,” the reference to Intermediate period still persists. Some chronologies include the 25th Dynasty within the Late period, and others do not. Other chronologies include Kashta and Piankhy (qq.v.) of the early 25th Dynasty with the Third Intermediate period, as their control was centered around Thebes, and from Shabaka (q.v.) on to the second Persian (q.v.) occupation of Egypt with the Late period. Thus, depending on definition or perspective, the Third Intermediate period concluded either at the start or at the end of the 25th Dynasty. Then the Late period (q.v.) began, according to some reckoning. This period also had some foreign rulers, but it did contain the last truly Egyptian ruler, Nectanebo II (q.v.) of the 30th Dynasty.

THUWRE, THURE. See AMENHOTEP I; APPENDIX; KING’S SON OF KUSH.

TIMOTHEOS, BISHOP (q.v.). This Alexandrian patriarch consecrated Timotheos as the bishop of Faras and Qasr Ibrim (qq.v.) in 1372 while Nobatia and Dongola (qq.v.) were under a joint administration. This was a last stand for Nubian Christianity (q.v.) since the regional king had been defeated in 1317 and the church at Dongola had already been turned into a mosque. Thus, Timotheos was the last to hold this title as the Muslims entered Nubia and brought official Christianity to a close in the fourteenth century.

TIRAWA. This Nubian land appears in New Kingdom (q.v.) tribute or conquest lists, but its precise location or organization has not been determined.

TIUREK. This Nubian land appears in New Kingdom (q.v.) tribute or conquest lists, but its precise location or organization has not been determined.

TIY, TIYE (ca. 1417–1379 BCE). This nonroyal but high-ranking woman was married to the enduring pharaoh Amenhotep III (q.v.). She was the daughter of Yuya and Tuya. After her marriage, she held
the title of the Great Royal Wife of Amenhotep III. Her influence and depiction were extensive. The royal couple resided in their lavish palace at Malkata on the western bank at Thebes. On the death of Amenhotep III and the rise of her second son, the so-called heretic king Akhenaton (q.v.), she moved to his new capital at Amarna. There she continued to exert considerable influence in their common effort to curb the powers of the Theban Amun (q.v.) priests and shift to the worship of Aton. Tiy had a close relationship to Tutankhamen (q.v.), and some postulate that she possibly was his mother or grandmother, as a lock of her hair was in his long-lost tomb in the Valley of the Kings. Her burial site is disputed, and she may have first been buried at Amarna and then moved to the western necropolis of Thebes. Since the 18th Dynasty was at the height of New Kingdom colonization of Nubia, Tiy was celebrated in a temple constructed in her honor at Sedegna (q.v.), where she appears in the form of Hathor (q.v.). Sedegna is just downstream of Soleb (q.v.), where Amenhotep III had built his huge temple.

**TJEHENU, THAMEHU, TEMEHU, TEMENU.** This seminomadic Libyan or Berber people lived in the Western Desert and oases of Egypt and Nubia. Other references to Mashwash (q.v.) people of the region may represent only a different group of the Libu (Libyans) or a more general term for the Tjehenu, but this is not completely clear since the term is used inconsistently. From time to time, they represented a military threat to the settled peoples of the region and sporadically attacked the Nile valley. From the early travels of Harkuf (q.v.) on his Western Desert route to Kerma (q.v.), we learn of hard struggles through Tjehenu territory. Seti I and Ramses III (qq.v.) also made punitive raids into Tjehenu territory. Ramses II at Wadi es-Se-bua (qq.v.) noted Tjehenu in that area on the western bank of the Nile. In the Kawa (q.v.) inscription by Taharka (q.v.), he is shown trampling such invaders. They often are translated as Libyans, but this term was a general Greco-Roman reference for sub-Saharan Africans away from the Nile. Clashes with the Tjehenu and Mashwash (q.v.) were noted near the western delta in the Late period (q.v.), when they represented a major threat to the unity of the Nile during Nubian rule and during the 26th Dynasty, when Psamtik II (q.v.) sought to control the oases trade in the Western Desert. In the times of Trajan (q.v.), he
also had to face the Tjehenu or else risk losing control of the desert trade, so the Romans built a string of desert forts for this purpose. Some ancient references to the Tjemeh may be a parallel or related group of Tjehenu who appear to have occupied a more southerly and western territory, including particularly the western oases as far as Farafra Oasis.

**TRAJAN** (98–117 CE). This Spanish-born Roman served Emperor Domitian as consul before he himself became the Roman emperor. Trajan built extensively in Rome, including a huge forum or shopping mall in 113 CE. This was probably the largest and most spectacular of the imperial forums in Rome. Trajan held bloody “games” in the Roman Colosseum in which thousands of animals perished for Roman amusement and celebration. Trajan’s column, built in Rome in 106 CE, shows Dacian war captives as slaves as well as other military scenes. The Dacian wars from 101 to 102 and 105 to 106 CE were especially productive for the great wealth that supported his construction projects. The historian Tacitus recorded Trajan’s wars against the Germanic people as he was building the empire, and it was partly under Trajan’s later administration that Plutarch (q.v.) also wrote.

In Egypt and Nubia, Trajan decorated the columns in the hypostyle hall of Kalabsha (q.v.) temple, dedicated to the Nubian deity Man- dulis (q.v.). He constructed his famous and impressive kiosk on the eastern side of Philae (q.v.) Island, where Isis (q.v.) was the most revered deity. This airy structure of fourteen beautifully sculpted columns was saved in the Nubian salvage project and relocated to Agilka (q.v.) Island. Deep in the Sahara along the Darb al-Arba’in (q.v.) road south of Kharga Oasis (q.v.), Trajan also built and maintained a military fort and temple at Dush to control the slave and merchandise trade with Nubia.

Correspondence between Pliny the Younger (q.v.) and Trajan reveals discussions over the policies of suppression of Christians in the contemporary eastern Mediterranean states at a time of the early but very difficult rise of Christianity (q.v.) in the region. Generally, it appears that Trajan did not consider Christians to be much more than a minor problem at his time, when the Roman Empire was at its height. On his death, he was cremated, and his remains were interred in his memorial column at his forum.
TRIAKONTASCHOENOS. Literally, the Triakontaschoenos region refers to its Greek length being thirty schoenos. It began at Maharraqa (q.v.) and went up to the Second Cataract. It is the region that follows just south of the Dodekaschonos (twelve schoenos), which began just south of Aswan (q.v.) up to about Maharraqa. Apparently, the first use of the Triakontaschoenos was during the rule of Ptolemy VI (q.v.), after he reestablished Ptolemaic administration in this region after they had lost it to Nubians during the immediately previous Ptolemies. After Ptolemy VI, the internal wrangling in succession disputes meant that Greek control of the Triakontaschoenos was apparently lost once again, not to be recovered, and Meroitic (q.v.) contemporaries reoccupied the region as far as Qasr Ibrim (q.v).

TUMULAE. See BALLANA; GABATI; KERMA; KURRU.

TUNGUR. The Tungur arrived in northern Darfur (q.v.) in about the fourteenth century CE and spread west into Wadai. It is not clear whether they are Arabized Berbers, Nubian (q.v.) refugees, related to the Daju (q.v.), or perhaps “Africanized” Danagla. In any case, they intermarried or replaced the Daju, whom they came to rule. They accepted Islam but relatively late. Their territory was based in northern Darfur with clashes and claims to control of Wadai and Kanem. Sometime probably after 1600 CE, Ahmed al Ma’qur, the last leader of Tungur, was replaced by the Keira dynastic line of Fur sultans.

TUTHMOSIS I, THOTHMOSES I (1524–1518 BCE). This noted New Kingdom (q.v.) pharaoh of the 18th Dynasty (q.v.) conducted military campaigns in Nubia and raised a commemorative stela in his second regnal year at Argo Island. Indeed, Tuthmosis I was probably of military rather than royal background, but he married into the royal family. Following the tradition of Amenhotep I (q.v.), whom he had succeeded, Tuthmosis I continued to use the military skills of Ahmose, son of Ebana (q.v.), to repress Nubians. Like Amenhotep I, the campaign of Tuthmosis I also sought to intimidate Nubians by tying one of their dead leaders upside down on the bow of his riverboat as he returned to Egypt. Tuthmosis I was the father of Hatshepsut (q.v.). His mummy is well preserved in the Cairo Museum.
TUTHMOSIS II, THOTHMOSES II (1518–1504 BCE). This short-lived New Kingdom (q.v.) pharaoh crushed a Nubian (q.v.) revolt in “vile Kush” in his first regnal year. This is recorded on a commemorative stela on the Aswan–Philae (qq.v.) road. Apparently, he took hostages from among some of the children of a Nubian chief to pressure the Nubians into accepting his rule. Tuthmosis II was married to his sister Hatshepsut (q.v.), but he died not long after. Tuthmosis II was also married to a Queen Nitocris (q.v.), who is not the same as the God’s Wife of Amun of that name. His mummy is well preserved in the Cairo Museum.

TUTHMOSIS III, THOTHMOSES III (1504–1450 BCE). By the seventh year of the supposed rule by Tuthmosis III, Hatshepsut (q.v.) had manipulated her position to be considered the full “king,” and Tuthmosis III did not gain royal authority until after her death in 1482 BCE. This great New Kingdom (q.v.) pharaoh is credited with the construction of the Semna (q.v.) temple in his second regnal year, but most likely this was built under the direction of Hatshepsut (q.v.), with whom he was initially coregent. In Nubia, Tuthmosis III built at Kalabsha (q.v.) temple, at Amada and Soleb (qq.v.), and at the fortresses at Kumma and Semna (qq.v.). Also at Semna, Tuthmosis III received the white crown (of Upper Egypt) from the Blemmye god Dedun (qq.v.). At Karnak temple, he lists 115 places in Nubia that he had brought under his authority, but most of them are impossible to locate with any precision.

Tuthmosis III is credited with a trading voyage to Punt (q.v.) and Nubian military campaigns, including the placement of his boundary stone at Kurgo above the Fourth Cataract, thus making the southernmost point of Nubian territory claimed by New Kingdom Egyptians. A great measure of the wealth and opulence of the reign of Tuthmosis III was attributable to the gold mines of Nubia, which produced 500 to 800 pounds of gold per year for the Egyptian coffers. Tuthmosis III had a remarkably inaccessible tomb cut in the Valley of the Kings. Like most tombs there, it was looted, but his mummy has been preserved in the Cairo Museum.

TUTZIS. See DENDUR.

TOMBOS. The Tombos quarries lie on islands and on the eastern and western bank of the Nile just downstream of Kerma (q.v.).
was the chief resource of Nubian granite and gneiss, used in con-
struction and statuary in the vicinity of the Third Cataract. Using the
stone of Tombos saved New Kingdom (q.v.) Egyptians and 25th Dy-
nasty (q.v.) Nubians the trouble of going farther downstream to the
Aswan granite quarries. Tombos was also used during Napatan and
Meroitic (qq.v.) times. An uninscribed and unfinished statue that is
dated stylistically to the 25th Dynasty or Napatan times still lies at
Tombos. Regional quarries were also known at Daygah, upstream
from Napata, but they appear to have been less productive or less
used than the Tombos quarries.

TOSHKA, WEST. The archaeological site of Toshka was known for its
Meroitic to Christian (qq.v.) cemeteries and presumed town sites.
Toshka West was to the north of Abu Simbel (q.v.). In the desert to
the west of Toshka were diorite quarries that were periodically favored for
high-quality sculptural stone in the Old and Middle Kingdoms. In
1889, Toshka East was the farthest northern point of military expansion
of the forces of Khalifa 'Abdullahi, led by his general, Wad al-Nijumi,
who was defeated there by Anglo-Egyptian soldiers. Today, with a
heightened Lake Nasser, Toshka is the site of a major irrigation system
that provides water for the “New Valley” of Kharga Oasis (q.v.).

TUTANKHAMEN, TUTANKHATON. This Egyptian pharaoh of the
18th Dynasty (q.v.) was a short-lived, transitional pharaoh during
whose reign the Theban priests were able to restore the Amun (q.v.)
cult from the heretic Aton beliefs of Amenhotep IV (q.v.). His rather
small tomb was left virtually undisturbed in the Valley of the Kings.
Its excavation in 1922 by Howard Carter found it virtually un-
touched, and it promptly became a world archaeological sensation.

From a Nubian (q.v.) point of view, the grave goods of Tu-
tankhamen display typical New Kingdom (q.v.) chauvinism and ar-
rogance. This is demonstrated in Tutankhamen’s chariot being de-
picted as driving over slaughtered Nubians or in the image of
Tutankhamen as a lion stepping on Nubians. This motif is continued
in the handles of royal canes depicted with Nubian heads. On his san-
dals were images of bound Nubians with their typical symbols of
leopard skin clothes, a head feather, and eight bows. Thus, with every
step that the young pharaoh took, he literally trod on Nubians.
Huy-Amenophis, the viceroy of Nubia (q.v.) under Tutankhamen, has famed tomb pictures of Nubian servants or subordinates making tribute of gold rings, animal skins, incense, and ivory (q.v.), all of which serve to illustrate the lowly view of Nubians held by New Kingdom monarchs.

12th DYNASTY. See AMENEMHAT I AND II; SENUSORET I, II, AND III.

20th DYNASTY.

25th DYNASTY (ca. 790–656 BCE). In ancient African and Nubian (q.v.) studies, the 25th Dynasty stands out as the most celebrated achievement of people who would today be considered Sudanese. During this time, Nubians controlled not only a vast area of Nubia (q.v.) but also all or most of the Egyptian Nile (q.v.). Having become regional powers recognized in Old Testament inscriptions by individually named pharaohs, these Nubians engaged in strategic interactions with the Libyans, Judaeans, Philistines, and Phoenicians and in war with the Assyrians. While this dynasty may not be long in Egyptian terms, it was engaged in regional foreign relations similar to those in ancient Egypt, and traces of it linger on to the present.

Once Egyptian Pharaoh Ahmose I (q.v.) restored the Egyptian state under the imperial New Kingdom (q.v.) in the sixteenth century BCE, the traces of the C-Group (q.v.) and Kerma (q.v.) disappear under the imperial policy of colonialism and the economic dominance of Egypt. To signify its end, this dictionary uses the term “Kerma” (to subsume the terms “Yam” and “Irem” [q.v.]) when it was a sovereign Nubian state, and the term “Kush” (q.v.) is used for the Egyptian colonial period, for the 25th Dynasty period, and at least through the end of the Napatan (q.v.) period. Certainly by the New Kingdom or even as early as the late Middle Kingdom, Nubia was known as Kush, which is cited in Genesis 10:6–7 of the Old Testament.

Without any question, Nubians were still there, but their recorded self-identity is subordinated to Egyptian cultural, artistic, religious, and architectural themes. Egyptian authority at this time was formalized in the appointment of the pharaoh’s viceroy (or king’s son) of Kush (q.v.), Kush being the name for the residual structures, people,
and land of defeated Kerma. Indeed, it may well have been that a portion of the regional administration of the Egyptian colony of Kush was based at Kerma and, later under Nubian control, at Napata.

Repeatedly, New Kingdom references show systematic campaigns to trade or to gather, sometimes by force, the human, animal, mineral, and other natural resources of Kush. No doubt the early viceroys of Kush were Egyptian appointees, such as Meri-Mose, who served Amenhotep III (q.v.), and Huy, who served Tutankhamen (q.v.), both in the 18th Dynasty, and Herihor (q.v.), who served Ramses XI (q.v.), followed by a viceroy Piankhy (q.v.) (perhaps Herihor's son-in-law), both of whom served in the 21st Dynasty. This Piankhy must not be confused with the king Piankhy of the 25th Dynasty. Although the record is not clear, it is possible that among these last viceroys of Kush were Nubians themselves. Herein is a contradiction: Nubians could more effectively administer their own nation than could outsiders in a colonial relationship, but as Nubians became more skilled at this task, it also became possible that Nubians would seek to exercise independent authority of their land or even of Egypt itself.

As Egypt had experienced twice before, the great epoch of empire building could not be sustained eternally. Confusion and divisions of the Third Intermediate period (q.v.), which emerged in the eleventh and tenth centuries BCE, created the opportunity, the responsibility, or the necessity for Nubians to become the masters of the entire Nile valley. They would control not only their native Nubia but all of Egypt as well. Just as New Kingdom pharaohs had done in previous centuries, the Nubian pharaohs became actively engaged in the politics of the city-states of ancient Phoenicia and Judaea in the Levant, then under severe military pressure from the Assyrians (q.v.).

Perhaps by about 950 BCE, the Kushitic king Aserkhamen, based at Napata (q.v.) adjacent to Jebel Barkal (q.v.) and just downstream of the Fourth Cataract, began some border raids into Upper Egypt. This practice likely was continued by other still nameless Nubians, probably buried at Kurru (q.v.), in the ninth century BCE. At some time, either late in the reign of Kushite Pharaoh Alara (q.v.; 790–760 BCE) or with his successor, Pharaoh Kashta (q.v.; 760–747 BCE), the roots of the 25th Dynasty were in formation. By the time of the Kushite king Alara (790–760 BCE), Thebes was considered under Nubian influence or perhaps even control, and the 25th Dynasty took another step to-
ward becoming the “Ethiopian” pharaohs of both Nubia and Upper Egypt. Thebes had been the religious capital of the New Kingdom, but to complete his objectives, Kashta had to fight with his delta rival Osorkon III (q.v.) at Leontopolis (of the 23rd Dynasty, 787–759 BCE).

The military task of consolidating Kushite control of Egypt was further advanced during the thirty-one-year reign (747–716 BCE) of Piankhy (q.v.; Men-Kheper-Re). His first step was to establish his legitimacy to the emergent Nubian throne by marrying a daughter of Alara. Securing his place at Napata, Piankhy expanded his claims by declaring that Thebes was a province of Kush. As with his father, Kashta, Piankhy had hoped that an alliance with Libyan delta princes would be a tactical advantage and a useful means of local indirect administration in Egypt. However, the tactical alliances with the aspiring Libyan princes of the delta were equally distracting, especially when the Kushites were more diverted by other foreign engagements. Thus it was that the military forces of Piankhy had to fight with the Libyan Tefnakt (q.v.) of the 24th Dynasty, at Sais in the delta, in about 730 BCE. When Piankhy finally succeeded, Kushites ruled from central Sudan to the Egyptian delta. They reconstructed the political unity of the Nile valley to an extent that would be arguably greater than it had even been even during the celebrated Egyptian New Kingdom. Piankhy, like Kashta, was buried at Kurru near Napata and Jebel Barkal.

Piankhy’s younger brother, Pharaoh Shabaka (q.v.; 716–701 BCE), followed him. Shabaka is one of three Kushite kings to be noted in the Old Testament (Genesis 10:7). He supported the Judaean king Isaiah at El-Tekeh in their joint fight against the Assyrians. In appreciation, Isaiah sent gifts to Shabaka. Shabaka was reported by Manetho (q.v.) to have captured his 24th Dynasty rival Bakenranef (q.v.) and burned him alive. Shabaka died in 701 BCE and was buried at Kurru. The following reign of Pharaoh Shabataka (q.v.; 701–690 BCE) was also noted in Genesis 10:7. Similarly, he was buried at Kurru rather than Thebes.

Perhaps the most prominent pharaoh of the 25th Dynasty was Taharka (q.v.; 690–664 BCE), who was the last to have control of the unified Nile. Although the claim of “Lord of Two Lands” was to continue for centuries, Tanutamun (q.v.) was the last to, only briefly, occupy Egypt. This brought the 25th Dynasty to an end.

Thus, during this high point of Nubian rule of Egypt, strategic alliances were forged with Phoenicians and Jews (q.v.) in an ultimately
failed but joint effort to block Assyrian expansion. The foreign policy
tactic to ally against Assyrian expansion was coupled with domestic
insecurity surrounding Egyptian revival and rival Libyan princes in
the delta. At this time, Nubian authority swept from the confluence of
the two Niles to the Mediterranean Sea and was engaged in military
and political activities in the Levant. Although not Egyptians them-

TZITZIS. See KERTASSI.

UKMA. The site of Ukma lies is on the eastern bank of the Nile (q.v.)
just downstream from Kulubnarti (q.v.) or on the upper reach of the
Butn al-Hajr (q.v.). Ukma was first surveyed by the Sudan Antiqui-
ties Service and later by the Swiss under André Vila during the Nu-
bian Salvage Project. The several hundred nonroyal Kerma (q.v.)-style burials from this site suggest that Ukma might represent an
intrusive or symbiotic linkage with Kerma.

UPPER NUBIA. Although complete agreement has not been reached re-
garding the domain of Upper Nubia, it certainly begins at the Second
Cataract and includes the Butn al-Hajr (q.v.) to the Third Cataract. Thus,
it is the part of Nubia (q.v.) that lies to the south, or upstream, of Lower
Nubia (q.v.). Some scholars add the Nile reach from the Third to Fourth
Cataracts as part of Upper Nubia; other scholars reserve this region for
the reference of Kush (q.v.) or Napata (q.v.). The term “Kush” can also
be applied to all of Nubia, both Upper and Lower, and southern Nubia
in a general sense, but here the term “Kush” is used for Nubia during
and after the New Kingdom (q.v.) occupation. “Kerma” (q.v.) is the
name used here for the previous Nubian state in Upper Nubia. The re-

region above the Fourth Cataract and certainly upstream of the Fifth
Cataract can be termed “southern Nubia” or “Meroë” (q.v.). “Irem” or
“Yam” (q.v.) may apply only to segments of Upper Nubia, but here they
are subsumed under the reference “Kerma,” which is at the heartland of
Upper Nubia before 1500 BCE. The ancient reference to the Ta-Setiu
(q.v.) is probably broad enough to include the “bow-people” of Upper and Lower Nubia. *See also Maps C and D.*

**Uronarti.** This island is located just upstream of Shelfak (q.v.) between the Second and Third Cataracts on the Nile (q.v.). Uronarti is a heavily walled, compact military settlement with only two gateways and rooms for barracks and storage. During the Middle Kingdom, Egyptian militarists were deeply fearful of attacks from Kerma (q.v.), and Uronarti was a part of a series of forts built along this region of the Nile. In the New Kingdom, the need for defensive posts on the Nile was less, but Tuthmosis III (q.v.) used Uronarti to build small temples dedicated to the Nubian god Dedun (q.v.) and Montu the warrior (falcon) god, who was particularly popular in the Middle Kingdom and among Theban priests. Its name probably is derived from the Nubian words for “King’s Island.”

**Ushanhu, Ushanahu.** This Nubian (q.v.) crown prince was the son of King Taharka (q.v.). During his father’s administration of Egypt from Memphis, the capital city was attacked repeatedly by the forces of the Assyrian (q.v.) king Esarhaddon (q.v.) in about 671 BCE. Ushanhu and perhaps some of Taharka’s wives were captured and taken back to Nineveh, where he disappeared from the written record. Taharka may have been wounded during this siege, but he lived to drive Esarhaddon back out of Egypt and continue the battle for Nubian control of the Nile (q.v.) valley.

---

**Vespasian (69–79 CE).** This Roman emperor is best known for starting the construction of the great Colosseum in Rome. He commanded the Roman army, in 67 CE, to crush the Jews (q.v.), then in an anti-Roman revolt in Palestine. The Roman prefect of Egypt declared him to be emperor in 69 CE, and he ruled from Alexandria briefly until taking control of Rome. In Egypt, he is known from inscriptions at the Serapis temple of Alexandria and the Esna temple.
VICEROY OF NUBIA. This titled office was also known as “King’s Son of Kush” (q.v.). Essentially, the viceroy of Nubia was akin to the position of a colonial governor-general. The viceroy was directly responsible to and appointed by the pharaoh. The chief duties were to maintain peace and stability of Nubia (q.v.) or Wawat in Lower Nubia (qq.v.) and Kush in Upper Nubia, (qq.v.) to ensure a continuous flow of the Nubian resources that were sought by Egypt. These included gold and sculptural stones, animal skins, ostrich feathers and eggs, ivory, incense, and ebony (qq.v.), among the more important products. Pharaoh Ahmose I (q.v.) probably initiated this position as the founder of the New Kingdom (q.v.), and it lasted until the end of the 20th Dynasty. Among the very last viceroys, these might have been Nubians themselves, such as Viceroy Piankhy or Viceroy Panehesi (qq.v.), but it is most likely that most were of Egyptian descent. Pa-Nehesi commanded Nubian troops in Upper Egypt for Ramses XI (q.v.), and he was buried in the strategic Nubian town of Aniba (q.v.). Viceroy Piankhy may well have been something of a legitimating model for the later king Piankhy (q.v.), who perhaps was the first Nubian to rule all of Egypt and Kush.

During the early part of the Third Intermediate period, the viceroy of Nubia played an influential role in Theban politics. Such might have also been the case for a poorly known viceroy named Amenmese, who briefly followed Merenptah in the 19th Dynasty. See also APPENDIX.

WAD BEN NAQA. This area of the western Butana adjoins the eastern bank of the Nile between modern Shendi and the Sabaluka (Sixth) Cataract. This first-century BCE royal town was an access point to the sites at Naqa and Musawwarat es-Sufra (qq.v.). It was an area attributed to Meroitic King Natakamani and Queen Amanishakekte (?) (qq.v.). It has special significance because of a bark stand (Berlin 7261) found at the Egyptian (i.e., contemporary Ptolemaic)-style, multiroomed Isis temple there. This stand had parallel Egyptian and Meroitic hieroglyphs that allowed for the transliteration of this form of Meroitic and ultimately the transliteration of Meroitic cursive (demotic).
According to Jean Vercouter and Steffen Wenig, Wad Ben Naqa also includes a thick-walled brick and sandstone palace about sixty meters square with a columned hall and more than forty other buildings that were probably trade magazines. At least one grand building had a second story, and perhaps the remains of other temples exist as well. A mysterious thick-walled, round, ramped structure with an interior measurement of almost thirteen meters has defied explanation since it seems unique in the archaeological record of Nubia to date. A granary, observatory, and temple have been proposed without substantial confirmation. A sandstone lion sculpture, a gilded sandstone royal wall inlay, clay lion and falcon sculptures, offering basins, and king’s head also attest to Wad Ben Naqa’s being a royal palace. The extent of this town may indicate importance close to Meroë itself, yet it remains to be more fully investigated.

**WADI AL-ALLAQI, WADI ALAKI.** The thick-walled Kubban (q.v.) fortress on the eastern bank of the Nile (q.v.) guarded this Nubian wadi, or valley, that was a source area for copper and gold. Dakka (q.v.) temple reinforced Kubban fort from the western bank. This wadi is also known as Akita. The mines of Wadi al-Allaqi were especially important in New Kingdom (q.v.), Ptolemaic (q.v.), and Roman times. The lack of water for drinking and mining proved problematic until the New Kingdom 19th Dynasty pharaohs sunk a number of strategic wells to meet this need. Traveling up Wadi al-Allaqi from Kubban, one could gain access to Wadi Gabgaba (q.v.), another gold-producing minefield to the east of Lower Nubia (q.v.). Today, the lower parts of Wadi al-Allaqi are now under the waters of Lake Nasser. Some modest efforts have been made to allow Nubians to return to the region around the Wadi al-Allaqi area to create a modern fishing village.

**WADI AL-HUDI, WADI HUDI.** This valley in lower Nubia, only a dozen kilometers from Aswan (q.v.), has quarrying inscriptions that date to Mentuhotep III and Mentuhotep IV at the end of the Middle Kingdom 11th Dynasty and Senusret I and Senusret III (q.v.) and Amenemhat III (q.v.) in the 12th Dynasty. Valued resources of Wadi al-Hudi included amethyst and copper ore.
WADI AS-SEBUA (WADY SABOUA). The original location of the Wadi as-Sebua temple was on the western bank of the Nile (q.v.) across from the small wadi that gave it its name. Being on a low river floodplain, it was moved to higher ground a few kilometers upstream. Its orientation was peculiar in that it was parallel rather than perpendicular to the river. Before its relocation, the avenue of sphinxes in the outer court and the very base of the first pylon were flooded by the rising waters.

Amenhotep III (q.v.) in the New Kingdom (q.v.) 18th Dynasty built a small rock-cut temple with brick pylon at the original location. The temple was dedicated to a Nubian form of Horus and later to Amun (q.v.) after the reign of Akhenaton (q.v.), who stressed worship of the Aton cult. The Amun cult was reestablished thereafter, and Ramses II (q.v.) added to the front of that temple pylon. The remains of this earlier temple at Wadi as-Sebua are lost.

However, in the 19th Dynasty, Ramses II built the new and larger (?) Wadi as-Sebua temple. It was about two kilometers from its present relocation. It was partially rock cut and partially freestanding, especially the grand avenue of sphinxes, two outer courts, and outer pylons. Probably four colossi of this pharaoh were placed in front of the third pylon, and more standing images of Ramses II were in the inner court before the hypostyle hall of twelve columns was removed from solid rock for its historical preservation. This court led to another set of three chambers, of which two were probably for storage. Finally, the innermost sanctuary, having three chambers, is reached. The central sanctuary had been converted to a church in Christian (q.v.) times, so that one sees the ironic anachronism of Ramses II on the side walls making offerings to Christian icons plastered on to the walls some 2,000 years later.

This important temple has an inscription indicating that Ramses II had at least 170 children, of whom 111 were boys. Another inscription indicates that it was built at the time of Setau, who served as his last viceroy of Kush (q.v.) in the closing years of Ramses II. Aside from its orientation, the temple is standard in style and arrangement with a central axis, three pylons, a small stairway to the rock-cut hypostyle hall, and an inner sanctuary. Although the sanctuary statues are difficult to confirm, the late date of construction in his reign and the apparent parallel with Abu Simbel (q.v.) can lead to the conclusion that Ramses II was also represented as a deity with Amun, Ptah,
and Ra-Horakhty. Today, the temples of Wadi as-Sebua, Maharraqa, and Dakka (q.v.) are reconstructed and relocated in a common, new archaeological park.

WADI GABGABA (KABKABA). Wadi Gabgaba is one of the ancient slave-operated gold minefields deep in the Eastern Desert of Lower Nubia (q.v.) or the gold mines of Wawat (q.v.). Access to gold was much sought by Nubians, Egyptians, Ptolemies, and Romans when they controlled these lands. Control of the fortress of Kubban (q.v.) was critical to enter Wadi al-Alaqi (q.v.) and farther in the desert at Wadi Gabgaba. Alternatively, the use of the so-called Korosko (q.v.) Road allowed access to Wadi Gabgaba from a point farther upstream on the Nile (q.v.).

WADI GHAZALI. Wadi Ghazali is located downstream of the Fourth Cataract on the western bank of the Nile. It follows Wadi Abu Dom, which penetrates southeasterly into the Bayuda plain from the Kushite town of Sanam (q.v.). At this somewhat removed and thereby obscured site was a Christian church and monastery that was excavated by Peter Shinnie for the Sudan Antiquities Service in 1953–1954. According to William Adams, it functioned probably from the ninth to twelfth centuries but is badly ruined today.

WADI HALFA. Wadi Halfa is at the downstream end of the Second Cataract and is on the modern Sudano-Egyptian border. Wadi Halfa is significant in prehistoric times, as it produces some of the early traces of Middle Paleolithic man in Nubia (q.v.) at the nearby site of Khor Musa (q.v.), which functioned about 18,000 years bp. The Wadi Halfa area enters the historical record in very earliest recorded times. It was on a nearby stone that the Archaic period pharaoh king Djer (q.v.) recorded one of the very earliest Egyptian conquests of Nubia. It was in this vicinity that various Old Kingdom and Middle Kingdom pharaohs commonly made their defense line against the Nubians. For example, inscriptions found in this vicinity date to Senusoret I (q.v.) of the 12th Dynasty, and others are dated to the 19th Dynasty in the New Kingdom (q.v.). By the end of the 20th Dynasty, Nubians returned to this borderland to reassert their control of the region and press on to assert control of Lower Nubia (q.v.) and Upper Egypt.
The modern history of Wadi Halfa is central to the Turco-Egyptian and British conquest of Sudan. Wadi Halfa was particularly important in the Nubian salvage and relocation project in the context of the creation of Lake Nasser.

**WADI HOWAR.** This irregular, or seasonal, watercourse drains the region up to 100 kilometers west of the Dongola (q.v.) reach of the Nile and empties into the Nile (q.v.) downstream of al-Debba between the Third and Fourth Cataracts. It was probably a general southwestern migration route into the Sahara before its profound desiccation in the fourth millennium BCE. A-Group (q.v.) and C-Group (q.v.) pottery parallels have been found to the west as far as the Middle Wadi Howar. Wadi Howar has also produced stone celts that appear to have Dynastic Egyptian inspiration. In the times of Kush (q.v.), Wadi Howar also may have served as a transportation route to the western areas of northern Kordofan and Darfur (q.v.).

**WAVY-LINE POTTERY. See KHARTOUM MESOLITHIC.**

**WAWAT.** Wawat was a sometimes independent polity in Lower Nubia (q.v.). Although regional history goes back to the Paleolithic (q.v.) period, the Nubian (q.v.) people of Wawat first enter the historical record as the A-Group (q.v.) and later with the intrusive cattle-herding C-Group (q.v.). In the Middle Kingdom, the southern boundary of Wawat was usually at the Second Cataract forts that blocked attacks from Kerma (q.v.), Egypt’s rival in Upper Nubia (q.v.). The northern frontier of Wawat likely was upstream of Aswan (q.v.), but this may have fluctuated at times. The administrative center for Wawat was usually at Aniba (q.v.; ancient Miam), which shows long occupation in the Middle Kingdom. For example, Pharaoh Amen-emhat (q.v.) in the 12th Dynasty wrote of his clashes with the chiefs of Wawat.

During the New Kingdom, the provincial town of Aniba in Wawat was sometimes the headquarters of the viceroy of Kush (q.v.). Many New Kingdom pharaohs make reference to the slaves, livestock, and natural resources and administration in Wawat. For example, such accounts are found for Tuthmosis III and Tuthmosis IV (q.v.). From Wawat, the viceroy could quickly advance farther to Upper Nubia or
back to Thebes. All the riverine lands of original Wawat are now under Lake Nasser.

WENI. This dynamic, innovative Egyptian military leader, investigator, and judge served under Pepi I (q.v.; ca. 2332–2283 BCE) of the 6th Dynasty. His procurement of conscripted troops from each Egyptian nomarch allowed for a broad base for his military. He also relied on battalions of highly regarded archers from Nubia (q.v.) for his campaigns in Nubia, Sinai, and elsewhere. At this time, Egypt was at the conclusion of its early period of expansion, but defensive structures of the First Cataract and some early work on canals probably near Seheil (q.v.) Island also took place during his administration. As a governor of Upper Egypt during the Old Kingdom, he was buried at the important pilgrimage site at Abydos.

WERESH, WERETJ. This (Upper?) Nubian land is mentioned in New Kingdom texts that suggest either a local administration or a tribute-paying region. A number of references have been made for Nubian polities that have not been identified with any precision, but they appear in the “land” cartouches of bound Nubian prisoners that are featured in New Kingdom (q.v.) statuary showing their subordinate status.

WILBOUR, CHARLES EDWIN (1833–1896). This American businessman traveled extensively in the Middle East, but he was deeply fascinated by Egyptology. Much of his personal collection led to the formation of the Brooklyn Museum collection on Egyptology. In 1889, he reported on the noted famine stela on Seheil Island (q.v.) at Aswan (q.v.).

W-GROUP. This is a name given by early twentieth-century archaeologists to the Greco-Roman remains in Nubia (q.v.). This term has now been abandoned.

WOOLLEY, CHARLES LEONARD (1880–1960). This English archaeologist excavated widely in the Middle East, including Ur in Mesopotamia and Amarna and Sinai in Egypt. His Nubian (q.v.) research was at Areika (q.v.) with D. R. MacIver and Francis Ll. Griffith (q.v.) in the 1907–1911 Eckley B. Coxe Expedition and in the 1912 Oxford University Nubian Expedition. He excavated a major
Meroitic (q.v.) cemetery at Karanog (q.v.) that produced a significant number of Meroitic inscription on funerary stela and hetep offering tablets. Reports were also published on Buhen (q.v.). His work with MacIver appeared mostly in publications of the University Museum in Philadelphia.

– X –

**X-GROUP.** The X-Group culture and population of Lower Nubia (q.v.) flourished in the 200s to 500s CE. It was a post-Meroitic (q.v.) syncretic mixture of Roman, Kushite (q.v.), and new elements, creating a distinctive culture. Some scholars believe that the X-Group originated as new migrants into the region, while others stress the continuity of development from earlier groups. The Qustul, Ballana, and Tanqasi (q.q.v.) cultures are considered X-Group, and most authorities identify the X-Group with what became the Christian (q.v.) kingdom of Nobatia (q.v.). Despite the fact that the X-Group people had not accepted Christianity as their religion, numerous Byzantine artistic elements have been incorporated from the neighboring Coptic Christians in Egypt. Their conquest by King Silko (q.v.) brought their culture to an end and completed the transition of Lower Nubia to Christianity. The deficiency of textual material about or from the X-Group, as well as its transitional nature, has slowed the historiography of this intriguing period in Nubian history. Despite efforts to rid the literature of Reisner’s (q.v.) term, it seems embedded in Nubian archaeology.

– Y –

**YAM (IREM).** This was an independent trading kingdom in the third millennium BCE. Perhaps it was a precursor Kerma (q.v.) culture. Indeed, Yam is essentially the Egyptian or perhaps the Kushite name for the ancient Nubian state generally referred to by archaeologists as Kerma (q.v.). In fact, Kerma is named only for the village at this site. Yam is known textually from at least four peaceful trading visits of Harkuf (q.v.), the governor of Aswan (q.v.) who served Pharaohs Merenre and Pepi II (q.v.) in the Old Kingdom and in the First Inter-
mediate period. On Harkuf’s first trade mission to Yam, he traveled for seven months with his father, Iri. His second mission took eight months and was led without his father, and on his third expedition he reported that the kingdom of Yam was warring with the southernmost Libyan (Berber?) people, the Tjemehu (q.v.), to the west. In order to secure the friendship of Yam, Harkuf pursued and defeated the Tjemehu.

His reward was abundant trade items requiring 300 donkeys with an armed detachment from Yam that guaranteed protection against the Itet (q.v.) and Setiu peoples of the Second Cataract (?) region. Each of these missions bypassed the First and Second Cataracts, with his donkey train traveling securely in the Western Desert to and from Yam. The short reign of Merenre brought Harkuf into service under Pharaoh Pepi II, under whom he took his fourth expedition to Yam. On this trip, he carefully returned with a dwarf or pygmy who was much noted as a gift that would please his king. It was imagined that dwarfs were the Nubian prototype for the god Bes, who was considered a deity for amusements and joviality.

In the Middle Kingdom, Yam/Kerma was a major, threatening Egyptian rival, as suggested by the renewal of the massive and numerous Egyptian border forts. In the New Kingdom (q.v.), after the Hyksos (q.v.) were expelled from the delta, Yam was conquered and probably looted and burned by invading Egyptian forces. Yet in the 1280s BCE, the leaders of Yam attempted a revolt against the Egyptian pharaoh Seti I (q.v.), the father of Ramses II (qq.v.). The revolt was finally put down when Seti I’s troops launched a weeklong punitive raid that resulted in 800 Nubian prisoners.

YESBOKHEAMANI, YESBEKHEAMANI (AMANI-YESH-BEHE). This king of late Meroitic (q.v.) times probably ruled from about 283 to 300 CE. An inscription of Yesbokheamani is recorded on the lion temple at Meroë. According to Derek Welsby, the presence of Meroitic graffiti at Philae and Qasr Ibrim (qq.v.) suggest that Yesbokheamani may have reoccupied Lower Nubia (q.v.) following Diocletian’s (q.v.) tactical retreat to Aswan (q.v.) in 298 CE. Yesbokheamani was buried in the northern cemetery at Meroë, and he was among the last rulers of Meroë before its final destruction by King Ezana of Axum (q.v.) sometime in about the first third of the fourth century CE.
Y-GROUP. The Y-Group is an arbitrary reference given to Christian (q.v.) Nubia (q.v.) from the sixth through twelfth centuries. Seeking to order a nameless archaeological chronology, this term was used by early twentieth-century archaeologists but is no longer used.

– Z –

ZAGHAWA. See BERTI.

ZAKARIA, KING. This Christian (q.v.) king of Nubia (q.v.) is known for possibly sending his son Giorgis/Girgis to the khalifa of Baghdad or his Cairo representative in 836 CE to explain or protest the unpaid baqt (treaty tribute) payment that was expected from Christian Nubia to the Abbasid Muslims. Presumably, it was the same Giorgis who ruled as king of Nubia from 860 to 920 CE, although the regnal dates are so long that this may be confused.

ZERAH. It is possible that Zerah is another name for the Egyptian pharaoh Sheshonk (q.v.), who followed after Pharaoh Osorkon I (q.v.; 924–889 BCE) of the Tanite 22nd Dynasty. On the other hand, Sheshonk is clearly and separately named in the Bible in 1 Kings 14:26, so perhaps this is an otherwise unknown “Ethiopian” (Nubian) ruler or leader. In the Bible, references are made to the “Ethiopian” Zerah in II Chronicles 14:9–15 and 16:8. According to this, Zerah invaded Judaea from the south in 900 BCE but was defeated and driven out by the Judaean king Asa (911–870 BCE). There he is referred to as “the Ethiopian with a host of a thousand and three hundred chariots” who were defeated and dispersed at Mareshah by King Asa, who pursued them to Gerar. King Asa returned safely to Jerusalem with cattle, sheep, and camels taken from Zerah. Thus, with this brief mention, Zerah is otherwise obscure.
Appendix I: Main Language Groups Associated with Ancient Nubia

I. Afro-Asiatic (Hamito-Semitic) Languages
A. Hamitic: Ancient Egyptian (Saidic and Boharic), (hieroglyphic, hieratic, and demotic written forms); Coptic, Libyc, Berber
B. Northern Cushitic: Blemmye, Ababda, Amarar, Beni Amer, Beja, Bisharin, Hadendowa, Medjay
C. Central Semitic: Aramaic, Assyrian, Canaanite, Hebrew, Punic, Proto-Sinaitic, Arabic
D. South Semitic: South Arabian, Axumite (Ge’ez)

II. Eastern Sudanic Languages
A. PreNilotic
B. Nilotic
C. Daju
D. Nubian Languages: Meroitic (?), Old Nubian, Danagla/Don-golawi, Fadicha, Kenuz/Kenzi, Mahas, Sukkot

III. Kordofanian (of the Nuba Hills)
IV. Furian (of Darfur)
V. Niger-Congo (Nigritic, Bantu)
VI. Indo-European: Greek, Latin, Persian

NOTE

## Appendix II: New Kingdom Viceroy of Nubia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viceroy</th>
<th>Pharaoh Served</th>
<th>Regnal Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sa-Taiyit</td>
<td>Ahmose I</td>
<td>1570–1546 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuwre</td>
<td>Amenhotep I</td>
<td>1551–1524 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuwre</td>
<td>Tuthmosis I</td>
<td>1524–1518 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seni</td>
<td>Tuthmosis I and II</td>
<td>1518–1504 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehi</td>
<td>Hatshepsut</td>
<td>1498–1483 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehi</td>
<td>Tuthmosis III</td>
<td>1504–1450 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usersatet</td>
<td>Amenhotep II</td>
<td>1453–1419 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep</td>
<td>Tuthmosis IV</td>
<td>1419–1386 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep</td>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>1386–1349 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merymose</td>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthmose</td>
<td>Amenhotep IV</td>
<td>1350–1334 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huy-Amenhotep</td>
<td>Tutankhamen</td>
<td>1334–1325 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paser I</td>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>1325–1321 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paser I</td>
<td>Horemheb?</td>
<td>1321–1293 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenemopet</td>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td>1293–1291 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenemopet</td>
<td>Ramses II</td>
<td>1279–1212 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuni</td>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuni</td>
<td>Ramses II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hekanakht</td>
<td>Ramses II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paser II</td>
<td>Ramses II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sethauw</td>
<td>Ramses II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messuwy</td>
<td>Merneptah</td>
<td>1212–1202 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messuwy</td>
<td>Amenmesses?</td>
<td>1202–1199 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messuwy</td>
<td>Seti II</td>
<td>1199–1193 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti</td>
<td>Siptah</td>
<td>1193–1187 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hori I</td>
<td>Setnakhte?</td>
<td>1185–1182 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hori II</td>
<td>Ramses III</td>
<td>1182–1151 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hori II</td>
<td>Ramses IV</td>
<td>1151–1145 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Viceroy Pharaoh Served Regnal Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viceroy</th>
<th>Pharaoh Served</th>
<th>Regnal Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siese</td>
<td>Ramses VI</td>
<td>1141–1133 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahiho</td>
<td>Ramses VII</td>
<td>1133–1126 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahiho</td>
<td>Ramses VIII?</td>
<td>1133–1126 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentawat</td>
<td>Ramses IX</td>
<td>1126–1108 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesenakht</td>
<td>Ramses IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panehsi</td>
<td>Ramses XI</td>
<td>1098–1070 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herihor</td>
<td>Ramses XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piankhy</td>
<td>Herihor</td>
<td>1080–1074 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE

1. These data are adapted from the list of Reisner (1920). The viceroy of Nubia or the King’s Son of Kush was the administrative official responsible for the southern section of Egypt and Nubia, ranging from Hierakonpolis (Nekhne) in Upper Egypt to Napata (Karei) near the Fourth Cataract. The Piankhy listed here should not be confused with King Piankhy of the 25th Dynasty.
Appendix III: Proposed Reconstruction of Kinship in the 25th Dynasty

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Kashita} &= \text{Patma} \\
\text{Kasaqa} &= \text{Alara} \\
\text{A} &= s-1 \\
\text{A} &= s-1 \\
\text{A} &= s-1 \\
\text{Khensa} &= \text{Peksater} \\
\text{Piankh} &= \text{Abar} \\
\text{Tabiy} &= \text{Amenirdis I} \\
\text{SHABAQO} &= a-1 \\
\text{Haremakhet} &= a-1 \\
\text{Khalut} &= \text{SHABATAQO} \\
\text{Yusita} &= \text{TAHARQO} \\
\text{Piehetetemery} &= \text{Sheperwepet II} \\
\text{Napary} &= \text{Tabaknamun} \\
\text{Dukhatamun} &= s-2 \\
\text{Qeltha} &= \text{TANUTAMUN} \\
\text{Malaqaye} &= s-2 \\
\text{Maletaral} &= \text{ATLANERSA} \\
\text{Yetrow} &= \text{Ushazhuru} \\
\text{Amenirdis II} &= a-2 \\
\text{Neshutehn} &= a-2 \\
\text{Nafors} &= a-2 \\
\text{Nasalsa} &= \text{SENKAMUNISKEN} \\
\text{Amanimalel} &= \text{Nitocris} \\
\text{Harkhebi} &= \text{O} \\
\text{Artaha} &= \text{ASPELTA} \\
\text{Asata} &= \text{ANLAMANI} \\
\text{Madekan} &= \text{O}
\end{align*} \]

NOTES

1. This diagram unifies a variety of sources, but is inspired by K. A. Kitchen, (1986. The Third Intermediate Period, 2nd edition. Warminster, UK: Aris and
Phillips, p. 478). This chart has included all information without apparent contradiction. Assumed relations are indicated with a question mark. The reigns of the pharaohs are noted below. Notes: A, bold upper case = male; O, lower case = female; | = marriage; l = descent; N = descent from Nasalsa; A = descent from Alara; Italicized = God’s Wife of Amun; double underscore = High Priest of Amun.

2. Both Shabaka and Shabataka have diverse spellings of their names and are mentioned in the Old Testament (Genesis 10:7). Shabaka is called Shabako, Sabteh, and Sabachon; Shabataka is called Shebitku, Sebichos, and Sabtechah.

3. Piankhy is sometime called Piye or Pi.

4. The daughter of Queen Amenirdes I and Shabaka is not known by name, but one of their daughters married Psamtik (Psammetichus), a pharaoh-prince in the delta, to help solidify Kushitic political relations there or, alternatively, to solidify Psamtik’s ties to Theban legitimacy. Whether this daughter, or another, had the child Harkhebi is not clear. Harkhebi is known just as a grandson of Shabaka. Budge (1893) states that Psamtik married Shepenupt, a daughter of Piankhy and sister of Taharka; perhaps he married both. In any case, Psamtik’s daughter Nitaqert (Nitocris I) was considered adopted by Shepenwepet (Shepenupet) to secure his access to the matrilineal royal line. Psamtik was the son of Nekau (Necho), the Saitic governor who recognized the rule of the 25th dynasty at Sais. When Psamtik I died in 610 BCE, after the fall of Ninevah, he was succeeded by his son, also known as Nekau (see II Kings 23:29; II Chronicles 35:20; Jeremiah 46:2). Psamtik II (26th Dynasty) followed his father, Necho II, also of the 26th Dynasty. The marriage(s) of Psamtik I are examples of some use of the principle of matrilineal descent. It is clear that Psamtik I was an outsider (26th dynasty) who sought to legitimize his access to royal authority—first, by his marriage to the daughter of Amenirdes, a sister of Piankhy; second, by his marriage to Shepenwepet, a daughter of Piankhy; and third, by the adoption of Nitocris by Shepenwepet, a final demonstration that the line of inheritance was traced by and through women.

5. It is not certain that Khapenupet II was the wife of Shabataka, only that he married a daughter of Piankhy. It is a reasonable assumption, however, since she is represented in the royal Isis-form manner in a statue with her name at Medinat Habu. A lesser figure than a pharaoh’s wife likely would not be projected in this way.

6. The son of Taharka and Queen Yusata was Ushanhuru, who was captured at Memphis by Esarhaddon and taken as a captive back to Assyria. Taharka also had a son named Exshowfenet and a daughter named Peltasen as well as Amenirdes II, who became a Theban God’s Wife of Amun.

7. The proposal that Senkamunseken married both Amarimalel and Nasalsa seems to be a way to resolve numerous overlapping relationships typical of an endogamous, matrilineal ruling class. If this is correct, he probably married Nasala first and Amarimalel second.
8. The unknown name of the sister of Asata and Madekan was termed the “chief sistrum player” in the royal court. A sistrum is an ancient musical instrument played for religious purposes.

9. The record is unclear about the parents of Kashta and Pabatma.

10. According to R. A. Fazzini (1988:2), the reigns of the God’s Wives of Amun are indicated as (a = adoptive tie to God’s Wife of Amun). Kinship according to Dunham and Macadam (1949:149) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>754–714</td>
<td>Shepenwepet I</td>
<td>Daughter of Osorkon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740–700</td>
<td>Amenirdes I</td>
<td>Daughter of Kashta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710–650</td>
<td>Shepenwepet II</td>
<td>Daughter of Piankhy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670–640</td>
<td>Amenirdes II</td>
<td>Daughter of Taharka?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through adoptive mother Piebtetemery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656–586</td>
<td>Nitocris I</td>
<td>Daughter of Psamtik I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Wives of Piankhy:
   - Nefrukekashta, daughter of Kashta and Pabatma
   - Abar, daughter of Kashta and Pabatma, mother of Taharka
   - Khensa, daughter of Kashta and Pabatma
   - Peksater, daughter of Kashta, adopted by Pabatma
   - Tabiry, daughter of Alara and Kasaqa
   - Khapenupet I, perhaps a wife of Piankhy

12. Wives of Taharka:
   - Yusata, mother of Ushanhuru (Esanhure, Ushanakhuru), taken captive
   - Atakhebasken, . . . salka, mother of Atlanersa
   - Naparaye, daughter of Piankhy
   - Tabekenamun?, daughter of Piankhy
   - Tekahatamani, daughter of Piankhy
Appendix IV: 25th Dynasty Dynamics

A. Themes in 25th Dynasty Statecraft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period/Pharaoh</th>
<th>Themes and Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashta (760–747 BCE)</td>
<td>Consolidation of Lower Nubia and Thebes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classical period</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piankhy (747–716 BCE; “The Pioneer”)</td>
<td>Foreign relations: Conquest of Upper and Lower Egypt but without administrative consolidation; siege of Memphis; “defeat” of Tefnakt and Nimlot; control of the oases and delta. Legitimacy: Amun; “Critique” of Nimlot; stela at Napata; steward Harwa; God’s Wives of Amun: Shepenwepet I and Amenirdis I. Construction: Kurru, Abdyos Chapel for Peksater, Sanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabaka (716–702 BCE; “The Diplomat”)</td>
<td>Foreign relations: Defeat of western delta rival Bakenranef (Bocchois); peaceful alliance with Judaeans;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period/Pharaoh</td>
<td>Themes and Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful cooperation with Assyrians; extradition of Philistine Yamani of Ashdod; avoided war.</td>
<td>Legitimacy: Son of Amun; Apis Bull; God’s Wife of Amun, sister Amenirdis I; High Priest of Amun, son Haremakhet; Shabako was the brother of Piankhy. Construction: Karnak, Memphis (stone), Medinat Habu, Luxor, Kawa, Kurru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabataka (702–690 BCE; “The Revivalist”)</td>
<td>Foreign relations: Failed insurrection in Phoenicia; political and military training for Prince Taharka; battle of El Teqeh (701); aggressive policy to resist Assyrians; strategic alliance with Hezekiah; local rule in delta. Legitimacy: God’s Wife of Amun Amenirdis and sister Shepenwepet II; Shabataka was the son of Piankhy. Construction: Karnak, Kurru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taharka (690–664 BCE; “The Sleeping Giant”)</td>
<td>Foreign relations: Full ruler of Kush and Egypt (“defeat” of Libyans; military rival to Assyrians Essarhaddon and Assurbanipal; unstable alliances in the delta. Legitimacy: Mother’s visit God’s Wife of Amun; Apis Bull; Theban authority of Mentuemhat; Taharka was son of Piankhy. Construction: Karnak (four places at least), Tanis, Memphis, Kawa, Napata, Qasr Ibrim, Medinat Habu, Nuri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Foreign relations: Brief return to Egypt; failed Revival of the 25th Dynasty; sack of Karnak; exile to Napata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanutamun (664–656 BCE; “The Failed Dreamer”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Period/Pharaoh | Themes and Events
--- | ---
Legitimacy: Brief coregency with Taharka; Amun; Tanutamun was the grandson of Piankhy. Construction: Tomb at Kurru

NOTES

1. Chronology following Kitchen (1986, 2nd ed.).
2. The battle of El-Teqeh probably was attended by Prince Taharka, but it was not decisive, yet it served temporary strategic advantage: 1) Probably bowmen and cavalry largely returned and were not pursued; 2) Assyrians did not press attack into Egypt or Palestine; and 3) divided Assyrian forces had to regroup, thus relieving pressure on Jerusalem in conjunction with death of Sennacherib.

B. Main Features of 25th Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious/Ideological</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Monumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worship of Amun-Re</td>
<td>Nubian dress</td>
<td>Construction at Tanis, Memphis, El Kab, Edfu, Medinat Habu, Karnak, Kawa, Semna, Buhen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship of Apis bull</td>
<td>Nubian features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration of Sed festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebration of Opet festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of God’s Wives of Amun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Theban priesthood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian mortuary beliefs</td>
<td>Nubian burials</td>
<td>Qasr Ibrim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramids, ba, ka</td>
<td>Nubian burials</td>
<td>Nuri, Kurru, Jebel Barkal, Shabaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Book of the Dead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Religious/Ideological | Cultural | Monumental
--- | --- | ---
Stone Egyptian mortuary practices | Inscriptions in demotic, hieroglyphics | Mumification, canopic jars, shawabtis
Egyptian mythology and deities | Nubian deities | Proper rulers of the “world”
Themes Restoration | Nubianity | Authenticity
Renewal Purification | Service to Amun
C. Features of 25th Dynasty Administration

| Egyptian Relations | Diplomatic Relations | Military |
--- | --- | ---
Administration by: Tax and fiscal system | Alliances with Sidon and Tyre | Cavalry
Calendrical reckoning | Alliances with Judaea | Expert archers
Nomarchs/local chiefs | Extradition of rebel Yamani of Ashdod | Siege engineers, river navy
Scribes | Repression of delta Princes Tefnakt and Bakenref | Easy supply
Coregencies | Repression of Libyans/Kawa |
Theban priesthood | Gold reserves |

D. Reasons for the Collapse of the 25th Dynasty

I. Military overextension in context of regional “world war” with the Assyrians, Phonecians, Judeans, Samarians, Canaanites, Egyptians, and Nubians.
II. Failed or weak alliances
   A. Weak Egyptian support
      1) among repressed rivals in the delta
      2) among members of the Theban priesthood?
   B. Failed alliance with Phoenicians
   C. Weak alliance with Judaeans
   D. Antagonism with Canaanites
   E. Hostility with Libyans

III. Technological weaknesses
   A. No military chariots for Nubians
   B. Reliance on bronze (not iron) technology
   C. Probably limited use of camel logistic support
   D. Probably no major role for sea transport of troops
Appendix V: Near Eastern Dynasties in the Ninth to Seventh Centuries BCE

A. Kingdom of Judah (921–586)
   Uzziah (Azariah) 790–739
   Jotham 750–731
   Ahaz 735–715
   Hezekiah 729–686 (built tunnel at Jerusalem during siege of Sennacherib; see II Kings 20:20; II Chronicles 32:3–4, 30)
   Manasseh 696–641
   Amon 641–639
   Josiah 639–608


B. Kingdom of Israel (921–722/721)
   David ca. 1010–970
   Solomon

Split into northern kingdom of Israel under Jeroboam and southern kingdom of Judah under Rehoboam, Solomon’s son
   Zimri 882–882
   Omri 882–871
   Ahab 871–852 (built royal city of Jezreel)
   Ahaziah 852–851
   Joram 851–842
   Joash 798–782 (father of Jeroboam II)
   Jeroboam II 793–753
   Zachariah 753–752
Shallum 752
Menahem 752–742
Pekahiah 742–740
Pekah 740–732 (during the Tiglath–Pileser III raid on Israel)
Hoshea 732–723/722


C. Sargonid Dynasty of Assyria

Sargon II 721–705 (Samaria falls in 722 to Shalmaneser; Sargon II conquers Ashdod in 712)
Sennacherib 704–681 (Sennacherib campaigns in 701 against Hezekiah; see I Kings 18:13–16; Isaiah 36:1; forty-six fortified cities destroyed; Lachish noted in II Chronicles 32:9 and Isaiah 36:2)
Esarhaddon 680–669
Ashurbanipal 680–627/626 (Gilgamesh epic recorded at Nineveh)
Ashuretelilani 630–623
Sinsharrishkun 623–612


D. A Segment of the Ninth Dynasty of Babylon

Sargon II 709–705
Sennacherib 704–703
Minor kings 703
Sennacherib 688–680
Esarhaddon 680–669
Shamash-shumukin 668–648

Source: Finegan (1986:82).

E. 22nd Dynasty XXII (Libyan, at Tanis and Bubastis—a complex, divided, and confusing dynasty)
Sheshonq I/Shishak 945–924 (defeated Judah and Israel in 925; Solomon marries the pharaoh’s daughter)

Osorkon I 924–889
Sheshonq II ca. 890
Takelot I 889–874
Osorkon II 874–850 (wife was Queen Karomama I)
Takelot II 850–825 (wife was Queen Karomama II)
Sheshonq III 825–773
Pami 773–767
Sheshonq V 767–730
Osorkon IV 730–715
Harsies 870–860 (tried to be High Priest of Thebes after Nimlot)

Note: For Shishak, see I Kings 14:25–26; II Chronicles 12:2–9.

F. 23rd Dynasty (delta rebels at Leontopolis and Tanis)

Pedibastete 818–793
Sheshonq IV 793–787
Osorkon III 787–759
Takelot III 764–757
Rudamon 757–754
Iput 754–715

Peftjauabastet (at Herakleopolis)
Nimlot (at Hermopolis; father of Queen Karomama II); Nimlot served as High Priest of Thebes; father-in-law of Takelot II; referred to as Nimrod in the Bible


G. 24th Dynasty

Shepsesre (Tefnakhte) 727–720
Bochoris (Bakenrenerf) 720–715

H. 26th Dynasty (Saite)

Psammetichos I (Psamtik I) 664–610
Necho II (Nekau II) 610–595
Psammetichos II (Psamtik II) 595–589
Apries (Wahibre) 589–570
Amasis (Ahmose II) 570–526
Psammetichos III (Psamtik III) 526–525

Appendix VI: The Salvage of Ancient Nubian Temples in Egypt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancient Site</th>
<th>Associated With</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abu Simbel Temples</td>
<td>Ramses II (1279–1212 BCE)</td>
<td>Moved and elevated sixty meters Re-Horakhty, Hathor, Nefertari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qasr Ibrim</td>
<td>Multiple periods, including Dynastic, Meroitic, Roman, Christian, and Islamic</td>
<td>Excavations continue; much already lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amada Temple</td>
<td>Tuthmosis III (1504–1450 BCE)</td>
<td>New Amada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenhhotep II (1453–1419 BCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derr Temple</td>
<td>Ramses II</td>
<td>New Amada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb of Peniut</td>
<td>Peniut, governor of Wawat</td>
<td>New Amada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakka Temple</td>
<td>Ptolemy IV and Meroitic</td>
<td>New Wadi as-Sebua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharraqa Temple</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>New Wadi as-Sebua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi As-Sebua Temple</td>
<td>Ramses II</td>
<td>New Wadi as-Sebua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalabsha Temple</td>
<td>Roman, Augustus</td>
<td>New Kalabsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beit Al-Wali</td>
<td>Ramses II</td>
<td>New Kalabsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qertassi Kiosk</td>
<td>Greco-Roman</td>
<td>New Kalabsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isis Temple complex</td>
<td>Greco-Roman at Philaeand Meroitic (332 BCE–312 CE)</td>
<td>Relocated to nearby Agilkia Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancient Site</th>
<th>Associated With</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerf Hussein Temple</td>
<td>Ramses II</td>
<td>Fragments saved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qasr Ibrim chapel</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Fragments saved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Oda Temple</td>
<td>Horemheb (1321–1293 BCE)</td>
<td>Fragments saved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix VII: The Salvage of Ancient Nubian Temples in Sudan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancient Site</th>
<th>Associated With</th>
<th>Current Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semna West Temple</td>
<td>Tuthmosis III</td>
<td>Sudan National Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djer Inscription</td>
<td>Old Kingdom</td>
<td>Sudan National Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djehutihotep tomb</td>
<td>New Kingdom Prince</td>
<td>Sudan National Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhen Temple</td>
<td>Hatshepsut (1498–1483 BCE)</td>
<td>Sudan National Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semna East Temple</td>
<td>Hatshepsut (1498–1483 BCE), Amenhotep II (1453–1419 BCE), Tuthmosis III (1504–1450 BCE)</td>
<td>Sudan National Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soleb Temple</td>
<td>Amenhotep III (1386–1349 BCE)</td>
<td>In situ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerma</td>
<td>Kerma kings and occupation</td>
<td>In situ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napata</td>
<td>25th Dynasty and Napatan times</td>
<td>In situ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meroë and Butana</td>
<td>Meroitic times and later</td>
<td>In situ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongola and Soba</td>
<td>Christian and Islamic Times</td>
<td>In situ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Nile</td>
<td>Various periods</td>
<td>Little study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Nile</td>
<td>Various periods</td>
<td>Little study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ancient Structures Removed to New Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temple</th>
<th>Associated With</th>
<th>Moved To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debod Temple</td>
<td>Ptolemy VI and Adikhalamani</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taffa Temple</td>
<td>Greco-Roman</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendur</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Lessiya</td>
<td>Tuhmosis III</td>
<td>Turin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalabsha gate</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix VIII: Implications of the High Dam at Aswan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gains</strong></th>
<th><strong>Losses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vast hydroelectric power</td>
<td>The end of excavations in Lower Nubia, especially at Ballana, Qustul, and Qasr Ibrim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective flood control</td>
<td>Traditional Nubian villages and lifeways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of irrigation land</td>
<td>Loss of bilingual texts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of lake fishing</td>
<td>Depopulation of Lower Nubia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New tourist potentials</td>
<td>Original temple colors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvage of Nubian Temples</td>
<td>Loss of agricultural lands and trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular interest in Nubia</td>
<td>Loss of townsites and cemeteries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Liabilities**
- Changed water table increased soil salinity, jeopardizing many sites
- No more river silt, hence polluting fertilizers now required
- Expansion of Bilharzia
- Expansion of water hyacinth
Appendix IX: Table of Meroitic Hieroglyphs and Cursive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meroitic Word</th>
<th>Hieroglyph</th>
<th>Cursive</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>ṣ</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>ḫ</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td>ḱ</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>ṟ</td>
<td>_FACTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>ḫ ṟ</td>
<td>s (se)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>ṟ</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>ṟ</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>ṟ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>ṟ</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>ṟ</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋ (ne)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ṟ ṟ</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meroitic Words with Known or Possible Meanings
This short list is assembled from the works of L. B. Fanfoni (1996), F.L.L. Griffith (1910, 1911 [various], 1922), I. Hofmann (1981), J. Leclant (1967), and Trigger (1970). It also includes some of the author’s refinements based on computer-based Meroitic studies with kharyssa rhodes, Helene Longpre, Monica Ouelette, and Melissa Talbot at Rhode Island College. At this stage in Meroitic studies, this can be considered only as a guide and should be used with caution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Meroitic Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abundant</td>
<td>mge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>dik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
<td>porite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambassador, trade representative, envoy</td>
<td>apote, epote, apete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanitaraqide</td>
<td>mni/trqide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanitore, Queen</td>
<td>Mni/tore, Mni/tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amara West</td>
<td>Pedeme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amun</td>
<td>Mn, Amni, Mni, Mnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amun of Napata</td>
<td>mni/pi, mnp, mnptes, mnpte, mnpteli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amun of Note</td>
<td>mnote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amun of Pedeme [Amara]</td>
<td>mnptme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniba</td>
<td>miym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniba/Karanog</td>
<td>Nlote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apedemek</td>
<td>Pdk, Pedemk, Apedemki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a place-name Quban</td>
<td>qbnysli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arminna</td>
<td>Adomn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a title</td>
<td>khrpkhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a title</td>
<td>qoreny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a type of priest</td>
<td>hont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballana</td>
<td>Beq, Boqbh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begarawiya</td>
<td>Bedewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beget, born of chief, king, ruler</td>
<td>terikel, terikelowi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child, small</td>
<td>qor, qr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crown prince</td>
<td>mate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefit</td>
<td>pqr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Meroitic Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blemmyes, military leader</td>
<td>plimish, blms, pelamos, plemos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional military administrator of</td>
<td>plemos adb-li-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional military administrator of</td>
<td>plemos ato-li-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bond, abundant</td>
<td>mhe, mb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book, scroll?</td>
<td>dor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bread</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td>wi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civil title</td>
<td>atqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clergyman, priest</td>
<td>beloloke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clergyman</td>
<td>amero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clergyman</td>
<td>ant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter</td>
<td>mevkdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derr</td>
<td>Adere, Dor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth</td>
<td>ad, adb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephantine</td>
<td>Abu/yeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipped for life</td>
<td>wtj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eternally</td>
<td>mrozo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falcon?</td>
<td>bk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faras [Pakhoras]</td>
<td>Phrse, Phrs, Pkhrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father</td>
<td>sv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female title</td>
<td>shiremroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footprint</td>
<td>zvqo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formula of blessing</td>
<td>kos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>Amnbshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>Ariteny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>Pproti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>Arokhetye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goddess or Queen</td>
<td>Mkdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>great</td>
<td>lk, lh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derr</td>
<td>Adere, Dor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harendotes</td>
<td>Aretate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathor</td>
<td>Atari, Atriqo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horus, related</td>
<td>armouse, are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head</td>
<td>mlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Meroitic Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrim</td>
<td>Pedeme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrim</td>
<td>shimlok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikhimidi</td>
<td>Sye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikhimidi</td>
<td>Siye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incarnation</td>
<td>yesboxe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infant, son</td>
<td>dd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isis, various</td>
<td>Ashi, Ashy, Wos, Wosh, Woshte, Ahwosh, Ws, Woshi, Woshls, Woshsl, Woshslw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karanog (Abu Simbel)</td>
<td>Simbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerma (Yam, Irem)</td>
<td>Arme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khonsu</td>
<td>Aqedis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Akinidad</td>
<td>Akinidd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Amanakhedolo</td>
<td>Amnkhedolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Amanikhabale</td>
<td>Mnkhble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Kharamadoye</td>
<td>Khrmdoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Naktakamani</td>
<td>Ntkmni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Shorakaror</td>
<td>Shorkrr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king’s name</td>
<td>Trekendlqo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king’s name</td>
<td>Akh?niqwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king’s name</td>
<td>Tmeqorde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king’s name</td>
<td>Wyekiyeqo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kin relations</td>
<td>tedkhelowi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kin relations</td>
<td>tedkheloi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kingly, royal</td>
<td>qoreyi, qareli, qorisl, qorte, qesh, qsh, qesho, qeshli, qesh, qsh, kishri, khshlis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kush (related to)</td>
<td>ado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td>trot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landlords</td>
<td>adb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land or earth</td>
<td>lx, lh, lg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large, high</td>
<td>pke, bkeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life?</td>
<td>wv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living</td>
<td>pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local official</td>
<td>pester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local official</td>
<td>perite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Meroitic Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local official</td>
<td>plshn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local ruler</td>
<td>mak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Nubia, town in</td>
<td>Akin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>abr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men</td>
<td>abrleb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashil, Nubian sun god</td>
<td>mashamani,msmni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medjay</td>
<td>Mdoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>messenger</td>
<td>apov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military title</td>
<td>khlbiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monarch, king</td>
<td>qor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>month or season</td>
<td>glabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>ste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name of a prince</td>
<td>Shorkkhror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nephew, cousin</td>
<td>yetmde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noble/great</td>
<td>qowi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noble person?</td>
<td>tjyij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubian god?</td>
<td>pirotislw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubians</td>
<td>nbow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubians (Nehesi)</td>
<td>nhs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obedient</td>
<td>yerexlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obeisance</td>
<td>twisti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer</td>
<td>avpo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer of the queen</td>
<td>msqoros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official</td>
<td>koro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>wid(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osiris (various)</td>
<td>Shor, Ashoreyi, Ashori, Sorev, Shori, Shoreyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palace courtiers</td>
<td>salakhas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Aman Napata</td>
<td>mnpaleb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Abrye</td>
<td>abryeqowi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Shdost</td>
<td>shdosteleb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Tyesi</td>
<td>Tyesiqowi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Horplmo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Hanptp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Herpmlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Khirettenyyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Yiqrekye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Meroitic Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Mkesmeny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Tyeshinokhoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Pkhomekhimeye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Ptsnoyegowi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Pqebete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal name</td>
<td>Mnhdoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philae</td>
<td>Pilqo, Pilqe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td>Abesnyye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td>Apmle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayer formula</td>
<td>tewiseti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred</td>
<td>medes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priests</td>
<td>wab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince, royal heir, commander,</td>
<td>pqrrtlo, pqr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crown prince</td>
<td>pqrtrqo, pqorlike, pq-rtlo, ... pqar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Arikakharor</td>
<td>Arikhorqo, Rkror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Arakakhtani</td>
<td>Arakakhtani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qasr Ibrim</td>
<td>Pederne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen</td>
<td>kdike, ktke, kntiky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>queen mother, royal woman</td>
<td>kdakqo, kdiqo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Amanishete</td>
<td>Amnishete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Amanitere</td>
<td>Amniteres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Amanitnide</td>
<td>Amnitnide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Shanadakte</td>
<td>Shnndkhete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qustul</td>
<td>Amod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spouse?</td>
<td>qoresm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ring, collar</td>
<td>tgrl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome, Roman</td>
<td>Areme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sai</td>
<td>shiyeteli, shyeteli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saqadi</td>
<td>Skdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scribe</td>
<td>ddor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedeigna</td>
<td>Atitye, Atiye, Atiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servant?</td>
<td>kdbj, wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shablul</td>
<td>Saple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shawabti, helper statue</td>
<td>shpti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellal (cataract)</td>
<td>Sleleyte, Slele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sister</td>
<td>kdis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sky</td>
<td>ari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Meroitic Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southern</td>
<td>yere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spouse</td>
<td>sm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>star</td>
<td>wyeki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun, sun god?</td>
<td>masha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temple</td>
<td>mklu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title, royal</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td>ant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td>ttnylkh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td>shshor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to generate</td>
<td>yerike, erike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to calculate</td>
<td>yevke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to donate</td>
<td>d(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to exist</td>
<td>qe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to give birth</td>
<td>tedehe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to kill?</td>
<td>kedi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to look?</td>
<td>dek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to make</td>
<td>due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to obey</td>
<td>erexio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to offer</td>
<td>ple, pwrite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to send</td>
<td>apete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to tread upon</td>
<td>dk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to, towards</td>
<td>-w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two?</td>
<td>tbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>until</td>
<td>-yoti, -yu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viceroy (of Lower Nubia)</td>
<td>pedu, pesato, pesto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi es Sabua</td>
<td>Sdose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>ate, ato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife</td>
<td>sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witness, testimony?</td>
<td>mtr wse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West?</td>
<td>vjke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman</td>
<td>kdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman’s name</td>
<td>kditrye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women</td>
<td>kdileb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word, saying</td>
<td>sal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world</td>
<td>dto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year, ten?</td>
<td>deme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young person?</td>
<td>mv, dg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

A wide variety of information on ancient Nubia is available to English-language readers. Given the close intersection between ancient Nubia and ancient Egypt, a huge Egyptological and archaeological literature exists with valuable works in various European languages describing and
interpreting the history and culture of this region, which straddles the present regions of southern Egypt and northern Sudan. It is thus possible to learn about ancient Nubia from a variety of perspectives. The time frame for this dictionary and its bibliography is from prehistoric times to the end of the last Christian Kingdom in 1504. Those interested in Islamic times in Sudan should consult the third edition of the *Historical Dictionary of the Sudan* in the African Historical Dictionary Series by Scarecrow Press.

The ancient and medieval periods of Sudanese history are exciting areas of expanding study. The many archaeological projects of the past years are opening new vistas of history, and new works continue to appear. One major book that tries to draw much of the information together is William Y. Adams’s *Nubia, Corridor to Africa*. Valuable sources are the journals *Kush Meroitica*, *Sudan Archaeological Research Society Newsletter*, and *Sudan Notes and Records*. Important summary studies in this area include P. L. Shinnie’s *Meroë: A Civilization of the Sudan* and Fritz and Ursala Hintze’s *Civilizations of the Old Sudan*, a short, readable, and well-illustrated book. Mandour el-Mahdi’s *A Short History of the Sudan* presents a summary of Sudanese history from antiquity to the present. A general description of Sudan is provided by *Sudan: A Country Study*, edited by H. C. Metz. For the late Christian and early Islamic eras, several works are useful, including G. Vantini’s *Christianity in the Sudan*, J. S. Trimingham’s *Islam in the Sudan*, Yusuf Fadl Hasan’s *The Arabs and the Sudan, from the Seventh to the Early Sixteenth Century*, R. S. O’Fahey and J. L. Spaulding’s *Kingdoms of the Sudan*, H. A. MacMichael’s *A History of the Arabs in the Sudan*, and Richard Hill’s *A Biographical Dictionary of the Sudan*, covering ancient times to the twentieth century.
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