II. THE EMERGENCE OF THE KINGDOM OF KUSH

6. The dynasty of Kush and the el Kurru cemetery

Before going down to the discussion of the post-New Kingdom unification process in the Middle Nile Region, let us briefly reconsider the sources relating to the dynasty of chiefs which was in all probability initiator and motor of this process and whose descendants became the rulers of the unified kingdom of Kush.

In 1918 and 1919 the Harvard-Boston expedition under the direction of George Andrew Reisner excavated the royal cemetery of el Kurru ca. one mile west of the right bank of the Nile and about ten miles downstream from Gebel Barkal, the Holy Mountain of Amen-âê, and the site of ancient Napata (see Map). The cemetery proved to be the earliest royal necropolis of the post-Egyptian age containing besides the pyramid tombs of the ruler generations from Piye to Tanutamani, except for Taharqo who was buried at Nuri, the burials of earlier ruler generations, c/ the burials of the chariot horses of Piye, Shabaqo, Shebitqo, and Tanutamani, further d/ the pyramids of a later, early 4th century BC king (Ku. 1) and of his (?) queen (Ku. 2). The most prominent highest point of the necropolis is occupied by the tumulus burials of pre-Twenty-Fifth Dynasty rulers (mentioned under b/ above) (see Fig. 1). This central group consists of graves Tumulus (henceforth Tum.) 2, 4, 5; and in this group of burials are also to be included Ku. 14 and Tum. 6, the latter on the plateau of the neighbouring northern hill, and furthermore a row of mastaba burials running along the eastern edge of the central plateau. On the top of the hill to the south of the central hill, the latter row of mastabas is continued by a row of pyramid burials belonging to queens of Piye (Ku. 4), Shabaqo (Ku. 5), Shebitqo (Ku. 6 ?), and Taharqo (Ku. 3). The — lower — eastern outcrop of the central hill is occupied by the pyramids of Piye (Ku. 17), Shabaqo (Ku. 15), and Tanutamani (Ku. 16), while Shebitqo was buried on a higher point of the central hill to the south of the central tumulus group (Ku. 18).

A cluster of pit graves situated some 150 metres to the NNE of the above burials occupies another low hill and belongs apparently to queens of Piye. Ku. 52 is the burial of Nefrukekashta; Ku. 53 that of Tabiry. On the SE outcrop of this hill were buried the royal chariot horses. To the NE of the pit graves of Piye's queens are situated further pyramid graves: at a distance of ca. 100 metres a queen of Shabaqo (?) (Ku. 62) and a queen of Tanutamani (?) (Ku. 61) were buried. Ca. 250 metres farther NE pyramids Ku. 71-73 were erected over the graves of lesser queens of Shabaqo (?) (not in Fig. 1).

The situation of the two later, 4th century BC, pyramid burials Ku. 1 and 2 highlights an important feature of the necropolis. The monumental Ku. 1, the largest pyramid of the cemetery, adjoins the cluster consisting of the tumulus graves, mastabas, and royal pyramids. The contemporary Ku. 2, burial of a queen
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(probably the consort of the owner of Ku. 1), adjoins, by contrast, the four pyramids erected over the tombs of the principal queens of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty. It appears thus that the central hill was the burial place of ruling kings, and the adjoining hill to the south was reserved for the burial place of queens of a certain status (see Chapters 17.4 and 17.5, below).

The excavator of the necropolis, G.A. Reisner, also proposed a chronology\(^\text{115}\) which is to-day generally accepted (for a divergent opinion see below). His typo-chronology may be summarized as follows:\(^\text{116}\)

1/ Pit-and-side chamber oriented N-S covered with a simple circular grave mound, pebble- or rubble-pitched. Contracted body on floor (?) Tum. 1, Tum. 4, Tum. 5 = Dunham's Generation A.

1a/ Simple shallow pit oriented N-S roofed with transverse stone slabs and covered with a small (diameter ca. 5 metres) circular mound. Body on right side, head S. Tum. 2 = Dunham's Generation D or Generation A (?)\(^\text{117}\).

2/ Pit-and-side chamber oriented N-S, covered with a circular grave mound, rubble-pitched, stone-faced. Burial of contracted body on bed the legs of which stood in trenches in the floor of the burial pit. Horseshoe-shaped enclosure wall, mud-brick chapel at SE (i.e., oriented towards the Nile) adjoining the mound. Tum. 6, Ku. 19 = Dunham's Generation B.

3/ As 2, yet the mound is overbuilt by a square masonry mastaba — apparently as a result of a change of superstructure type carried out shortly after the completion of the tumulus. Rectangular enclosure. Ku. 14 = Dunham's Generation C.


5/ Pit with side chamber at W, oriented N-S, covered with sandstone masonry mastaba. Burial on bed with legs standing in trenches. Masonry chapel, rectangular masonry enclosure wall. Ku. 9, 10, 11 = Dunham's Generation D. The chronological position of this group is, however, somewhat ambiguous. In the chapel of Ku. 9, as indicated by an unpublished lecture of T. Kendall at the Seventh International Conference for Meroitic Studies in Berlin in September 1992, the earliest stela niche and offering table stand were observed by Reisner (unpublished field diary entry). On this basis, and considering the size of the grave, I have tentatively identified, similarly to Kendall (and contra my earlier attribution), Ku. 9 with the burial of Alara (see Table A).

6/ Simple shallow pit oriented N-S, covered with mastaba (?). Rectangular masonry enclosure wall. Burial not recorded. Ku. 21, 23 = Dunham's Generation E. The group's chronological relation to group 7 below is indicated by the distorted SE section of the enclosure of Ku. 8 avoiding thus the already standing enclosure wall of Ku. 21.

7/ Rectangular pit oriented E-W, covered with sandstone masonry mastaba (?). Burial not recorded. Masonry chapel and enclosure wall. Ku. 8, tentatively identified as burial of Kashta = Dunham's Generation 1\(^\text{118}\).


8a/ Medium deep rectangular pit oriented E-W, roofed probably with masonry corbel vault. Superstructure unknown. Rock bench with cut-outs or sinkages for bed legs. Ku. 51, 52,


\(^{116}\) On the basis of Dunham 1950.

\(^{117}\) Dunham 1950, 3 identifies it as Generation D, ibid., 15 as Generation A.

\(^{118}\) Cf. Dunham 1950, 23 no. 19-3-537, fig. 7c, Pl. XXXII/C, Dunham – Macadam 1949, no. 34a, name of Kashta on faience offering table fragment, from intrusive debris in Ku. 1.
54, 55 (unidentified queens) = Dunham’s Generation 2.


10/ Double chamber (burial chamber with masonry corbel vault) covered with sandstone masonry pyramid. Rock-cut and masonry coffin bench (only Ku. 18). Masonry chapel and rectangular enclosing wall. Ku. 18 (Shebitqo) = Dunham’s Generation 4; Ku. 16 (Tanwetamani), Ku. 3 (Queen Naparaye, w. of Taharqo), Ku. 4 (Queen Khensa, w. of Piye, buried by Taharqo) = Dunham’s Generation 5; Ku. 5 (Queen Qalhata w. of Shabaqo, buried by Tanwetamani) = Dunham’s Generation 6; Kurru 6 (Queen Arty w. of Shebitqo?) = Dunham’s Generation 4 (?), Ku. 61 (unidentified queen) = Dunham’s Generation ?

Though divided into chronological, typological, rank, and gender units (plus the unit of the royal chariot horses), the el Kurru cemetery clearly represents a homogeneous whole, viz., a dynastic necropolis within which typological differences describe a line of changes in time and whose two main parts represent the traditional burial grounds of the rulers on the one hand, and of the principal queens, on the other. The relationship of the pyramid field of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty kings Piye, Shabaqo, Shebitqo, and Tanwetamani with the adjacent mastaba field consisting of the tomb of Kashta and with the tumulus cluster to the west of the latter is such that the direct family- and ideological connections among the three burial groups are completely obvious. It is thus self-evident that the burials predating Piye’s pyramid describe, in however indirect terms, the emergence of the kingdom of Kush. If we accept Reisner’s and Dunham’s cemetery analysis, el Kurru would only cover a part of the interval between the end of the Egyptian viceregal administration and the appearance of Kashta. Although it may well be imagined that the career of Kashta’s family started only as late as assumed by Reisner and Dunham, the question is nevertheless worth being posed once again: could Reisner’s short chronology not be replaced by a longer chronology?

7. The long chronology of el Kurru and the testimony of the cemetery

The line of typological development in the necropolis, as reconstructed by Reisner, is thus from pit-and-side chamber (lateral niche) grave covered with tumulus via lateral niche grave covered with stone-faced tumulus plus chapel and horseshoe-shaped enclosure and then lateral niche grave covered with mastaba plus chapel and enclosure to the one- and two-chambered grave with axial staircase descent covered with masonry pyramid and provided with masonry chapel and rectangular enclosure wall. The chronological sequence of types is also supported by one or two clear cases of transition or succession: so a/ the superstructure of Ku. 14 was first a tumulus which was then overbuilt with a mastaba; b/ the rectangular enclosure of the mastaba tomb Ku. 13 abuts on the horseshoe-shaped enclosure of tumulus grave Ku. 19; c/ the E-W oriented pit is later than the N-S oriented pit, as is suggested by the relationship between the enclosures of Ku. 7 and Ku. 21 (see Fig. 1).

119 Assumed by Dunham 1950, 30 on the basis of an alabaster vessel fragment with the cartouche of Taharqo and found in Ku. 4, Dunham 1950, fig. 11k.
120 Mud jar stoppers with cartouche and s3-R' name of Tanwetamani, nos 19-2-647 and 648, Dunham 1950, 41 and fig. 12f.
Fig.1 – Map of the royal cemetery at el Kurru, central part (after Dunham 1950, Map II)
As to smaller typological differences and variants, they may refer to chronological differences as well as to differences of some other nature. The most conspicuous variants are the E-W oriented large pit with mastaba superstructure listed above under type 7; the E-W oriented simple pits with presumed mastaba superstructure under types 8 and 8a; and, finally, the E-W oriented pit with axial chamber listed above under type 8b.

Type 7, represented by Ku. 8 alone, was tentatively identified as burial of King Kashta. The identification was made presumably on the basis of the size of the pit and the mastaba. The E-W pit orientation seems to have been first introduced by Ku. 14 belonging to type 3, i.e., by a tomb whose superstructure embodies the transition from tumulus to mastaba. It must be added, however, that Ku. 14 is a lateral niche grave. The other E-W oriented simple pits besides Ku. 8 belong to types 8 and 8a and are, apparently without exception, burials of Piye's lesser queens (Dunham's Generation 2). Types 8 and 8a may thus be explained as burial types connected exclusively to Piye's queens. It is significant that also Piye's burial chamber is oriented E-W (Ku. 17). An alternative explanation of the E-W oriented pit of the queens is suggested, however, by the characteristic pit grave type of the early burials at Meroe City: accordingly, the tombs in question at el Kurru would hint at the southern origins of Piye's lesser queens (see Chapter 8).

Type 8b, represented by the pit-and-axial chamber tomb Ku. 53, the burial of Tabiry, a queen of Piye, may be interpreted either as a double chamber grave without axial staircase descent (thus a compromise between pit grave and axial descent grave), or as a variant of the axial niche grave type which was characteristic of the Meroe City region.

Returning to the main line of development, Reisner and Dunham and their followers regarded each pre-pyramidal burial type as representing one single ruler generation, irrespective of the actual number of graves belonging to the type in question. In this system, type 1 consisting of tumuli Tum. 1, 4, 5 and perhaps 2 (type 1a) incorporates the earliest Generation A of the el Kurru family of chieftains. The next Generation B is represented by the two burials of type 2 (Tum. 6 and Ku. 19); Generation C has only one burial (Ku. 14, type 3). Generation D, by contrast, is represented by the three graves of type 5 (Ku. 9, 10, 11), while Generation E was identified with the two burials under type 6 (Ku. 21, 23). Since the anthropological material was almost totally destroyed, there is hardly any possibility to control the suggestion put forward by Reisner and Dunham that certain burials belonged to infants (i.e., non-ruling persons) and to female members of the family. Tum. 2 of type 1 is said to have been the burial of a female, but — similarly to Tum. 1, 4, and 19 — in the tomb there were flint arrowheads found. These finds indicate clearly enough a rite connected with the burial of a ruling warrior. From among the three burials belonging to type 5 one burial — Ku. 11 — may perhaps be identified as the burial of a woman, yet Reisner himself noted in his excavation diary (Feb. 25, 1919) that the bone fragments unearthed there were «light and small, but not necessarily female ».

Assuming, then, five ancestral generations prior to the generation of Kashta and on an estimate of twenty years per generation, Reisner dated Generation A and hence Tum. 1, 4, and 5 to around 860 BC. But why should we accept his premise according to which the burial type and rite rigorously changed with every new generation of the el Kurru chiefs? Would it not be more logical to assume that the changes, rather than reflecting the rhythm of generations, describe changes determined by dynastic, religious, ethnic, i.e., historical factors?

The revision of the el Kurru chronology must, of course, be started with the problem of datable objects. In several burials were found
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objects of Egyptian origin, yet there are only one or two of a certain chronological relevance. In Tum. 1, Reisner discovered faience vessels, among which a shallow bowl bears a painted decoration depicting a drinking man in a late New Kingdom-early Third Intermediate Period style. This bowl and the other, stylistically closely related, wares from Tum. 1 would thus date this burial to the late New Kingdom-early Third Intermediate Period. Nevertheless, Reisner and those who follow him in this matter regard the faïences as «heirlooms» and date the burial some two centuries later. Now if we accept the possibility that Tum. 1 — which is doubtless the earliest burial at el Kurru — does not considerably postdate the withdrawal of the Egyptian viceregal administration in the first half of the eleventh century BC, we must add another six generations or so to Reisner’s five ancestral generations in order to span the interval from the (traditional) date of Ramesses XI (1098-1069 BC) till Kashta’s reign starting around the middle of the eighth century BC. It must be noted here that, following the consensus in Nubian literature, Kashta will be regarded Generation 1, thus his immediate predecessor Alara (see Chapter 8 and Table 2) will represent Generation -1.

It was shown above that the principal queens of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty (or, more precisely, the queens of a certain status in the harem, see Chapter 17 and Table B) were buried in a separate part of the centre of the necropolis, while the lesser queens were assigned again a separate burial ground. It would thus seem that the central hill was reserved for the ruling male members of the family. Consequently, I suppose that female members of the clan were not buried on the central hill, and, also considering what was said above about the burial types, we can produce the necessary number of tombs and generations pre-dating Kashta. The burials Tum. 1, 4, 5, 2, 6, Ku. 19, 14, 13, 11, 10, 23, 21, 9 (listed here in the sequence suggested by the cemetery topography) present themselves to be considered as burials of chieftains.

The possibility of a long sequence, without, however, giving a detailed chronology, was put forward first by Timothy Kendall. His suggestion, based on the painted bowl from Tum. 1, was recently rejected by Morkot who argues for a general shortening of the Third Intermediate Period (see Chapter 10) and in the framework of a « New Chronology » dates the late New Kingdom-early Third Intermediate Period style faïences to the late ninth century BC. Morkot also refers to a so far unverified and unpublished radiocarbon test carried out on material from (not specified) tumuli and yielding a ninth century BC date. As the tumulus burials cover in the sequence proposed here (see Table A below) the period between the late eleventh and the late tenth century BC, the radiocarbon test does not necessarily contradict the long sequence. Before the publication of the actual test material(s), however, the fact must be stressed here that all burials at el Kurru were plundered in the antiquity and their majority was found to contain intrusive material from other tombs. However, Morkot also put forward an alternative hypothesis according to which the early section of el Kurru is «a mix of New Kingdom graves and later ones ». Putting aside the issue of absolute dates, this assumption is closer both to Kendall’s

125 Ku. Tum. 1 : Dunham 1950, fig. 1/b,c and Kendall 1982, Cat. 1 ; Tum. 2 : Dunham 1950, fig. 2/d and Pl. LVII/B ; Tum. 6 : ibid., fig. 5/d ; Ku. 19 : ibid., fig. 24/f ; Ku. 19 : ibid., fig. 17/b.
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127 No. 19-3-348 is painted in a closely resembling style, see Dunham 1950, fig. 1/b.
128 Kendall 1982, 21ff. — In a paper presented in September 1992 at the Seventh Int. Conference for Meroitic Studies in Berlin, after the completion of the editing of this book, Timothy Kendall revised his views published in the 1982 Brockton catalogue and discussed the cemetery on the basis of Reisner’s chronology. Although he introduced so far unknown evidence from Reisner’s field papers, the Boston MFA storerooms, and a recent anthropological investigation of the skeletal remains in Boston, Dr. Kendall failed to convince me of the validity of Reisner’s cemetery analysis and of his own aprioristic interpretation of the individual tombs and of their — still selectively discussed — inventories.
130 Ibid. 213 and 377 note 30. In his 1992 paper referred to in note 128 above Kendall has presented three, admittedly inconclusive, carbon tests which may support both chronologies.
131 Ibid., 376 note 27.
earlier suggestion and to the long sequence suggested here.

Another important point was made by Kendall when he stressed the significance of the hundreds of sherds of native red ware (mostly also red-slipped) vessels with black painted decoration representing Egyptian-style funerary rite scenes: processions of pairs of mourners, mumiform figures, women kneeling before offering altars and found in Tum. 6 and in Ku. 19. Kendall also observed that the vessels were manufactured with perforations on their bottoms and were deliberately broken at the burial. He therefore brought them, quite rightly, into connection with the rite of « breaking the red pots » (sd dsrwt), and associated them with priests educated in Egyptian religion who were thus able to perform Egyptian funerary rites and recite the appropriate liturgic texts. The association is also justified by the skilfully rendered paintings themselves.

It cannot be accidental that the appearance of the « breaking the red pots » is associated with Tum. 6, i.e., the first el Kurru burial with a mortuary cult chapel. At Ku. 19 no remains of a chapel were found, but, as Dunham’s Pl. XXIV/A shows, the E half of the enclosure of this tomb was completely eroded. With the subsequent types 3, 4, and 5 (see above) the chapel becomes a regular feature of all superstructures; it seems thus reasonable to suppose that also Ku. 19 was originally provided with a mud-brick chapel. The « breaking the red pots » and the chapels mark an important change, as compared to the earlier tumulus graves: viz., the adoption of Egyptian funerary rites and mortuary cult. This change is indeed unimaginable without the presence of properly educated priests.

Reisner and Dunham supposed that the native custom of burying the non-mummified body in contracted position on a bed continued even after the introduction of Egyptian mortuary rites. The archaeological evidence is, however, inconclusive. As a rule, in the plundered graves only the benches and the place prepared for the legs of the bed could be verified, yet no unambiguous traces of either contracted or extended bodies could be identified. I prefer thus to suppose that the burial in coffin was introduced in connection with the adoption of Egyptian funerary rites and mortuary cult. This assumption is not contradicted by the continued presence of beds, for typological changes do not necessarily coincide with cultural changes. The lateral niche grave type was continued, e.g., also after the introduction of the Egyptian rites almost through Generation 1 (Kashta). The native tumulus superstructure survived — although only for one generation — the introduction of Egyptian mortuary cult: Ku. 14 reveals the moment of change when to the already introduced mortuary chapel a mastaba superstructure is added as an afterthought, hiding in its body the original tumulus first erected over the burial. That the custom of bed burial — meaning, however, now the burial in coffin on a bed — is indeed continued after the reign of Kashta, is attested by the coffin bench in the graves of Piye, of some of his queens, and in a number of still later burials.

Clearly, the introduction of the mastaba superstructure is not independent of the appearance of Egyptian funerary rites and mortuary cult. In Reisner’s chronology their appearance is dated to the generations directly preceding Kashta. In the longer chronology proposed here these fundamental changes occur about one century before Kashta. Both alternatives may be argued for on the basis of historical considerations. It seems to me, however, that it is the second alternative, i.e., that of the longer chronology, which may be judged historically
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more plausible and which is more in accordance
with the archaeological testimony of el Kurru
too.

8. The genesis of the Kushite state: from the beginnings to Alara

The reconstruction of the state genesis process
proposed in this book rests on the following
considerations:

1. The el Kurru cemetery is the family
necropolis of the kings of the Twenty-Fifth
Dynasty. The regnal years of these rulers from
Piye to Tanwetamani may be regarded as reason­
ably established. In our chronological scheme we
shall thus accept the regnal dates of Piye as
suggested by Kitchen: 747-716 BC. For lack
of any evidence concerning the lengths of the
reigns of Piye’s known (Alara and Kashta) and
anonymous (before Alara) predecessors, I shall
follow the general consensus in professional
literature in ascribing an average of twenty years
of reign to each generation (such an average
reign seems especially justified in the case of
the actual succession order of the Kushites; see
below). According to the typology outlined above
in Chapter 7, the following royal and burial
sequence may be suggested:

Table A. The long chronology of el Kurru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Generation (Dunham)</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>reign BC</th>
<th>burial</th>
<th>type of burial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1020-1000</td>
<td>Tum. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1000-980</td>
<td>Tum. 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>980-960</td>
<td>Tum. 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>960-940</td>
<td>Tum. 2</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>940-920</td>
<td>Tum. 6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>920-900</td>
<td>Ku. 19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>900-880</td>
<td>Ku. 14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>880-860</td>
<td>Ku. 13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>860-840</td>
<td>Ku. 11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>840-820</td>
<td>Ku. 10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>820-800</td>
<td>Ku. 23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>800-780</td>
<td>Ku. 21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Alara</td>
<td>780-760</td>
<td>Ku. 9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kashta</td>
<td>760-747</td>
<td>Ku. 8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Piye</td>
<td>747-716</td>
<td>Ku. 17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shabaqo</td>
<td>716-702</td>
<td>Ku. 15</td>
<td>9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shebitqo</td>
<td>702-690</td>
<td>Ku. 18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Taharqo</td>
<td>690-664</td>
<td>(Nu.1)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tanwetamani</td>
<td>664-655</td>
<td>Ku. 16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above sequence corresponds well with the
model of evolution suggested by Reisner and
Dunham and summarized by the latter in 1950
and also with the growth of the cemetery which
must become sufficiently clear at the first glance
at the cemetery map (see Fig. 1).

138 Kitchen 1986, § 359 and Table 4 gives to Tanwetamani 8 years in Egypt; a recently published block from Luxor
(G. Vittmann, SAK 10, 1983, 327 and figs 1, 2, Pl. 20a) indicates, however, a Year 9 of this ruler in Egypt.
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According to the long chronology, the first ancestor of Piye was buried at el Kurru around 1020 BC. His chronological position is also indicated by objects of Egyptian origin in his burial equipment. It may be presumed that these objects, if not contemporary with the burial, were valued heirlooms of a family of chiefs who were participating in the government of the province of Kush until the Egyptian withdrawal. The owner of el Kurru Tum. 1 appears to have been the first chieftain of his line who established the centre of his chiefdom in the neighbourhood of the former Egyptian frontier fort and temple settlement of Napata, in an area of strategic and economic importance; at a place controlling the desert road connecting the Nubian Nile Valley with the interior of Africa. Despite the Egyptian objects in his equipment, his burial was in a non-Egyptian, obviously native, tradition which may be interpreted as an indication of the continuity of a tribal culture that underlay the process of Egyptianization of the preceding centuries.

The burials of the subsequent Generations b, c, d display the same indigenous traditions. The burial of Generation e, dated to about 920 in the long chronology, indicates a fundamental change. The traditional tomb superstructure is complemented here with a funerary cult chapel and Reisner also discovered here indubitable signs of the Egyptian funerary rites performed during the burial: viz., he unearthed in Tum. 6 in the debris between the mound superstructure and the enclosing wall several hundred painted sherds, the fragments of the large storage vessels and offering bowls smashed in the course of the rite of the "breaking the red pots" (see Chapter 7). Fragments of similar wares, and in similar quantities, were also found around the superstructure of Ku. 19, the tomb of the next Generation f. Most interestingly, from Tum. 6 onwards the burial of the contracted body on a bed is practiced. Bed burial is generally regarded as an indication of the thus presumed Kerma ascendancy of the el Kurru chiefs. The fact however, that this feature appears only in the fifth generation and that it coincides with the appearance of the enclosure wall, the chapel, the rite of the "breaking the red pots" speaks against the presence of Kerma traditions from the very outset. It would seem that the el Kurru dynasty adopted the Kerma rite of bed burial as a consequence of a territorial and cultural integration process at a stage of state development when also the adoption of Egyptian mortuary cult appeared most opportune (see below).

With Generation g around 880 BC a further stage of "Egyptianization" of the burial is reached: after the erection of a mound over the grave, as if an afterthought, a square sandstone masonry mastaba is built to encase the tumulus superstructure.

For the next seven generations the complex of the indigenous pit grave and the Egyptianized mastaba superstructure (or, perhaps, a pyramid-mastaba superstructure formally resembling the Egyptian New Kingdom superstructure type represented e.g. by the tomb of Amenemhet, Prince of Teh-khet at Debeira West in Lower Nubia) with mortuary cult chapel and enclosing wall is maintained. The burial of Piye around 716 BC introduces the stairway descent tomb with pyramid superstructure and thus the Egyptianization of the ancestral necropolis is virtually completed. The king's body is buried in an anthropoid wooden coffin and he is accompanied into afterlife by shawabti figures. In his equipment we also find dummy canopic jars referring to the influence of contemporary Egyptian non-royal burial customs.

While Reisner's and Dunham's short chronology suggested an Egyptianization of the el Kurru dynasty within two generations (in absolute chronology it would mean a rapid change occurring around 820 BC), the long chronology draws the picture of a process of a different pace and rhythm. The adoption of Egyptian funerary rites and mortuary cult appears with the fifth generation around 920 BC. An Egyptian tomb superstructure type would be built, however, only after another three generations around 880 BC. Under mastabas (or pyramid-topped mastabas) were thus buried altogether eight

139 Dunham 1950, 2, Gen. B.
generations, which means that the bi-ritual burial type uniting the indigenous pit grave with Egyptian mortuary cult and an Egyptian-type superstructure survived until the middle of the eighth century BC in an apparently unchanged form ever since the early ninth century BC.

It was suggested above in Chapter 4 that the development leading to the emergence of Kashta's united kingdom was made possible by the survival of the indigenous elite after the collapse of the Egyptian provincial administration, further by the survival of a number of Egyptianized «urban» communities and finally by the continuity of the agricultural communities and of their political, social, and economic interrelations. How do these premises relate to el Kurru? Also the question arises here as to whether further determining factors are reflected by the development of the necropolis.

The traditional and non-Egyptianized character of the burials of Generations a to d indicates quite unambiguously the indigenous backgrounds of Kashta's and Piye's ancestors. The bed burial appearing in Generation e was already mentioned above as a possible Kerma heritage, yet it may also be brought into connection with a similar Lower Nubian C-Group burial custom. While it seems that internment on a bed and the erecting of a circular earth tumulus over a grave were characteristic of the cultures of Upper Nubia as well as of Lower Nubia, the tumulus superstructure is also attested as a tradition of the Meroitic-speakers of the Butana region (see the earliest burials in the cemeteries at Meroe City). By contrast, the lateral niche grave superstructure type was apparently restricted originally to el Kurru — where it may perhaps be interpreted as a tradition of the Nubian-speaking population of the Dongola-Napata region. The simple pit-and-axial niche graves were, on the other hand, characteristic for the Butana area; and it may be presumed that they represent the native tradition of Irame.

It may be speculated that the origins of the el Kurru chiefs reach back to some clan of hereditary chieftains subjected as vassals by Tuthmosis I and then left in possession of a severely restricted and nominal authority in the civil government of the indigenous population after the viceregal administration took its final shape by the sole reign of Tuthmosis III. In the times of Tuthmosis I and Tuthmosis III we know of five vassal chiefs. Paramount chiefs, or notables, wrw, are attested textually as well as pictorially during the Eighteenth Dynasty. In the Theban tomb of Huy, Viceroy of Kush under Tutankhamun, six chiefs of Kush are represented. If the families of wrw continued to play their administrative role under the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, the Egyptian withdrawal would have strongly affected their position, yet it is difficult to imagine, who other than these indigenous families could have filled the vacuum left behind by the disappearance of Egyptian authority. The indigenous character of the early el Kurru burials before ca. 920 BC indicates, as it would seem, a complete discontinuity of Egyptian religiosity caused by the disappearance of temple personnel. At the same time, however, it may also reveal a politically motivated revival of native traditions — which does not necessarily imply the complete disappearance of all Egyptian and/or Egyptianized cults, rites, beliefs, customs, thus of any type and form of Egyptianized and Egyptian-type religiosity.

140 Cf. Priese 1978, 71f. — Possible Lower Nubian connections are also indicated by fragments of a special type of handmade pottery incense burner from Ku. Tum. 4, Gen. b, and of more complete exemplars of the same type of burner from Ku. Tum. 5, Gen. c, see L.A. Heidorn : « Preliminary Analysis of Selected Vessels from the Earliest Tombs at El-Kurru (Generations A-F) », Pre-publication of paper submitted at the Seventh Int. Conference for Meroitic Studies, Berlin September 1992, fig. 1 (Tum. 4); Dunham 1950, fig. 4b (Tum. 5), which have analogies from Site 176 at Debeira, a New Kingdom cemetery, see T. Säve-Söderbergh et al.: Middle Nubian Sites I, Uddevalla, 1989, 200ff., II. Pl. 36. Interestingly, Site 176 also yielded Egyptian faience vessels with painted decoration similar in style to those from Ku. Tum. 1, cf. Säve-Söderbergh et al., op. cit., Pl. 62.
142 O'Connor 1983, 265.
143 N.M. Davies: Ancient Egyptian Paintings, Chicago, 1936, Pls LXXVIII-LXXXI.
THE EMERGENCE OF THE KINGDOM OF KUSH

It depends on a fortunate accident of future archaeological finds whether we shall ever learn the extension and character of the « state » units coming into existence after the Egyptian withdrawal along the Upper Nubian Nile. For the time being we may only speculate about the existence of eventual chiefdoms prior to their unification by Alara or Kashta, and we may presume with confidence that the general trend of development after the first post-New Kingdom chiefdoms came into existence was the process of their integration into larger and larger units. As was aptly formulated by Kemp, the growth in the mechanisms of the state, as with other products of the mind, has been a process of addition.\textsuperscript{144}

In the first place, the process of integration was determined by the centralized Egyptian administration, whose top echelons were removed and whose functioning was rendered almost completely pointless with the collapse of the temple-town structure — but whose experience may to an extent have survived the great change in the condition of the native elite. The participation of the indigenous element in the lower spheres of administration, probably at the village level, during the New Kingdom may have secured a rather smooth transition without basic structural changes in the countryside. Integration of units on all levels (within and without the limits of individual chiefdoms) was certainly necessitated by the limited availability of arable land,\textsuperscript{145} a condition that leads generally to the amalgamation of communities of various ranks and sizes. It was also promoted, it may be at least presumed, by the rivalry and ambition of individual chieftains and also influenced by the threat represented by Egypt in the north and the ruler(s) of the Butana region in the south.

The appearance of the first el Kurru chief in the Napata region around the end of the eleventh century BC probably marks an advanced stage of the integration process. Although the fate of Napata after the Egyptian withdrawal is completely obscure, it can be hardly accidental that the anonymous prince of Generation $a$ chose as the burial ground of his family a place so close to Napata — as it was not accidental, either, that his successful descendants elected Napata as their most important and sacrosanct centre of ideological and political power.

Why just Napata? It was assumed earlier in this book that one of the decisive factors in the emergence of the post-Egyptian states was the survival of « urban » settlements. It was also repeatedly stressed that it could not have been accidental that the great majority of Twenty-Fifth Dynasty and later centres existed at New Kingdom temple-town sites (Kawa, Tabo, Soleb, Sedeinga, Amara, Buhien, Aksha, Faras, Aniba/Qasr Ibrim). Archaeologists have failed so far to discover any clear evidence of settlement continuity at these sites between the end of Egyptian domination and the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty, yet the example of, e.g., Dorginarti in Lower Nubia\textsuperscript{146} may warn us that the blankness of the post-New Kingdom archaeological record is only virtual. This may well be the case for Napata too where Reisner apparently did not find any epigraphical or archaeological trace of life between the end of Egyptian occupation and the first buildings attributed to Piye. Disregarding here the possibility of a shift of the settlement centre (perhaps to the neighbourhood of el Kurru !) and also the possibility that Reisner's unpublished field notes may contain fragments of the missing information, I merely note that at one place — in B 800 — Reisner was nevertheless compelled to presume a temple building activity predating Piye's work there. In a preliminary report\textsuperscript{147} Reisner attributed the first period of B 800, a small temple dedicated to Amûn-Rê of Napata (?), to « Kashta or his immediate predecessor »,\textsuperscript{148} which became in later literature\textsuperscript{149} a dating to temp. Kashta or Pi'ankh.

\textsuperscript{144} Kemp 1989, 19.
\textsuperscript{145} Cf. K.A. Bard – R.L. Carneiro: « Patterns of Predynastic Settlement Location, Social Evolution, and the Circumscription Theory », CRIPEL 11, 1989, 15-23. — I have found far less adaptable the suggestions made by C.E. Guksch: « Ethnological Models and Processes of State Formation — Chiefdom Survivals in the Old Kingdom », GM 125, 1991, 37-50, for they are too general and theoretical even to be concretely confronted with data from Old Kingdom Egypt.
\textsuperscript{146} Heidorn, op. cit. (cf. note 78, above).
Reisner’s dating followed from the relationship of B 800 with the adjacent B 900 which was built later than B 800 and which could be identified as a construction of Piye. No evidence was discovered, however, which would decide whether B 800 was built one, or two, or three, or even more reigns before Piye.

The burials of Generations a to d do not indicate the existence of Egyptian cult life at Napata, or, if there existed a cult life in the New Kingdom temple of Amen-Rê (temple B 500) or in the predecessor of B 800, the el Kurru chiefs did not have religious contacts with it. The burials of Generations e and f in the second half of the tenth century BC, by contrast, prove both the presence of a temple cult of Egyptian type in a neighbouring place, most probably at Napata, and its acceptance in terms of religious practice by the el Kurru dynasty. The rite of $sd\ d\srwt$ (« breaking the red pots ») could be performed only by priests educated in Egyptian religion and able to recite the Egyptian text of the funerary ceremonies. Tum. 6, the burial of Generation e around 920 BC, also introduces another important new feature. This is the mud-brick chapel attached to the east side of the circular earth mound and oriented thus towards the Nile. The cult function of this chapel and the sacral character of the tomb is completed by a horseshoe-shaped masonry enclosure wall. The sceptic may interpret « breaking the red pots » as an occasional and passing phase of syncretism. The appearance of the mortuary cult chapel and of the enceinte wall contradicts, however, the assumption of a superficial influence and attests a profound change in the realms of religion, cult, and ideology.

For from the aspect of religion and cult the adoption of Egyptian funerary rites and the erection of funerary cult chapels means the knowledge and acceptance of Egyptian concepts of mortuary religion. The enclosure wall indicates that the tomb, beyond its inherent and natural sacral character, is now regarded as a sanctuary, the scene of mortuary services, i.e., of cult performed in the attached chapel.

Unfortunately though, the completely plundered condition of the burial pits in Tum. 6 and Ku. 19 does not allow one to establish the actual type of burial. The existence of mummy burial would seem logical, and is not contradicted by the traces of beds found in the tombs until Generation i (Ku. 10). The earliest burial in a coffin verified at el Kurru was, however, that of Piye, and it coincided also with the presence of shawabti figures, (dummy) canopic jars, amulets, heart scarabs in his as well as in the tombs of his generation.

The apparent incompleteness of the adaptation of Egyptian mortuary religion, i.e., the consequence revealed by the lack of shawabti and other integral elements of a burial, may be better interpreted from the more general aspect of ideology. In the process of state formation a significant early stage is reached when the demand for a coherent ideology of power is manifested. The ideology of power cannot, of course, be formulated without creating the concept of continuity with the past on which the concepts of legitimacy and unity are founded. In Tum. 6 and Ku. 19 we may identify the beginnings of this particular stage: the enclosed royal tomb with its mortuary cult chapel is a place of ancestor cult which plays an essential role in the process of establishing a religious image of political continuity with the past.

Egyptian mortuary religion could offer, even without being completely understood and accepted, an elementary view of continuity. From the consciousness of the need of an institutionalized
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  \item 148 Ibid., 254.
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  \item 152 Ibid., 254 Reisner writes concerning the finds associated with the pre-Piye building: « six crude scarabs, a few beads, and fragments of gold foil certainly belonged to the period of occupation of B 800-first. Possibly something might be found if we removed the stone pavement of the second temple, but that I have been loath to do ».
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THE EMERGENCE OF THE KINGDOM OF KUSH

mortuary cult of the ancestors the way to the discovery of a corresponding kingship ideology could not have been very long. We are probably not fundamentally wrong when supposing that the el Kurru chiefs turned to priests educated in Egyptian religion at the moment when they realized the significance of the institutions of Egyptian mortuary cult. In the course of the subsequent century the reception of a religious concept of the former overlords led to the creation of a complex Kushite kingship ideology whose Egyptian components cannot be denied.

The Egyptianization of the el Kurru dynasty and the subsequent unfolding of its kingship concept were connected with a thousand ties to the cult of Amun of Napata. The first discernible ties may be identified in the change in funerary rites and mortuary cult introduced with the burial of Generation e. The priests standing behind the radical and expert innovations cannot be termed « itinerant », as is sometimes suggested in learned literature. And the sanctuary to which they belonged was probably a — however humble — temple of Amen-Rê. Two significant facts must be remembered here. The decree of Seti I of the Nineteenth Dynasty from his Year 4 (ca. 1299 BC) and carved on a rock on the east bank of the Nile at Nauri in the Third Cataract region records that certain properties and incomes of the temple of Amun at Napata were donated to the mortuary temple of the king at Abydos. The appearance of the Egyptian priests in Upper Nubia in the course of the late tenth century BC may perhaps be connected with attempts of the Abydos mortuary temple of Seti I, to regain its Nubian properties. Secondly, we must also consider the fact that by the late New Kingdom — as is also indicated by the Nauri decree itself — the royal mortuary cult was increasingly connected with the cult temples. It may be thus expected that the mortuary cult of the kings of Kush was modelled on Egyptian practice and connected from the very outset institutionally with the Amun temple at Napata. During the times of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty and of the subsequent rulers this is attested by the erection of the monumental royal statues in the sanctuary at Gebel Barkal. These were doubtless cult images of the royal funerary cult. The Amûn temples erected — or enlarged — in the course of the state organisation by the kings of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty in the centres of the country were, evidently, also places of royal ancestor worship.

It would seem that, in spite of the gap indicated by the non-Egyptianized burials of Generations a to d, the emerging Kushite power ideology also drew upon the source of the « first », New Kingdom, Egyptianization of the Middle Nile Region. It was shown in an earlier paper that the iconography of the Meroitic lion god Apedemak, a deity closely associated with kingship dogma from the third century BC onwards, consisted of features which can be explained as deriving from an indigenous lion god Egyptianized already in New Kingdom times. On the other hand, also the ram-headed Amen-Rê of Napata — whose cult was established at Gebel Barkal by the New Kingdom Egyptian conquerors — had Nubian roots. It could furthermore be demonstrated that the costume of the kings of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty contained accessories (viz., the tasselled cord and the so-called Nubian coat) which derive from the pre-Twenty-Fifth Dynasty iconography of the Nubian ancestor of Apedemak and of a Nubian form of Amûn. These — however faint — traces of a New Kingdom Nubian-Egyptian syncretism refer, again despite the above-indicated gap represented by the early el Kurru generations, to the New Kingdom roots of the post-Egyptian indigenous chiefdoms (on this issue see also Chapter 16 below).

Let us confront here the development observed in the el Kurru cemetery with the suggested

157 Cf. ibid., 662 ; R. Stadelmann : Totentempel iii », LA, VI 706-711.
158 Török 1990.
absolute chronology. The first four el Kurru generations were dated above (see Table A) to the interval between ca. 1020 and 940 BC. In terms of the conventional chronology, they were thus contemporary with Psusennes I, Amenemope, Osochor, Siamun, and (Har-)Psusennes II of the Twenty-First Dynasty and with the Theban High Priests of Amun Menkheperre, Smendes II, Pinodjem II, and Psusennes II (cf. Table I). As was shown above in Chapter 2, Lower Nubia was controlled in this period and in the subsequent one and a half centuries by the Theban High Priests of Amun and the claims of the kings to Upper Nubia were repeatedly manifested by imperialistic programs announced in royal titularies and by military undertakings under Pinodjem I and Menkheperre. Generations e and f, the first chiefs buried under tumuli provided with a mortuary cult chapel, were dated to ca. 940-900 BC and would thus have been contemporaries of Shoshenq I and Osorkon I of the Twenty-Second Dynasty; rulers who announced an aggressive policy towards Upper Nubia. The tomb of the next Generation g introduces at el Kurru around 880 BC a revival of the archaic Egyptian tomb superstructure type of the mastaba or perhaps the New Kingdom-type pyramid-on-mastaba superstructure known from Lower Nubia. His successors would be buried until the middle of the eighth century BC under mastabas or pyramids-on-mastabas and they were supposed to have been contemporaries of Takeloth I, Osorkon II, Takeloth II, and the HPA Prince Osorkon who all appear to have undertaken military ventures in Upper Nubia. It was, however, under Takeloth II’s reign and Prince Osorkon’s pontificate that we hear for the last time about Egyptian interference in Upper Nubia and about Egyptian authority in the Lower Nubian province of the Theban « State of Amun ».

The generally hostile political attitude of the kings of Egypt does not exclude, however, contacts of a peaceful nature in commerce. The most important, even if unfortunately virtually isolated, testimony of contacts in a higher sphere is still the fragments of the « red pots » unearthed in the enclosures of Tum. 6 and Ku. 19. To recapitulate here once more their principal message: the red vessels broken at the burial of probably non-mummified bodies were manufactured locally but decorated with orthodox Egyptian mourning and offering scenes also picturing figures of mummies and revealing — in accordance with the whole of the rite in question — the Egyptian education (and origin?) of the painter(s). The basic religious inhomogeneity thus displayed can best be explained as « spontaneous » syncretism of a contradictory nature: an expression of the encounter of native tradition with orthodox Egyptian religiosity.

Contacts with Egypt and/or Lower Nubia are, evidently, also indicated by the tomb superstructure type replacing the earth mound. In Egypt no mastabas were erected after the Twelfth Dynasty; the el Kurru mastabas — if they were in fact mastabas — might thus be explained as a striking example of archaizing: or else as an archaeological error.

Generations h to I, dated approximately to the period between 880 and 800 BC, were buried in tombs similar in type and ritual to the burial of the preceding Generation g. These decades were in all probability decisive for the development of the chieftain whose princes were interred at el Kurru and for the emergence of the kingdom of Kush. However, the tombs in their plundered condition are silent about this process and their humble size strangely contradicts the undeniable reality manifested by Kashta’s appearance in Upper Egypt: that these chiefs were in fact the builders of an empire.

160 At Ku. 8, the presumed tomb of Kashta, at places five courses of a very steep masonry superstructure were preserved. Above these five courses a part of the rubble core was still standing at the time of the excavation to a height of ca. 3.5-4 metres, see Dunham 1950, fig. 15/a and Pl. II/A. These remains would allow the reconstruction of a bent pyramid similar to the superstructure of Karkamani’s and Aramatelqo’s burials at Nuri, or of a pyramid-on-mastaba superstructure resembling the tomb of a New Kingdom Prince of Teh-khet at Debeira West in Lower Nubia, see T. Säve-Söderbergh — L. Troy: New Kingdom Pharaonic Sites. The Finds and the Sites, Uppsala, 1991, 182ff. and figs 44, 45.
9. The emergence of the Kushite state: from Alara to Piye. The unification process

In a passage of his inscription no. IV in the temple of Amûn at Kawa, written in the sixth regnal year (ca. 685 BC), King Taharqo (690-664 BC) mentions his ancestor Alara. The passage is of a special significance for the understanding of the Kushite concept of legitimacy (see Chapters 12, 14). According to lines 16f.: "... the mothers of my [i.e., Taharqo's] mother were committed to him [i.e., Amen-Rê] by their brother, the Chieftain, the son of Rê, Alara, justified.

The story of the commitment of Alara's sister to Amûn is also repeated in Kawa VI, lines 22f., written in Year 10 of Taharqo (ca. 680 BC). In lines 23f. of this latter inscription the following prayer is put into Alara's mouth: O excellent god, swift of step, who comest to him that calls to thee, do thou look for me upon my sister, a woman born together with me in one womb. Do thou act for her even as thou didst act for him that acted for thee, a wonder unpromised and not contrived by (?) schemers, for thou didst thwart for me him that devised evil against me and didst set me up as king.

The status of Alara is somewhat curious: he is called Chieftain (wr), but at the same time his name is written in cartouche and preceded by the royal title s3-R', Son of Rê. He is thus viewed from two perspectives: from the perspective of his actual rank as chieftain of a tribal state existing before the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty, and from that of his descendant Taharqo who derives his kingship from Alara and hence bestows upon him a cartouche and the s3-R' title.

"King" Alara is mentioned again in the late fifth century BC enthronement text Kawa IX, line 54 of King Irike-Amanote. As founder of the royal dynasty of Kush he is evoked for the last time in the preserved evidence in King Nastasef's Enthronement Stela and Annals (Berlin Ägyptisches Museum 2268) written in the last third of the fourth century BC. In this text the king asks Amen-Rê of Napata for "... the sovereignty of the land of Nubia, and the crown of King Harshyotef, and the power of King Piankh-Alara" where Piankh (written in the cartouche) is to be understood as standing for "king". The Nastasef inscription also informs about the "place of origin" (or residence, or perhaps a temple housing his mortuary cult?) of Alara in the region of Sanam opposite Napata on the left bank of the Nile (see in more detail in Chapter 13).

According to the Taharqo inscriptions quoted above, Alara was the brother of Taharqo's grandmother (see also Table II). In Chapter 17 I shall investigate in more detail the significance of the act of committing of his sister to Amun-Rê. Here it may suffice to point out that Taharqo calls it to mind in the context of the justification of his own legitimacy, i.e., in the context of the legitimacy of his dynasty. Alara's act receives here the meaning of the "founding" of the dynasty. We do not know the relationship between Alara and the chief of Generation 1 buried in el Kurru tomb Ku. 21. Alara's distinguished role in the concept of dynastic legitimacy of his descendants may in theory indicate that he did not descend from, or was not the legitimate successor of, Generation 1 of el Kurru and hence was actually the founder of a new line. It is more probable, however, that — as indicated by the necropolis continuity — he was a member of the lineage and was the founder in another sense. Viz., he committed his sister and her descendants (who were, we may confidently suppose, at the same time his own descendants in terms of dynastic unity) to Amen-Rê and that thereby he
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established an undissoluble connection between the god and the dynasty and also adopted Egyptian legitimacy and succession concepts while thus abandoning his ancestral traditions (see Chapter 12).

Irike-Amanote’s enthronement inscription also commemorates another ancestor of the king, viz., Kashta. This latter royal predecessor is invoked in the same context as Alara. Irike-Amanote asks Amun to ... act for me as thou didst act for King Kashta, justified whereupon the god grants him the kingship with the following words: I give thee [every] land, [the south, the north], the west, and the east, and I give thee as I [gave] to King [Kashta, justified].

Kashta’s place in the royal genealogy is secured by a number of inscriptions from Egypt and Nubia (cf. Table II). He is attested to have been the consort of Queen Pebatma, father of King Piye’s wife Peksater, of the God’s Wife of Amun Amonirdis I, of Pakartror, and probably also of King Shabaqo and the royal wives of Piye Khefisa and Nefrukekashta. It is generally believed that Kashta and Alara were brothers, which, although not attested in the preserved evidence, may have been their actual relationship if we identify Alara’s unnamed sister with Kashta’s sister-wife Pebatma (see Table II and Chapter 12). The sequence Alara-Kashta is indicated by the order in which they are mentioned in the Irike-Amanote text and by the chronology of their descendants. Their association in the dynastic memory may hint at their significance as founders: Alara founder in the light of the new concepts of legitimacy and succession introduced by him, and Kashta as founder of an empire extending from Upper Egypt to the Butana region. On his preserved monuments and in texts referring to him as father of Amonirdis I at Karnak and in the funerary inscriptions of members of his family, Kashta’s name is written in cartouche and in a stela erected by him at Elephantine in Egypt (see below) he is bearing the titulary of a King of Upper and Lower Egypt. The geographical distribution of his monuments reveals that under his reign the ancestral territory of the Napata-Dongola region was united with the Butana region in the south and with Lower Nubia in the north. Moreover, he also appeared as Pharaoh in Upper Egypt. The scanty evidence is completely silent about the stages of this splendid process which was, one may have the misleading impression, accomplished overnight. We are thus forced to build speculations on isolated data.

The accomplishment of the southward extension of the el Kurru chiefdom is demonstrated by the earliest burials in the cemeteries of Meroe City. The highest parts of the hills on which the Meroe West and South Cemeteries (henceforth Meroe W. and Meroe S.) are situated were occupied by simple pit graves covered with — now completely eroded — mound superstructures. In the burial pits Reisner excavated a/ remains of contracted bodies (on the left side, head E.; or on the right side, head W.) buried supposedly on beds, yet no clear evidence of actual beds was found; and b/ coffin burials of mummified bodies provided as a rule with the characteristic Egyptian Late Period-type bead net. The chronological relationship of the two Meroe City cemeteries is fairly unambiguous: the contracted body burials are confined on Meroe W. where they appear to cover one or two generations, after which concurrent mummy burials begin; while in Meroe S. no not-mummified bodies are recorded. As to the absolute chronological position of the two necropoleis, in tomb Meroe W. 658 (coffin burial) a faience seal with the cartouches of Kashta and
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Amonirdis I was found; Meroe W. 816\(^{177}\) (coffin) yielded a golden Bastet statuette inscribed for \(P3-m3j\), i.e., the Chief of the Ma listed among the rulers of the Delta surrendering to Piye in ca. 728 BC.\(^{178}\) The not-mummified burials in the highest parts of Meroe W. predate thus Kashta by one or two generations, and the first coffin burials appear to have been introduced in the reign of Kashta or Piye. The coffin burials display an Egyptianized rite — so much so that they are generally, and probably quite wrongly, supposed to have been the burials of Egyptian professionals in Kushite service — while the pit graves with the contracted bodies doubtless represent an indigenous tradition. While this latter tradition differs from the indigenous rite observed in the early part of the el Kurru cemetery and may thus be identified as testimony of the local Meroitic-speaking population, the coffin burials may be attributed to settlers from the Napata area, viz., the settlers who can be regarded as vehicles of the «Egyptianization» or rather «Napatanization» of the Butana region.

Since Meroe W. 658 with the small seal inscribed with the names of Kashta and Amonirdis I as well as the burial consisting of the Bastet statuette, probably a gift of Piye to the tomb owner, were coffin burials, we can safely assume that the abrupt change from native burial rite to coffin burial (the burial in contracted position would disappear in the course of the next few generations) was a result of the extension of the power of the el Kurru dynasty over the Butana. The political take-over was carried out by settlers from the north. As already mentioned above, the excavators identified them as Egyptian priests, artists, and scribes.\(^{179}\) Whether Egyptians or Egyptianized Nubians from the Napata-Dongola region, their Egyptianized burials are clear evidence for the existence of a temple in the settlement next to the Meroe W. and S. cemeteries which could provide for mummification, the performance of Egyptian funerary rites, and for the maintenance of Egyptian-type mortuary cult. The excavators of Meroe City failed to discover this temple, for they did not investigate the earliest settlement layers of the central part (the area of the so-called Royal Enclosure). Garstang and his collaborators unearthed, however, though without realizing their actual significance, relics of a temple of Amen-Re in the SE part of the Royal Enclosure which already functioned in the reign of Senkamanisken (Taharqo’s third successor) but was probably founded by a ruler of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty.\(^{180}\)

Interestingly, the first coffin burials at Meroe City apparently predate the general Egyptianization of the burial rites in the Napata area itself (cf. Chapter 7 above on el Kurru types 8 and 8a) and may thus refer to Kashta’s contacts with Egypt. The small number of the non-Egyptianized type burials at Meroe W indicates, however, that this cemetery, unlike el Kurru, cannot be regarded as the ancestral cemetery of some local rulers (but see also Chapter 20 on King Arkamaniqo’s origins). It would seem, instead, that Meroe W. was started in conjunction with the unification of the Butana area with the el Kurru chieftdom some time under Alara or in Kashta’s reign.

The unification of the Butana region with the Napata-Dongola region is in a most significant manner connected to the expansion of the el Kurru dynasty towards the north by the enigmatic Kadimalo inscription at Semna West. This difficult hieroglyphic text, which resisted so far all attempts at a translation, was carved on the façade of the temple dedicated by Tuthmosis III to Dedwen and the deified Sesostris III.\(^{181}\) The inscription accompanies a fairly well-carved relief scene (Fig 2) showing Queen Kadimalo and a princess before Isis. The queen is wearing a vulture headdress surmounted by a tall plumed

\(^{176}\) Dunham 1963, 304.  
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\(^{178}\) Cairo 48862, Great Triumphant Stela, lunette and line 116.  
\(^{180}\) Török n.d., Chapter 2.4.1.  
Fig. 2 – Semna West, Temple of Dedwen and Sesostris III, façade. Quenn Kadimalo and a princess before Isis (after a drawing of W. Weudenbach, 1844, in Grapow 1940, Pl. III)
superstructure with sundisc and with ribbons hanging down at back; further a broad collar necklace, armlets, and a transparent double robe with short arms.\textsuperscript{182} In her right hand she holds a scepter (perhaps the \textit{jm3t} or the \textit{hts}?),\textsuperscript{183} and in her left hand she carries a flail. Similarly to the smaller figure behind her, the queen is also wearing a steliform ear pendant of a type familiar from representations of post-Twenty-Fifth Dynasty Kushite queens,\textsuperscript{184} and her figure is protected by the vulture goddess Nekhbet wearing the atef crown and extending her wings over the queen’s head. In front of the royal figure and above the offerings the following title is engraved: \textit{nsw-bjt \textit{hm\textit{mt nsw wrt s3t nsw}}, «King (sic!) of Upper and Lower Egypt, great wife of the king, daughter of the king.»}

The actual genre of the text is difficult to determine. The scene depicts apparently the offering of Kadimalo and a princess presented to Isis. It leaps to the eye, however, that the offerings on two of the three traditional offering stands are turned towards the queen, who is thus their beneficiary, and only one offering is directed to the goddess. The queen turns nevertheless to the goddess and presents her an offering with the following words: \textit{... take the […] flowers}\textsuperscript{185} and the words of the goddess are: \textit{Isis, the Mother of the God, Eye of Re, Mistress of All Gods, speaks: 'I grant, that the heart of the great royal wife and royal daughter, Ka\textit{dimalo}, be satisfied.} The libation- and lotus offering presented to Kadimalo becomes meaningful if we realize the significance of the fact that her titulary in the inscriptions that accompany the scene is completed with the word «justified», thus she is referred to as deceased: \textit{\textit{hm\textit{mt nsw wrt s3t nsw K3-t-y-m-l mn3[t] h\textit{rw}}, «great wife of the king, daughter of the king, Kadimalo, justified» e.g. in the introduction of Isis’ speech.}\textsuperscript{187} Accordingly, the main part of the inscription does not record Kadimalo’s speech but that of an unnamed king who is speaking in first person singular and is referring to himself as «His Majesty» and «Pharaoh».\textsuperscript{188} That it is this anonymous king who is speaking becomes clear from the introduction which after the date «Year 14, second (month of) Peret, day 9\textsuperscript{189} reads thus: \textit{\textit{\textit{d\textit{di\textit{n h\textit{m.f n h\textit{mt-nsw wrt etc., «His Majesty speaks (or spoke) to the great royal wife etc.»}}}}}} In the following the anonymous king gives a description of war-like events, a rebellion, a conflict concerning gold mines. Some passages where the meaning is less obscure are worth quoting here in Hermann Grapow’s translation:\textsuperscript{191}

\textsuperscript{182} For the Ramesside style of the dress cf., e.g., the representations of Nefertari Merytmut, wife of Ramesses II, at Abu Simbel, Chr. Desroches-Noblecourt – Ch. Kuentz : \textit{Le petit temple d’Abou Simbel I}. Le Caire, 1968, Pl. 33 ; in Tomb 66 in the Valley of the Queens, K. Lange – M. Hirmer : \textit{Ägypten}, München, 1967, Pl. LVI.
\textsuperscript{183} Cf. Troy 1987, 2, Nos 31, 59, 64f., 75f., 87a, 89, 91, 109.
\textsuperscript{184} See Török 1987,2, Nos 31, 59, 64f., 75f., 87a, 89, 91, 109.
\textsuperscript{185} Grapow 1940, 26, restores the lacuna as \textit{sfn}, lotus.
\textsuperscript{186} \textit{Ibid.}, 26.
\textsuperscript{187} For the meaning of the sign Gardiner Sign List M 2 as \textit{mn3’t h\textit{rw}}, fem. \textit{mn3’t h\textit{rw}} see Wb. II 17, 16-18 ; W. Erichsen, \textit{Acta Or.} 6, 272 ; Caminos 1964, 89 note 3 ; B. Gessler-Löhr, \textit{GM} 116, 1990, 25-43.
\textsuperscript{188} The analysis of the text rests upon Professor R.H. Pierce’s unpublished comments prepared for the publication in the Bergen Fontes Historiae Nubiorum (FHN I, No. 1).
\textsuperscript{189} Pierce. – Grapow 1940, 29 also proposes the reading «Regierungsjahr 16, 1ster der prt-Zeit, Tag 9 ».
\textsuperscript{190} Grapow 1940, 29.
\textsuperscript{191} \textit{Ibid.}, 30-40.
Grapow\textsuperscript{197} stressed the Third Intermediate Period character of the text and compared it to the language of the Nesikhons papyrus\textsuperscript{198} and related texts. The tenor of the inscription recalls the phraseology of \textit{magical texts} what is also corroborated by the remarkable expression \textit{h\textk{3}y} employed in cols 4f.

The Semna West inscription commemorates thus a deceased royal wife in the historical context of a difficult situation in which the unnamed king appears to turn for aid to Am\text{n}\, and to powerful magic. What is most remarkable about the inscription is, however, that it invokes the queen as a mediator in the trouble and reveals thus the Egyptian backgrounds of the whole monument — which is, from this aspect, a supplication of a mortal through an intermediary to the deity. It is strange, however, that it is here a king who would appear in the position of a supplicant, whereas in Egypt the king alone is in the position to turn directly to the gods. Yet it is a High Priest of Am\text{n}\, of Thebes, Pinodjem II, who turns in the Nesikhons papyrus to magic, thus, after all, the Semna West inscription is not so strikingly anomalous as it would appear at the first glance. It may also be speculated that the anonymous king was not aware of the charismatic possibilities of an Egyptian king, and the author of the text did not consider him to possess charismatic privileges. On the other hand, the author of the text reveals his education by the relief scene showing the deceased queen in the company of a princess and conveying thus the concept of female duality\textsuperscript{199} associated with the ideology of royal succession, and in particular with the renewal of royal power. The concept of generational duality is also prevalent in Kadimalo’s titulary: she is wife of a king and daughter of a king (see Chapter 17 \textit{passim} and esp. Chapter 17.7).

Despite the ambiguous attitude of the author of the text towards the anonymous king, the

\textsuperscript{192} Pierce.
\textsuperscript{193} Pierce.
\textsuperscript{194} Pierce.
\textsuperscript{195} Grapow 1940, 40.
\textsuperscript{196} Pierce.
\textsuperscript{197} Grapow 1940, 41 and passim.
\textsuperscript{198} P. Caire 58032, decree for Am\text{n}, Cat. Gén. Mus. Caire I, 132 ; B. Gunn, \textit{JEA} 41, 1955, 83-105. It is most significant that through this papyrus Pinodjem II, Nesikhons’ surviving husband, tried to secure that his deceased wife does not do him harm from the Netherworld, cf. J. Czerny in : R.A. Parker : \textit{A Saite Oracle Papyrus from Thebes in The Brooklyn Museum (Papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.3)}, Providence, 1962, 39.
\textsuperscript{199} Cf. Troy 1986, 107ff.
political significance of the scene and inscription is quite obvious — the use of royal titularies and symbols of authority is an expression of a claim, which is also indicated by the clearly comprehensible language of iconography: the queen is protected by Nekhbet and is thus associated with the rule over Upper Egypt.

But who was this lady titled "King of Upper and Lower Egypt" and "great royal wife, royal daughter"? A part of the answer is revealed by her name in which it is not difficult to recognize the Meroitic words kdi, "woman" and mio, "good".200 According to this name, she originated from the homeland of the Meroitic-speaking population, the Butana region — the area which appears to have been united with the ancestral territories of the el Kurru chiefs around the first half of the eighth century BC, i.e., some time under the reign of Alara or Kashta. Although she bears high-sounding titles, her name is notwithstanding not written in cartouche. The relief depicts her in the possession of the traditional royal regalia of late New Kingdom queens and dressed in their style and the iconography of the scene in all details displays a knowledge of late New Kingdom queenship. The accompanying text describes the troubles of an anonymous king, probably her consort, in rather trivial terms and, besides alluding to the royal virtue of fighting, it also reveals that he did not shrink back from the non-royal use of magic. The genre of the text is only partly monumental (dating and narrative sections) and gives the impression of a half-educated author and of a commissioner who was not aware of the Egyptian traditions of royal utterances and of the nature of king-deity interaction. In other words, the Semna West monument is basically ambivalent. It was meant to be a royal monument by the person who commissioned it and who doubtless was in a position to order the execution of such a monument. Yet, the men carrying out his order knew Egyptian royal iconography and titulary better than their employer — the omission of the cartouche appears to have been due to the malice of the former, while the significance of the omission apparently escaped unnoticed by the latter.

It is thus tempting to hypothesize: the Kadimalo scene and inscription is a monument of the initial stage of the occupation of Lower Nubia by southern conquerors who usurp the titles and iconography of the former masters of the territory and who receive an ambivalent welcome from the surviving lower priesthood of the Egyptian province. The conquerors apparently belong to the first generation of newcomers in Lower Nubia possessing only a vague knowledge of the edifice of traditions they attempt to appropriate. They must content themselves with the service of the available poorly educated literati who nevertheless find some clever ways to give an expression to their reluctance to accept the legitimacy of the conqueror.

It may be thus concluded that the Kadimalo inscription is a monument of the el Kurru dynasty's advance into Lower Nubia, but it predates the stage of the Kushite expansion which is marked by Kashta's appearance in Upper Egypt.

The — not numerous — monuments of Kashta (disregarding here his mentions as Amonirdis I's father201) contain his name written in the royal cartouche. The list of them is short: 1/ an offering table fragment found in a secondary context at el Kurru and originating probably from his plundered burial Ku. 8 ;202 2/ a stela fragment from Elephantine ;203 3/ a bronze (?)204 aegis with counterweight of unknown provenance.205

The fragment under 1/ is too small to be commented upon here. More can be learned from the other two. The fragment under 2/ is from the

---

201 Leclant 1965, 53 : Karnak, Osiris Heqadjet Chapel ; 161 : block from Medinet Habu ; 169 : offering table from Medinet Habu ; 181 : offering table from Thebes.
202 Dunham 1950, fig. 7/c and Pl. XXXII/C.
204 The material is determined simply as « métal » in Leclant 1963, 78.
205 Ibid., 78ff.
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lunette of a small granite stela dedicated by Kashta to Chnum-Rê, Lord of the Cataract, and to Satet, Lady of [Elephantine] (and perhaps to the third associated deity, the goddess Anuket) and was discovered at Elephantine. Kashta — whose representation is badly damaged — is styled nsw-bjt Nj-M3It-RI 207 s3-R' nb-t3wy, « King of Upper and Lower Egypt, the Possessor of Truth (M3it) is Rê, Son of Rê, Lord of the Two Lands ». According to the stela fragment Kashta — whose Son of Rê-, i.e., personal name probably has the meaning « the Kushite » 208 — had thus assumed a traditional Egyptian royal titulary and used it on Egyptian soil. More precisely, in the territory of the Theban « State of Amûn », the realm of the Theban Twenty-Third Dynasty. 209 The dedication to Chnum-Rê conveys the clear message of Kashta's claim to Lower Nubia whose sovereignty was traditionally associated, together with the authority over the Aswan region, with the god of the First Cataract.

According to the recently accepted chronology of the Theban Twenty-Third Dynasty, Kashta was a contemporary of Takeloth III and Rudamun. Takeloth III appears to have been co-regent of his father Osorkon III from ca. 761 BC and was followed on the throne by his brother Rudamun ca. 754 BC 210 (cf. Table I). If the dating of the Kadimalo inscription suggested above is not entirely wrong, Kushite power must already have been present by Osorkon Ill's reign in Lower Nubia and was then firmly established during the subsequent reigns of Takeloth III and Rudamun. This chronology is also corroborated by the data quoted above at the conclusion of Chapter 2 according to which the last attested Egyptian Viceroy of Kush, Pamiu, was active around 775-750 BC.

For lack of narrative sources, it cannot be decided whether Kashta’s appearance in Elephantine and his use of the Egyptian royal titulary on his stela dedicated to Chnum are to be interpreted as the result of an aggressive attempt or, on the contrary, was he encouraged by some Theban circles to come to Upper Egypt; and that he was offered the kingship of Egypt. This latter possibility is suggested by the monument listed above under 3/. The « legitimacy » of his advance is indicated by the aegis and counterweight in subtle terms of traditional iconography. The aegis is made in the form of the goddess Mut wearing the Double Crown of Egypt. On the counterweight the scene shows Kashta being suckled by the same goddess. 211 The « allaitement royal » is an episode of the enthronement rites 212 and an act of legitimation. 213 In his fascinating study of the Kashta counterweight Leclant observed that Mut, consort of Amûn-Rê, is not only associated with the notion of the divine origin of royal power but, through her Double Crown, in this case is also connected with the God’s Wife of Amûn who assumed as her royal insignium Mut’s crown — alongside her divine queenship. 214 One may perhaps risk the speculation that the counterweight scene alluded to Kashta’s daughter Amonirdis I as the « source » of Kashta's royal power in Egypt — provided that Amonirdis I was installed in Thebes by Kashta, 215 and several assume that her

---

206 Leclant 1963, 74ff. and fig. 1.
208 J. Leclant : Kashta, LAA III, 353f.
211 Leclant 1963, figs 4, 5.
213 Leclant 1961 ; for a scene of Taharqo’s suckling by Rattaoui see Leclant 1965, 89 and Pl. LV, Karnak North.
214 Leclant 1965, 80.
instalment occurred only under Piye. 216 I prefer to see a causal interconnection between Kashta's appearance in Egypt, his pharaonic titulary, and Amonirdis I's adoption into the office through which in the subsequent period the king's power was secured in Upper Egypt. In the first place, it is attested in the cases of Shepenupet I 217 and Nitocris 218 — and may be assumed in other cases too — that the God's Wife Elect was installed, as a rule, by her father and was adopted by the ruling God's Wife of Amün. 219 The appointment of Amonirdis I by Kashta or, what would be equivalent, her adoption by Shepenupet I under a political pressure that was motivated by the initiative to use Kashta's power in the re-unification of Egypt, is also supported by the chronology of the Theban monuments inscribed with her name as God's Wife Elect and then God's Wife of Amün. 220

That Amonirdis I was the « source » of Kashta's kingship in Egypt can of course be understood also in terms of the theology of legitimacy. The situation must have been delicate and the basis of the legitimacy could only be an elliptic argumentation: Amonirdis I could be installed on the strength of Kashta's being accepted as king and at the same time her position as « daughter » of the reigning God's Wife of Amün secured Kashta's charisma. Seen in this light, Kashta's advance towards Upper Egypt can hardly be imagined without positive encouragement received from Thebes.

In his study on the Beginn der kuschitischen Herrschaft in Ägypten Karl-Heinz Priese assumed 221 that Kashta's kingship was fully acknowledged in Upper Egypt, that monuments were dated with his regnal years, and that he so completely replaced the Theban dynasty of Osorkon III that it was he who was included under the name « Ammeris the Kushite » in Manetho's work (Eusebius) as the first ruler of the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty. 222 It is indeed worth considering that, though maintaining ties with Thebes, Rudamun's successor Peftjauawybast seems to have ruled in Heracleopolis and not in Thebes. 223 The absence of the Twenty-Third Dynasty and the presence of the Kushites in Thebes in this period is also indicated by the fact that when Piye started in ca. 728 BC his war against the Delta princes he could put into action army contingents stationed in Upper Egypt. 224 The presence of descendants of Osorkon III, Takeloth III, Rudamun, and also Peftjauawybast in Thebes under Kushite rule during the century following Kashta's appearance may well be explained as a consequence of some treaty between Osorkon III's dynasty and Kashta's descendants securing the rule of the former over Middle Egypt in return for acquiescence to the Kushite supremacy over Upper Egypt. 225

---

216 H. Kees: Die Hohenpriester des Amun von Karnak von Herihor bis zum Ende der Äthiopienzeit, Leiden 1964, 158ff. ; Kitchen 1986, 359ff. ; Redford 1986, 314. — Baer 1973, 18, lists among the monuments of Osorkon III « the scenes in the temple of Osiris Heqa-djet, where he is depicted together with his successor Takelot III, his daughter the divine votaress Shepenupet I, and the divine votaress Ammeris I, daughter of Kashta ». Such a synchronism would be an excellent proof of the installation by Kashta. However, the chapel of Osiris Heqadjet was originally built by Osorkon III (his representation on the rear wall of the sanctuary under the ished-tree : P. Barguet, BIFAO 52, 1953, 111 note 3) and extended later towards the north by Shebitqo, Shepenupet I, and Amonirdis I ; and no such synchronism as indicated by Baer is contained in the relief scenes of either the original building or of the extension, cf. Leclant 1965, 47ff., 218, 342. For the representations of Osorkon III with Takeloth III see R.A. Schwaller de Lubicz : Les temples de Karnak, Paris 1982 I, 163ff. ; II, Pls 236ff.


218 Caminos 1964.

219 The appointment into this office cannot be regarded as a usual installation into a priestly office. Cf. Sander-Hansen 1940, 29ff. For the monuments and their chronology see Gitton – Leclant 1977 ; J. Yoyotte, RdE 8, 1951, 229.


221 Priese 1970, 18ff.

222 On Ammeris, with a different interpretation, see Kitchen 1986, 145-147, 454, Table 4.


225 For such a reconstruction of the situation see Aston – Taylor 1990, 147 and see also Redford 1986, 313ff.
Before turning to later developments initiated by Kashta's advance, a few sentences should stand here about his Egyptian throne name. The programmatic phrase *Nj-M3't-R*, «The Possessor of Truth/Equity (Ma'at) is Rê», suits well a king ascending to the throne in troubled times as well as a foreigner who seeks legitimacy through accepting the central idea of traditional Egyptian kingship (see Chapters 15, 19). Interestingly, however, *Nj-M3't-R* was also the throne name of Amenemhat III, the Twelfth Dynasty pharaoh who built out Egypt's southern frontier at Semna after Sesostris III had conquered Lower Nubia. The name *Nj-M3't-R* Amenemhat could be read in several Nile level inscriptions at Semna East (Kumma) as well as in the inscriptions of his temple in nearby Kuban. It cannot be excluded that Kashta was impressed by the implications of the name which he encountered while establishing Kushite rule in Lower Nubia: we should not forget that Semna West was a place of importance for the advancing Kushites, as already revealed by the Kadimalo inscription. An alternative explanation of the throne name would be that it alluded to Ma'at as daughter of Rê, the mediator, and thus to the «source» of Kashta's sovereignty in Egypt achieved through his daughter Amonirdis I.

Piye, son of Kashta, inherited from his father a vast kingdom extending from the Butana to Upper Egypt. He also inherited not only ties with Egypt, but also the discovery — or re-discovery — of the significance of her religion, writing, administration, and industries. His monuments in Nubia (and, evidently, in Egypt as well) display the features of a renaissance which cannot be discussed here. The vigour of his epoch was doubtless also determined by his personal intellect. As is also indicated by the Sandstone Stela erected early in his reign in the great temple of Amen-Rê in Napata, he was probably educated, and later surrounded, by Egyptian priests and professionals of best capacity. It is thus no wonder that the foundations of the Kushite myth of the state were created in his reign. Thanks to previous research, Piye's period and especially his activities in Egypt are well-known and do not need to be discussed here. Instead, the following chapters will be confined to the issues of legitimacy, succession, and kingship dogma viewed from the aspect of the indigenous backgrounds of Piye and his successors.

10. Excursus 1. The problem of the «New Chronology»

In the foregoing the emergence of the el Kurru dynasty was placed into two, to an extent independent, chronologies. The internal chronology was built on an analysis of the ancestral cemetery, the presumed number, sequence, and duration of its generations. This internal chronology was fixed in absolute chronology retrospectively, counting backwards from Taharqo's reign and on the assumption that each anonymous generation reigned for an average of twenty years. This chronology was confronted with historical events and reigns in Egypt in the framework of the conventional chronology of the late New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period as presented in the

---

227 PM VII, 83f.
229 For literature on Piye and his reign see Grimal 1981,1; Kitchen 1986, 362ff.; J. Leclant: «Pi(anchi)», LA IV, 1045-1052; on the intellectual life and arts of the period and their relationship with processes in the Libyan period see, e.g., Russmann 1974; R.A. Fazzini, Miscellanea Wilbouriana 1, 1972, 64ff.; id.: Ancient Egyptian Art in the Brooklyn Museum, New York 1989, Cat. 69; for the issue in general see the stimulating paper of A. Leahy: «Royal Iconography and Dynastic Change, 750-525 BC: The Blue and Cap Crowns», JEA 78, 1992, 223-240. Unfortunately, this latter study was published after the editing of this book and I was not able to discuss in my text Leahy's opinion concerning the beginnings of the Egyptianization of Kushite intellectual life.
230 Reisner 1931.
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epochal study of Kenneth A. Kitchen and as amended by a number of other authors writing on Egyptian chronology. In recent years a number of studies were published to challenge the conventional chronology. Setting out from controversial and contradictory points in the archaeological and historical chronology of the Mediterranean and the Near East, a group of ancient historians came to the conclusion that Old World chronology within the time-range 1100-700 BC is unreliable because Egyptian Third Intermediate Period chronology itself is unreliable. In their view the starting date of the Third Intermediate Period (henceforth TIP) around 1070 BC was founded on astronomical data of doubtful validity; but also independently of the value of Egyptian Sothis dates the inner structure and chronology of the TIP requires itself a thorough revision. An impressive survey of the problematic aspects of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Late Bronze Age chronology, as determined by conventional Egyptian chronology, was presented in 1991 in a book in which Peter James, I.J. Thorpe, Nikos Kokkinos, Robert Morkot and John Frankish proposed to replace the established chronologies with considerably lower ones. According to James' reasoning, which I do not repeat here, the TIP should be compressed so that the Twenty-First, Twenty-Second, and Twenty-Third Dynasties plus the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty would be largely contemporaneous with each other and would embrace the period between the middle of the ninth century BC and the conventionally accepted date of the beginning of the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty in 664 BC. This would mean that the length of the TIP is reduced to less than 200 years and that the dates for the New Kingdom (Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties) are lowered by some 250 years.

James' « New Chronology » for Egypt would obviously also affect Nubian chronology. Indeed, it is seemingly supported by the scarcity of archaeological and textual finds from post-New Kingdom Nubia and Robert Morkot gives a penetrating survey of some of the data discussed in this book in Chapters 2, 6, and 12 in order to demonstrate that the Middle Nile evidence provides independent indications for a low TIP chronology. In the discussion of el Kurru Morkot maintains that ... it is impossible to have a compromise solution which spreads the ancestral burials over the 300 or so years from the late 20th Dynasty to the mid-8th century, because of the limited number of graves thus disregarding the fact that the century between Kashta and Tanutamani alone is adequately covered by only five burials in the very same necropolis — and that a cemetery analysis cannot be replaced by a simple quantitative estimate. He also leaves out of consideration that in a royal necropolis (where the cemetery of the queens is separated from the burial ground of the rulers) there do not need to be more graves than the number of the royal generations interred there. Instead of a revision of the cemetery, Morkot, while accepting Reisner's internal chronology, concluded at the same time that the el Kurru sequence spans the entire TIP, ranging thus from the end of the Twentieth Dynasty — which would be lowered to somewhere around 850 BC — to the

233 Ibid.
234 Ibid., Table 10 : 4.
emergence of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty (i.e., the ascension of Piye in ca. 747 BC).\textsuperscript{237}

The first reactions to the « New Chronology » were unfavourable. While the diagnosis of the difficulties connected to the conventional Egyptian chronology is impressive, its radical compression does not really seem to be a completely acceptable remedy. This is not the place, and it is not within my competence, to present detailed arguments against James' and Morkot's suggestions. As to the latter, the relevant data were discussed in Chapters 1-4 and 7 and further evidence will be presented in Chapter 12. The el Kurru sequence summarized above in Table A starts about 1000 BC and if we suppose that the first chieftain buried there started his reign at the Egyptian withdrawal, el Kurru would indeed speak for a lowering of the end of the Twentieth Dynasty by about 80 years. Such a possibility may to a degree also be supported by the presence of late New Kingdom-type objects in the earliest el Kurru grave (see above, Chapter 7). Yet James also argued on the basis of textual evidence concerning TIP royal and non-royal genealogies. Since the data discussed in Chapter 2 are connected to the evidence analysed by him, and since the radical compression of the TIP would seriously affect our picture of Egyptian-Nubian contacts, I cannot avoid presenting an explanation of why do I not follow James and Morkot in eliminating completely the « Nubian Dark Age ».

On pp. 240ff. of their book James presents a composite genealogy of royal and elite families of the TIP. He gives the royal pedigree of the Twenty-Second and Twenty-Third Dynasties from Shoshenq I to Rudamun combined with the family tree of Ankhefenkhons whose seventh generation before Shoshenq I would be contemporary with Merenptah of the Nineteenth Dynasty,\textsuperscript{238} and also juxtaposed with the Memphite Genealogy in which Ramesses II and Shoshenq I would be divided from each other by seven generations.\textsuperscript{239} The disparity between the absolute chronological scheme based on Sothic dates and the chronology that derives from the Ankhefenkhons genealogy and the Memphite Genealogy is indeed considerable. Kitchen assumed therefore that, due to a haplography, in the Memphite Genealogy there was an omission of six or seven generations between Ramesses II and Shoshenq I,\textsuperscript{240} while Bierbrier suggested that there is a gap of three or four generations in the Ankhefenkhons genealogy.\textsuperscript{241}

Thus the following question emerges: is James right when rejecting the assumption of gaps — and if he is right, can a genealogy of the Twenty-First Dynasty and the genealogical data relating to the Theban High Priests of Amun be accommodated in the space provided by his short chronology between Ramesses II and Shoshenq I?

Table I suggests an answer in the negative. In its lower half I have accepted a number of corrections proposed by James and earlier studies versus Kitchen. In its upper half I present a genealogy of the Twenty-First Dynasty and of the HPAs on the basis of recent studies by Niwinski,\textsuperscript{242} Wente,\textsuperscript{243} Weeks\textsuperscript{244} and Dodson.\textsuperscript{245} Although there are still obscure and hypothetical points in this sketchily drawn genealogy, and although the reign lengths proposed for the individual kings of the Twenty-First Dynasty by Kitchen and others are open to doubts, the basic

\textsuperscript{237} Ibid., 216ff. In the course of this century between ca. 850 BC and 747 BC he supposes the « reign of local princes who assumed the Egyptian royal style » and dates two Kushite kings with « neo-Ramesside » titularies to this period, viz., a King Menmaatre-Setepenamun and a King Ary-Meriamun, and also dates Queen Kadimalo to this century. However, the first-named king is identical with king Ktsn, the Aktisanes of Hekataios of Abdera (in Diodorus, I, 60), a ruler probably contemporary with Ptolemy I (see Priese 1977 and Török 1988, 164). For the early Ptolemaic dating of the « neo-Ramesside » style titularies in Kush see Chapter 20 below.

\textsuperscript{238} For the Ankhefenkhons genealogy see Bierbrier 1975, 2-5, 51-53; Kitchen 1986 202.

\textsuperscript{239} For this genealogy see Kitchen 1986, 187ff.

\textsuperscript{240} Kitchen 1986, 189ff.

\textsuperscript{241} Bierbrier 1975, 51ff.

\textsuperscript{242} Niwinski 1979. See, however, also the criticisms of Kitchen 1986, 533ff. and D.A. Aston, JARCE 28, 1991, 234ff.

\textsuperscript{243} Wente 1979.

\textsuperscript{244} Weeks 1981.

\textsuperscript{245} A. Dodson: « The Takhats and Some Other Royal Ladies of the Ramesside Period », JEA 73, 1987, 224-229.
genealogical connections between the HPAs and their succession is reasonably secure.246 It is apparent that, even though the genealogy of Table I is shorter than Kitchen’s Twenty-First Dynasty genealogy,247 it still conflicts with the Memphite Genealogy. James’ version of the genealogy of the Twenty-Second and Twenty-Third Dynasties spans eight generations from Shoshenq I to Rudamun, which corresponds well with Table I. Thus the synchronism of the Twenty-First, Twenty-Second, and Twenty-Third Dynasties suggested by James as a basis of the short « New Chronology » of the TIP can only be established at the expense of the Twenty-First Dynasty.248 (It is worth noting that James did not present any solution for the genealogy of the Twenty-First Dynasty itself.) A radical shortening of this part of the genealogy would be possible if the descent of Maatkare B from Pinodjem II and Psusennes II could be doubted, and if we refused to believe the family relations and their genealogical implications suggested recently in connection with Herihor and his descendants; with Pinodjem I’s relation to Ramesses XI (which would thus have secured the legitimacy of his line) etc. Such doubts, however, appear unjustified,249 and we still have to accommodate about six generations between Ramesses XI and Shoshenq I, i.e., between the end of the Twentieth, and the beginning of the Twenty-Second Dynasty.

It would thus seem that although the revision of a number of details may well result in a certain compression of the TIP, nevertheless I see no possibility of compressing the Twenty-First to Twenty-Fifth Dynasties into a period of about 180 years and regarding them as largely contemporaneous — nor do I see the possibility of a radical lowering of New Kingdom dates such as would follow from the suggested, yet not fully demonstrated, contemporaneity of the dynasties in question. The scale of the necessary and verifiable compression of the TIP is strongly indicated by the gap we have observed between the date of the Egyptian withdrawal from Upper Nubia (about 1080 BC in the traditional chronology) and the beginning of the el Kurru necropolis (about 1000 BC if counting back from the firmly established regnal dates of Taharqo and if accepting my long el Kurru chronology).250

247 Kitchen 1986, Table 9 and pp. 537f. from where I have adopted Scheme B for Herihor’s position.
249 See Kitchen 1986, 60f.
250 Remarkably, Bierbrier 1975, 112 concluded on the basis of the evidence also used by Kitchen that « ...24 or 25 generations would have elapsed between approximately the beginning of the reign of Ramesses II and the year 664 BC (i.e., the ascension to the throne of Psammetich I). Calculating on the minimum figure of 20 years per generation, a total of 480 or 500 years is obtained for this period ... To reach a more acceptable total of near 600 years, the number of generations would have to be raised to a minimum of 30 ... On the generation analysis set forth in this study, a total of 30 generations is not possible. If each generation is estimated to last 25 years, then a total of 600 or 625 years is obtained. » Thus, we are confronted also here with the same ca. 80 to 100 years « missing » between Ramesses XI and the beginning of the el Kurru cemetery.