CHAPTER TWELVE

A LONG, SILENT INTERLUDE?
LOWER NUBIA IN THE
THIRD INTERMEDIATE PERIOD (C. 1069 760 BC)

Behold, it is good for AmunÊ although it is not his place.¹

1. The Archaeological Record

The apparent emptiness of Lower Nubia’s archaeological map between the end of the Twentieth Dynasty and the eighth century BC (and beyond), combined with the negative connotations of the unfortunate term Third Intermediate Period,² resulted in the view that with the end of the viceregal administration all political and social institutions dis-integrated between the First and Third Cataracts, the more so that, after a gradual population decline starting in the Nineteenth Dynasty, by the end of the New Kingdom the region became almost completely uninhabited and it remained so for the next millennium or even longer.

Confronted with the tiny number of burials that were securely dated to the New Kingdom on the one hand, and the dimensions of temple building, on the other, Firth suggested rather absurdly that the temples in Lower Nubia were used only by visitors from Egypt.³ Firth also argued that the dramatic population decline was caused by losses through conscription suffered in Rameses II’s wars and mass migration to the south.⁴ In the view of William Y. Adams, by the early Ramesside period only

¹ Semna, Kadimalo Inscription, col. 8, FHN I No. 1, trans. R.H. Pierce.
³ Firth 1927 25ff.
⁴ Firth 1912 29.
small numbers of Egyptians remained on frontier duty for another two centuries, building monuments to proclaim the glory and sovereignty of their pharaoh over a deserted land.\textsuperscript{5}

It was also suggested by Firth\textsuperscript{6} and maintained by later writers that a radical decline in the average Nile level from the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty was also responsible for the depopulation of Lower Nubia.\textsuperscript{7} Such a hydrological crisis in this period is, however, clearly contradicted by flood level records from Egypt.\textsuperscript{8} Sve-Sderbergh and Trigger suggested that the native population’s disappearance is largely an optical illusion caused by its material and religious acculturation and then by subsequent material impoverishment.\textsuperscript{9} From the late 1970s, Kemp\textsuperscript{10} and Morkot\textsuperscript{11} argued against the radical depopulation hypothesis on the basis of a broader set of textual and archaeological data. In effect, the settlement historical data reviewed in Chapter IX.2,3 in agreement with what we know about the changes in the land’s cult topography (Chapter X.1.2 5) clearly contradict the contention according to which New Kingdom Lower Nubia was, as a general historical tendency, characterized by the disappearance of the native population and, from the early Twentieth Dynasty onwards, the gradual withdrawal of the Egyptian administration.

While Bruce Williams’ reassessment of the mortuary evidence\textsuperscript{12} increased the number of identified later New Kingdom period burials, he also pointed out two important factors. Namely, a similar decrease in the number of later New Kingdom burials in Egypt on the one hand, and on the other, the adoption in Lower Nubia of the contemporary

\textsuperscript{5} W.Y. Adams: Post-Pharaonic Nubia in the Light of Archaeology I. \textit{JEAI} 50 (1964) 102 120 103ff.
\textsuperscript{6} Firth 1912 21ff.
\textsuperscript{10} Kemp 1978 39ff.
\textsuperscript{11} Morkot 1987 38f.
\textsuperscript{12} Williams 1992.
Egyptian fashion of multiple burials in family vaults. E.g., in the two chambers of a late New Kingdom tomb at Shellal 135 bodies were found; at Soleb from 49 vaults 733 bodies were obtained. The burial of small amulets with the dead instead of multitudes of better-datable household items also greatly impeded the realistic assessment of the population size in New Kingdom Nubia. Moreover, extensive late New Kingdom settlement mounds such as Wadi es-Sebua were left unexcavated. No attention at all seems to have been paid to the late- and post-New Kingdom layers during the investigation of the New Kingdom temple-towns. However, Ramesside burials were identiﬁed at Aniba and Buhen. It is likely that a considerable number of later Twentieth Dynasty burials could be added to the record if Ramesside pottery could be dated with more precision.

The unidentiﬁed burials of the post-New Kingdom population of Lower Nubia are hidden in the mass of evidence from which the late New Kingdom burials have just started to be sorted out. The post-New Kingdom landscape of Upper Nubia is not as bleak as it used to be supposed, either. The impression that there are also pre-Twenty-Fifth Dynasty burials in the large Twenty-Fifth Dynasty-Napatan cemetery of Sanam is now corroborated by the cemetery excavated by Irene Vincentelli at Hillat el-Arab about 3 km to the south of Gebel Barkal. Burials in this elite cemetery started in the Nineteenth Dynasty period in family tombs, which were used by several generations and were also repeatedly reused in later periods. The painted decoration of Tomb 1,
one of the earliest family tombs, reveals a kind of Egyptianization of the native mortuary religion the conceptual limitations of which closely resemble the cemetery of Fadrus in Lower Nubia (Chapter XI.1). In the Hillat el-Arab cemetery also tombs and secondary burials of the late New Kingdom, the post-New Kingdom and the early (?) Twenty-Fifth Dynasty periods were discovered.

Irene Liverani emphasizes the prosperity of the elite families buried at Hillat el-Arab between the eleventh and eighth centuries. She also suggests that around the end of the Egyptian domination

[t]he tombs reflect only the positive effects of this political situation and are, if possible, even richer [than the earlier burials]. Commerce with Egypt still appears to have been flourishing, and is represented by large containers for grain made of a whitish marl clay from the region of Thebes, pilgrim basins, and the wine and oil amphorae found in large numbers in all the tombs.

The question thus emerges: if Lower Nubia was not completely depopulated or abandoned to the nomads of the Eastern Desert and Upper Nubia not sinking completely into the impoverishment of a Dark Age, then what kind of world could it have been from which Kashta and Piankh emerged in the quality of saviours from the south?

2. The Remains of the Viceregal Administration

Egyptian domination in Lower Nubia by this time restricted on the region between the First and Second Cataracts was only interrupted but not finished by Panehesy’s revolt (Chapter IX.2.3.6, end). Declaring Egypt’s unaltered claim on the viceregal domain, Rameses XI appointed at once Piankh as new viceroy. Panehesy continued to hold the southern half of the region between the First and Second Cataracts until his death maybe he could do so thanks to a treaty concluded with Piankh. Yet Panehesy’s domain was a polity seceded from Egypt and not a native polity gaining independence.

25 Liverani 2004 139 f.
26 Niwinski’s suggestion (1995 337) that Panehesy may have decided to liberate the Nubians from Egyptian domination sounds quite unlikely.
After Panehesy’s death the Theban rulers, Herihor’s descendants, regained control over the whole of the Nile valley between the First and Second Cataracts\textsuperscript{27} and thus probably also over the gold-mining areas, which could be reached via the Wadis Allaqi and Gabgaba. The surviving evidence gives the impression that they appointed members of their family into the office of the Viceroy of Kush (cf. Chapter IX.2.2). The last known viceroy, Pamiu, a man whose son married a daughter of King Takelot III (754–734 BC)\textsuperscript{28} of the Twenty-Third Dynasty, is attested to around 775–750 BC.\textsuperscript{29} His office terminated probably as a consequence of the establishment of Kushite control as far north as the First Cataract region (Chapter XIII.2).

The shrunken viceregal domain seems to have become identical with the administration of some temples and temple domains (for similar developments in later periods, see Chapter XV). The female viceroy Nesikhons, wife of King Pinodjem II (c. 990–969 BC), had a remarkable titulary.\textsuperscript{30} Besides being \textit{bmy.(t)-r h\textit{s}swt rwy.tr}, overseer of the Southern Lands and \textit{s\textit{t}-nsw.t n K\text{"}{\textacuten}3}, king’s son of Kush, she was \textit{hryt sps wt}, leader of the \textit{spswt} (a title signifying her status in the Harem),\textsuperscript{31} \textit{hryt wrt hnr tpt n ḫmn-R\textsuperscript{e} nsw nfrw}, great one of the \textit{hnR}-harem of Amun-Re king of the gods, \textit{hmt-nfr n Nbt-htpt n Srdt}, priestess of Nebet-Hetepet of Srdt (unidentified Lower Nubian [?] toponym), \textit{hmt-nfr n ḫmn nb Kḥw}, priestess of Khnum, lord of the cataract.\textsuperscript{32} The titles connected

\textsuperscript{27} Zibelius-Chen 1989.
\textsuperscript{28} Regnal dates of the Twenty-First Dynasty after Kitchen 1986 465 Table 1; Twenty-Second and Twenty-Third Dynasties \textit{ibid}. 588 Table *3 Revised.
\textsuperscript{31} Troy 1986 183 f.
\textsuperscript{32} Kitchen 1986 275 f.; Troy 1986 174 2l.24. A complete list of the priestly titles held by the wives of Pinodjem II, Nesikhons A and Istemkheb D, is given by A. Niwinski: Some Remarks on Rank and Titles of Women in the Twenty-First Dynasty Theban State of Amun. \textit{DE} 14 (1989) 79 89 87 f. Niwinski suggests on the basis of the analysis of the two sets of coffins made for Istemkheb D the earlier one of which was usurped for Nesikhons A that the two queens held successively identical titularies, except for the title Viceroy of Kush which was con ned on Nesikhons A. In addition to the titles registered by Troy, Niwinski also lists the following: prophetess of the funerary temple of Ramesses II in Western Thebes; priestess of Mut in Karnak and of Chonsu in Karnak; priestess of Oniris-Shu, of Min, of Horus, and of Apis in Apu (ninth Upper Egyptian nome), of Nekhbet in Nekheb (third nome), of Osiris, Horus, and Isis in Abydos; priestess of Hathor, Lady of Kis (fourteenth Upper Egyptian nome), of Amun-Re Lord of Iu-red (sixteenth Upper Egyptian nome); of Hathor, Lady of Agana (third Upper Egyptian nome). In Niwinski’s view these titles indicate that the wife of the
with the cults of Nebehotepet and Khnum suggest the existence of an actual administration. This is further supported by data attesting to contemporary viceregal officials as a certain Khons-em-renep, *sš sšn* (a financial office), and a nameless *sš sšn 's n pr n ḫr ss-nswt n ḫrs*.\(^{33}\) It remains unknown, however, where the estates of the temples in question may have lain.\(^{34}\)

Kitchen and others supposed that Sheshonq I (Twenty-Second Dynasty, \(c.\, 945-924\)) directed a military campaign to Nubia.\(^{35}\) It seems, however, that the evidence quoted by Kitchen is connected entirely to the major campaign against Israel and Judah (see also 1 \(Kgs\). 14. 25f., 2 \(Chr\). 12. 2 9),\(^{36}\) and its association with relief blocks from Karnak representing the offering of Nubian products to Amun is also erroneous.\(^{37}\) Nevertheless, trade contacts with African areas are hinted at in Egyptian\(^{38}\) and Assyrian\(^{39}\) texts by mentions of special tributes and wares. Trade contacts are also attested by containers of expensive Egyptian commodities from the Hillat el-Arab cemetery and various Egyptian imports recovered in the cemetery of el Kurru (see below).

---

\(^{33}\) Zibelius-Chen 1989 336.

\(^{34}\) Darnell 2006 56 supposes that the surviving viceregal holdings [lay] north of Aswan.


\(^{37}\) P. Vernus: Inscriptions de la Troisième Periode Interim diaire (I). *BIFAO* 75 (1975) 1 66 26ff. has shown that the reliefs were carved under Taharqo. See also K.A. Kitchen in the Supplement to *Kitchen* 1986 575f.; Morkot 1999a 143f.


3. Native Polities

The period discussed in Chapter XII starts with the withdrawal of the viceregal administration from Upper Nubia and the secession of Lower Nubia under the command of Panehesy. It ends with the emergence of a vast indigenous kingdom extending from the Butana to the First Cataract. The developments between the mid-eleventh and mid-eighth centuries are obscure as to their details but the tendencies are rather evident.40

The viceregal administration did not establish a colonial system excluding mutual benefit41 Nubia was incorporated into the Egyptian redistributive system in such a way that the native territorial political structures were also integrated into the political and economic administration of the province. While the governmental structure was built on the network of the temple-towns with Egyptian and Nubian cults at their centres, the substructure of production and local redistribution seems to have been based to a considerable extent on the social structure of the indigenous chiefdoms. The survival of indigenous structures can best be measured on the various degrees of Egyptianization of elite, middle- and lower class burial customs (cf. Chapter XI).42 Due to the preservation of basic elements of the native social structure, the collapse of the viceregal government and the emigration of the Egyptian professional class brought about the collapse of the temple-towns as elements of the Egyptian political and economic structure but as a rule did not cause the depopulation of the settlements themselves.43 This is also clearly indicated by the fact that during as well as after the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty period the majority of Kushite urban centres would develop around temples at the sites of Egyptian New Kingdom temple-towns.44

---

40 The period is also discussed in Redford 2004 58ff. For a critical discussion of Redford's views, see D. Edwards, CIE 81 (2006) 194 197.
42 S ve-S derbergh Troy 1991 9, 248; L. T r k: The Emergence of the Kingdom of Kush and Her Myth of the State in the First Millennium BC. Actes Lille I 203 228 206.
43 As it would have done in the case of purely Egyptian temple-towns where the disruption of the cult would necessarily cause the disestablishment of the settlement, cf. Frandsen 1979 173.
With the Egyptian withdrawal, the centralised political and economic structure disappeared and the former viceregal domain inevitably disintegrated into smaller polities. These may well have been mainly identical with the subordinate territorial units of viceregal Nubia, which, in turn, had been organized on the bases of former native political units. The survival of the indigenous elite of these units and the experience, which this elite acquired through its participation in the government of viceregal Nubia facilitated the emergence of native successor states. Nevertheless, there can be little doubt that these relapsed into less developed social/economic structures. They had to rely on radically limited local resources and without an imperial background they were delivered to their rivals and enemies. Literacy also disappeared with the disappearance of the Egyptian professionals, which inevitably caused changes in the political and economic administration.

The re-integration of the Middle Nile Region into one political entity seems to have been determined from the very outset by the disfunctions of the fragmented successor states and facilitated by the new-old elite’s experience of imperial administration. The successor states also inherited the fragments of a socio-economic structure that functioned properly only on an imperial scale. The re-integration process was also stimulated by the necessity of re-integrating the entire region into international redistribution. The process was finally pushed ahead by inequality caused by differences in natural resources (including the limited availability of arable land in many of the successor states) so that the successor polities in Upper Nubia were given a time advantage. The el Kurru chiefdom (see below) owed its central role in the process to its direct access to gold-producing areas in the region between the Fourth and Fifth Cataracts and its geographical situation, which secured control over the caravan route between Abu Hamed and Lower Nubia and the roads leading across the Butana to the interior of Africa.

Robert Morkot and, following him, Timothy Kendall suggested that a native kingdom whose kings used for their monuments Egyptian hieroglyphic writing and iconography and adopted Egyptian-style royal titularies emerged in Upper Nubia some time in the ninth or eighth

45 For seemingly isolated cases, see, however, the papyrus amulet published by P. Rose: Evidence for Early Settlement at Qasr Ibrim. *Egyptian Archaeology* 17 (2000) 3–4.
(?) century. They have identified as rulers of this kingdom five kings of Kush with Neo-Ramesside titularies attested in hieroglyphic inscriptions from Kawa and Gebel Barkal, viz., Gastis/Aktisanes,49 Aryamani,50 Kash(É),51 Irike-Py-e-qo,52 and Sabrakamani.53 They also identified king Aryamani with Alara, the predecessor of King Kashta, who would appear in Taharqo’s inscriptions as the founder of his dynasty (Chapter XIII.2). Morkot and Kendall argue that the titles of these five rulers were modelled on Third Intermediate Period, more closely pre-Twenty-Fifth Dynasty titles.54 This dating would imply that the emergence of the post-New Kingdom Kushite kingdom cannot be associated solely with the line of princes buried at el Kurru, for it was other local princes who were initially the most powerful Kushite rulers and perhaps had Kawa as their base55 and who assumed complete Egyptian royal titularies several generations before Kashta. It must be pointed out once more,56 however, that the Third Intermediate Period-type titles occurring in the titularies of these five kings are only elements of carefully composed, politically meaningful title complexes in which they appear in the company of such titles as may be identified as creations of the early Ptolemaic period. Besides these, also titles of a Twenty-Fifth Dynasty flavour are present in these Neo-Ramesside titularies.57 The dating of the five Neo-Ramesside rulers to the period between the end of the fourth century BC and the middle of the third century BC is strongly supported by the language and the palaeography58 as well as the contents59 of their monuments too.

49 FHN II Nos (86)-88.
50 FHN II Nos (89)-92.
51 FHN II No. (93).
52 FHN II No. (94).
53 FHN II Nos (95)-96.
54 First suggested by H. Goedicke: Review of Dunham 1970, AJA 76 (1972) 89.
55 Morkot 2000 155.
56 On the titularies in question, see my comments in FHN II loc. cit.
57 See FHN II 511ff., 521, 534 and cf. T r k 1997a 394f. For the titularies of the kings and queens of Kush and their interpretation as political programs, see in detail FHN I III passim, FHN IV 1281ff.; T r k 1997a 198ff.; Lohwasser 2001 192ff.
59 In more detail about these documents, see my comments in FHN II Nos (86)-96 and T r k 1997a 394f. Morkots and Kendall’s early dating of the Neo-Ramesside kings is not accepted by Zibelius-Chen 2006a 295f., either.
4. Queen Kadimalo

The much-discussed relief and inscription of Queen Ḿtyml(u)/Ḳtyml, Katimala/Karimala, or in the re-Meroiticized form Ḿadimalo, which is preferred in this study, was carved on the front of the temple of Dedwen and the dei ed Senusret III at Semna West (for the temple, see Chapter X.1.2.2) to the left of the main entrance. The relief and the text are superimposed over Eighteenth and Twentieth Dynasty texts and gures. While the good quality of the relief was noted by most earlier writers, the text was judged to be of a poor quality by Grapow, Pierce and Caminos, the three philologists who examined it before the publication of Darnell’s recent study (see below).

The monument is interpreted generally in a native Nubian context. In 1999 C. Bennet suggested, however, that Kadimalo was the daughter of Osochor (c. 984–978 BC) and wife of Siamun (c. 978–959 BC) of the Twenty-First Dynasty and that her Semna text is the document of an Egyptian incursion into Lower Nubia. Bennet’s idea was accepted by Kendall and Edwards. Zibelius-Chen similarly argues for an Egyptian origin. Grapow dated the monument to the Twenty-First or Twenty-Second Dynasty; this writer, in accordance with the editors of FHN, to the second half of the eighth century BC. Caminos dated it to the eighth century BC; Morkot to the ninth-eighth centuries BC. According to Morkot, Kadimalo might have been the wife of one of the Upper Nubian kings with Neo-Ramesside titularies (see Chapter XII.3) or perhaps the wife of one of the Kurru rulers; [or] she

---

60 Similarly to Rilly (see below), I accept Macadam’s view that the name is Meroitic. For a different opinion, see the arguments presented in Zibelius-Chen 2007 379ff.
62 Grapow 1940.
63 R.H. Pierce in: FHN I 35 39 (Darnell 2006 passim attributes my comments ibid. 39ff. similarly to Professor Pierce).
64 Caminos 1998a 20ff.
67 Edwards 2004 117.
68 Zibelius-Chen 2007.
69 Grapow 1940 28.
71 Caminos 1998a 20ff.
may have ruled in her own right, while Semna marked the northern (or perhaps, although less likely, southern) frontier of the domain, which she ruled.  

More recently, J.C. Darnell assigned an early Third Intermediate Period date to the monument: roughly the time of the Twenty-First Dynasty in Egypt or perhaps even as late as the Twenty-Second Dynasty. While such a broad dating may indeed liberally enclose all datings listed above, in fact Darnell argues against any dating later than the Twenty-First Dynasty (1069–945 BC) on the basis of historical conjectures and the grammar and paleography of the text. He rejects as a principle all previous datings and interpretations of the monument without presenting detailed arguments against individual statements or hypotheses but provides a new transliteration and a complete translation of the text, which he considers remarkable for the purity of its Late Egyptian grammar and the complexity of its composition, an innovative inscription, making new use of older literary forms, among them the Königsnovelle. We shall return in a moment to Darnell’s study.

Although Queen Kadimalo and the anonymous king of the text cannot be identified with any historical person attested in independent sources, the style and certain details of the text doubtless indicate a Third Intermediate Period date; and it is also obvious that the Meroitic name of the Queen (kdi-mlo= good lady) associates the document with the internal history of the Middle Nile Region rather than with Third Intermediate Period Egypt.

The well-executed relief scene represents Kadimalo and another, much smaller, female figure standing before the goddess Isis. The smaller figure was identified as a princess by Caminos as well as by the present writer; Darnell suggests that she represents an early example of a šms.t Mu|t, a Devotee of Mut, a priestly function well attested in Late Period Egypt. The hmt-nswt wrt ⟨n⟩ nswt-hjt sst-nsw Kātymīl mš’ hrw, great King’s Wife of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt and king’s

---

72 Morkot 2000 153.
73 Darnell 2006 49 and passim.
75 Darnell 2006 50.
76 M.F.L. Macadam in: Dunham–Janssen 1960 10; Rilly 2007 19f. Rilly also quotes later occurrences of the name in Meroitic inscriptions: REM 0841, around 100 BC; REM 0949, 1st half-middle of the AD 5th century.
77 Darnell 2006 10.
daughter Kadimalo sports a vulture headdress surmounted by a tall plumed superstructure with sundisc and with ribbons hanging down at the back; she wears a transparent double robe with short sleeves, broad collar necklace and armlets. In her right hand she holds an īmt or ēts scepter; in her left a bail. Similarly to the smaller figure behind her, she also wears a steloform ear pendant of a type known from representations of Kushite queens of the post-Twenty-Fifth Dynasty period. Her figure is protected by the vulture goddess Nekhbet. The goddess wears the aṭef crown and extends her wings over the Queen's head. Between the figures of the goddess and the Queen are represented three offering stands of which two are turned towards the Queen and one is turned towards Isis. Thus, while offering a lotus to the goddess, the Queen too is a beneficiary of offerings. It also leaps to the eye that the figure of Isis is slightly smaller than the Queen and the offering stand with offerings turned toward the goddess is lower than the two stands turned toward the Queen. The latter receives thus divine features: I tried to explain the curiosity of this representation of a queen whose name is not written in a cartouche by supposing that she was deceased at the time when the relief was carved. Darnell completely eludes the problem raised by these remarkable iconographical details of what he describes as a monument composed on the basis of a profound knowledge of Egyptian religion and kingship ideology.

The text starts with a dating to the 14th regnal year, 2nd month of the winter, day 9 of an anonymous king who refers to himself as His Majesty (col. 1) and Pharaoh (col. 5) and records his speech directed to the great king's wife (and) king's daughter Kadimalo. Describing conflicts connected with rebel chieftains, gold mines, and Amun's ēḥrpt-cattle, the king seems to seek the aid of Kadimalo referring to her powerful magic. Grapow compared the language of the inscription to that of the Nesikhons Papyrus, a decree for Amun in which Pinodjem II,  

78 T r k 1987 Nos 31, 59, 64f., 75f., 87a, 89, 91, 109. The ear pendants appear in the drawings of the Lepsius expedition (see the illustration of Grapow 1940) but do not appear in Caminos' copy of the relief, probably because they were not preserved by the time when Caminos made his documentation. 
79 Also noted by Zibelius-Chen 2007 379. 
80 ḤHN I 40. 
81 The passage in question is read and translated by Pierce as ēḥr-p "m ṯm ṭw īḥt .hk A y[n--] ʾn .hmt wrt, Then I know in this year, O powerful of magic [ - - ] by the great wife; by Darnell 2006 66f. as ēḥr ʾm ṯt ʾy nhḥ ḫḥy pr nṯr, For it was that year I achieved the understanding then powerful is the magic of god. 
82 Papyrus Cairo 58032, B. Gunn, ḤEA 41 (1955) 83 105.
Nesikhons’ surviving husband (cf. Chapter XIII.2), tried to secure that his deceased wife did him no harm from the Netherworld. Though the affairs are obviously different, the two texts refer to similar interpretations of magic.

Although the relief depicts Kadimalo being protected by the vulture goddess of Upper Egypt and in possession of the traditional royal regalia of late New Kingdom queens and also dressed in their style, her name is nevertheless not written in a royal cartouche, even though her titles are royal. This ambiguity reflects a milieu, which was intellectually under the influence of Upper Egypt, particularly the Theban Amun temple, but it also indicates a certain isolation. It is worth noting, however, that the unnamed king of the text hints at his legitimation through an oracle received from Amun:

I having not called to mind the event that happened to me in this year, when Amun nodded his approval (in an oracle) for (my) accession.84

In his study of the monument Darnell suggests that

the inscription is a remarkable and thus far unique glimpse at the birth of the Napatan state, or at least the birth of one of the predecessors perhaps the most important of the Napatan state. Katimala defended the faith of Amun apparently a short time after the sad events at the end of the Ramesside Period.85 É The location of Katimala’s inscription at the southern end of the Second Cataract, and her reference to fighting an enemy in the mountains of gold together suggest that Katimala was interested in securing control of both Nilotic and Eastern Desert routes86 É the struggles in the mountains of gold may have been centered north of Abu Hamed and east of Amara, in the region of the Gold of Wawat, perhaps in and around the Wadi Gabgaba and the Wadi Allaqi in the Eastern Desert.86 É In the end Katimala asked if it were not right to make a land for Amun, where there was not formerly his place. The implication of the queen’s question is that the outcome of her war would be the Amunization of the Eastern Desert, the conversion of the tribes there and their subsequent inclusion in the nascent Napatan realm.87

Darnell’s somewhat garbled geographical identification of the scene of the actions is, however, hypothetical, as is also his dating of the monument to short time after the end of the Twentieth Dynasty.

83 Cf., e.g., Nefertari, wife of Rameses II, at Abu Simbel, Desroches-Noblecourt Kuentz 1968 Pl. 33.
84 FHN I No. 1, col. 3, trans. R.H. Pierce.
85 Darnell 2006 55.
86 Darnell 2006 58.
87 Darnell 2006 60f.
I have suggested in earlier studies\textsuperscript{88} that Kadimalo’s monument may be brought into connection with the northward advance of the young Kushite kingdom that prepared Kashta’s appearance in Upper Egypt, but had to leave undecided whether Kadimalo was the wife of one of Kashta’s immediate predecessors or a descendant of the Kushite royal family and wife of a Lower Nubian local ruler. In either hypothesis, the creation of a monument at Semna may be considered a natural gesture: ever since the Middle Kingdom, Semna at the Second Cataract was an important military and administrative centre of the alternating native and Egyptian governments, a place where the cults of Dedwen and the deified Senusret III were maintained more or less continuously from the Middle Kingdom to the Meroitic period\textsuperscript{89} (cf. Chapter X.1.5.6).

The monument of Kadimalo displays the kind of dualism we already have encountered in earlier monuments employing Egyptian writing and/or iconography but created in periods of relative isolation from contemporary Egypt, such as the documents of the Sepedhor family, the representations of rulers wearing the Upper Egyptian crown carved in the period of Kerman domination, or the Meryka stela from Askut (Chapter VII). The relief of Kadimalo is carved in a good style and with a knowledge of New Kingdom iconography, which may even mislead the modern viewer as to its perfection: the representation of the individual figures, their dress and attributes corresponds indeed with the Egyptian canon, but this is not the case of the inverse relation between the sizes of the goddess and the queen. The text shows similar limitations: it displays a certain knowledge of Egyptian royal monuments but was written by somebody who received only a fairly low-level, second-hand education in Egyptian language and writing— even if he had access to some contemporary (?) magical manuscripts.

5. \textit{The el Kurru Chiefs and Their Chronologies}

However thought-provoking the Kadimalo monument is, it does not provide a firm enough basis on which the history of Lower Nubia in the Third Intermediate Period could be built. Despite the lack of consensus even after the last fifteen or so years dispute about its chronology, it

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{FHN} 141; \textit{T r k} 1995a 45ff.
\textsuperscript{89} For an incomplete cartouche of Amanislo (mid-3rd century BC) on a column drum from Semna, see Dunham Janssen 1960 g. 4, Pl. 88/b.
still remains the cemetery of el Kurru\textsuperscript{90} to which one has to turn in order to form an idea of the processes leading to the emergence of the native kingdom of Kush. Since there can be no doubt that el Kurru was the burial place of the ancestors of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty, it seems fairly self-evident that it describes the emergence of the kingdom of Kush as concretely as it may be expected from any anepigraphic elite mortuary complex. Scholarly interpretations of this historical process greatly differ, however, which follows from the changing ideological outlook of the subsequent generations of the students of Nubian history. What is even more apparent in the studies published in the last few years, it is determined by the radical differences in the chronological assessment of the cemetery in general, and its individual tombs in particular.\textsuperscript{91}

Since its first preliminary publication by the excavator,\textsuperscript{92} a series of hypotheses have been built on this necropolis. It may suffice to recapitulate here that Reisner regarded el Kurru as an ancestral cemetery used without interruption until the generation of Shebitqo, and, after an interruption under Taharqo, for one more generation under Tanwetamani. Reisner excavated sixteen burials in the main section of the cemetery, which certainly predate Piankhy’s\textsuperscript{93} pyramid burial (Ku. 17). On the basis of the six different evolutionary types identified among these sixteen tombs, he suggested that they belonged not to sixteen successive generations of Piankhy’s ancestors but to six generations of rulers, their wives, and members of family. Reisner also speculated that the burials started around 860–840 BC.\textsuperscript{94} On the basis of stone, faience and pottery vessels from Reisner’s pre-Piankhy burials, Timothy Kendall suggested in 1982 that the necropolis may have been used over a much longer period of time extending from the end of the New Kingdom to the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty.\textsuperscript{95} In 1991, Robert Morkot suggested three alternatives, first, that the cemetery has a longer chronology than supposed by Reisner, i.e., in its early sections there may have

\textsuperscript{90} Dunham 1950.
\textsuperscript{91} The discussion of the el Kurru chronologies follows T r k n.d.
\textsuperscript{92} Reisner 1919; 1920b. For a more detailed publication of Reisner’s finds and documents, see Dunham 1950.
\textsuperscript{93} For the rehabilitated traditional reading of the name, see Rilly 2001. According to Zibelius 2006b, however, the problem posed by the orthographies of the king’s name is not resolved (ibid. 133).
\textsuperscript{94} Reisner 1919; 1920b; Dunham 1950.
been buried more than six ruler generations; secondly, that there may have been two separate tomb groups, one belonging to a New Kingdom period princely family, the other to ancestors of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty. As a third alternative, he suggested an independent solution according to which the end of the New Kingdom should be lowered by about two centuries. The third alternative would vindicate Reisner's original tomb sequence, since in its terms the time gap is eliminated between the end of the New Kingdom domination of Nubia and the earliest el Kurru burial. The cemetery would thus start around 860 BC, which date would now correspond directly with the end of the Twentieth Dynasty.

Arguing that the evolutionary process represented by Reisner's six tomb types might have taken a longer time than six ruler generations and assuming that only males were buried in the main section of el Kurru, Ahmed Ali Hakem proposed a long chronology in 1988. Ignoring Ali Hakem's suggestion, but being inspired by Kendall's 1982 hypothesis and trying to see whether the evidence from el Kurru supports or disproves Morkot's lowering of the end of the New Kingdom, in 1992 I put forward my version of a long el Kurru chronology. At the same time, my long chronology also represented a reaction on an erudite study by Timothy Kendall in which he presented a detailed reaffirmation and amendment of Reisner's original short typochronology as corrected by Dows Dunham. Kendall proposed a date range between c. 885–835 BC (Ku. Tum 1/Ku. Tum. 5) and Piankhy's

---

96 One speaks about ruler generation and not human generation because of the (probably concurrent) existence of the patrilinear and collateral succession orders.


98 Morkot 1991 b 213 ff.


100 Tšršk 1999 a (a preprint of the paper was presented in 1992 at the Seventh International Conference for Meroitic Studies, Gosen bei Berlin).

101 Kendall 1999 a (main paper, Seventh International Conference for Meroitic Studies, Gosen bei Berlin 1992; a preprint of the paper was distributed before the conference).

102 Dunham 1950.
burial (Ku. 17). In his study Kendall also explained the beginnings of the Egyptianization process at el Kurru with the supposed arrival of rebellious Amun priests fleeing from Thebes to Nubia in order to escape persecution from Crown Prince Osorkon, who was appointed High Priest of Amun of Thebes around 840 BC (cf. Chapter XII.6).

In my original contribution to Kendall’s paper and in subsequent, more detailed, contributions, I have presented a cemetery analysis in which I tried to explain the changes in tomb and burial types by political and religious factors. I considered the sixteen tombs of the central cemetery section as a cemetery of ruling males and suggested for it a date range between c. 1020–1000 BC (Ku. Tum. 1) and Piankhy (Ku. 17). Doing so, I partly relied on new evidence published by Lisa Heidorn in connection with Kendall’s 1992 paper. Besides a discussion of finds published earlier by Dunham, Heidorn also presented an analysis of so far unpublished imported stone, faience and pottery vessels from the tombs of Reisner’s and Kendall’s first six ruler generations. On the basis of analogues from datable Egyptian and Levantine contexts, she placed this material into an eleventh through eighth century BC, i.e., late New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period, chronological spectrum. Reisner’s, Dunham’s, and Kendall’s short chronology is excellently supported by these analogues, provided that they always receive a dating closer to the lower end of the chronological range in which they occur in datable contexts. At the same time, however, a

---

103 Henceforth referred to as short chronology, Kendall 1999a 97 Tomb Chart B.
105 T r k 1999a.
107 Henceforth I shall refer to my corrected long chronology. Corrections in the long chronology of T r k 1997a were made necessary by the new chronology of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty, cf. Chapter XIII.3.
109 Dunham 1950.
110 This tendency is also noted by Morkot 2003 164. I have quoted in T r k 1997a 114 note 208 cases such as the marl jar sherds from Ku. Tum. 4 (Heidorn 1994 119, g 1/i, j), analogues from Twentieth to Twenty-Sixth Dynasty contexts, burial nevertheless dated by Heidorn and Kendall to c. 865 825 BC; Phoenician storejars from Ku. 19 (Heidorn 1994 124, g 3/k, 4/a-f), analogues from contexts dated to c. 1050 850 BC, burial nevertheless dated to c. 845 815 BC (the approximative dates are from Kendall’s short chronology, Kendall 1999a 97 Tomb Chart B).
number of faience and stone vessels received an earlier New Kingdom date or were described as "Ramesside" in style. Consequently, Kendall interpreted them as "heirlooms," reused objects, or objects produced in a New Kingdom style for conservative customers. It is worth noting that, turning to the finds from Ku. 8, i.e., from Kashta's tomb, Kendall observes that

[w]hereas in the earlier tombs the stone vessels appeared to be of more antique Egyptian form, [those from Kashta's tomb] were Egyptian vessels of contemporary type, suggesting the immediacy of Kashta's relations with Thebes.

Inconsistently with this, other finds from Ku. 8, such as fragments of faience vessels, were classified by Kendall as belonging to the reused or conservative category.

In a separate study appended to the proceedings of the 1992 Meroitic Conference, Timothy Kendall responded to my long chronology. He justly pointed out inconsistencies in my tomb sequence around Ku. 21 and Ku. 8. With reference to an anthropological examination carried out by Lane Beck, Kendall also argued that Ku. Tum. 4 was the burial of a young adult woman and not a man as I have suggested with reference to the stone arrowheads recovered from the tomb. Kendall attached great importance to the anthropological evidence when he defended Reisner's view of pre-Twenty-Fifth Dynasty el Kurru as a family necropolis. We learn from Lane Beck's anthropological report, however, that in the cemetery section under discussion skeletal material was retained only from three burials, viz., Ku. Tum. 2, Ku. Tum. 4, and Ku. 11. According to Beck, from Ku. Tum. 2 come the skeletal remains of an adult male, from Ku. Tum. 4 the remains of the

---

111 Kendall 1999a 15 ff., 32.
112 Kendall 1999a 37.
113 Kendall 1999a 37.
115 Kendall 1999b.
116 Short chronology: c. 760–747 BC; these tombs are not included in the corrected long chronology.
117 Short chronology: c. 865–825 BC; corrected long chronology: c. 975–955 BC.
above-mentioned young adult female, while from Ku. 11 the remains of two male and three (?) female adults. It may thus be concluded that, from the particular aspect of anthropological remains, the rest of Reisner’s and Kendall’s attributions of burials to male or female tomb owners is completely hypothetical and, in the case of Ku. 19, it is also contradicted by the finding of arrowheads. It is interesting to note that, while attributing Ku. 11 to a prince, Kendall makes the following most disencouraging remark to explain the identification of Ku. 11 as the nd place of several skeletons instead of one: this must lead one to believe either that the analysis [of Beck] is incorrect, or that the bones belonged partly or wholly to intrusive burials, or that the bone samples were accidentally mixed with others in the 1eld. Kendall also considered the possibility that certain imports described usually as New Kingdom-type may be dated to the early Third Intermediate Period. He insisted, however, that stone vessels of a diagnostic New Kingdom shape still occur in burials as late as Ku. 10 dated c. 805–795 BC by him and c. 840–820 BC by me. He concluded that obviously such material can in no way be used as an accurate indicator of the date of the early tombs any more than it can be used as an indicator of the later. The objects can really tell us nothing except that at the time when these tombs were built such Egyptian objects were in circulation and available for use and burial.

Given the still incomplete publication of Reisner’s nds and 1eld notes and, as a result of this, our blurred view of what may, or may not be regarded as closed object assemblages discovered in and around plundered burials, one cannot help drawing a nihilistic conclusion from our debate. Namely, given our present knowledge, the nd material

120 According to Kendall, a significant collection [of bones] was retrieved from Ku. Tum. 4. Lane Beck declared the skeleton [from which the significant collection originates?] to be that of a female on the basis of the sharp orbits of a skull fragment. Kendall 1999a 16.
121 Kendall 1999a 97 Tomb Chart B presumes that the owners of Ku. Tum. 5, Ku. 19, 13, 10, 23, 21, 7 and 20 (listed in chronological order) were female, but there are no skeletal remains recorded from these burials. Stone arrowheads from Ku. 19: Dunham 1950 Pl. I.I. Kendall argues that arrowheads may also appear in female burials. Though not particularly likely, this possibility cannot be excluded, either.
122 Kendall 1999a 30f. note 37.
123 Kendall 1999b 167.
124 For the estimated absolute dates of Kendall, see 1999a 97.
125 Kendall 1999b 168.
from el Kurru serves whichever chronology one prefers. Clarity in this matter is not promoted by the important observation, either, according to which Twentieth Dynasty and ninth century BC pottery assemblages from stratified sites at Karnak and Elephantine may be very similar.126

Table G. The Alternative El Kurru Sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kendall 1999a, 1999b</th>
<th>Toröök 1997a (corrected)</th>
<th>estimated dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tomb</td>
<td>owner</td>
<td>tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. Tum. 1</td>
<td>prince A</td>
<td>Ku. Tum. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. Tum. 5</td>
<td>wife of prince A</td>
<td>Ku. Tum. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. Tum. 4</td>
<td>wife of prince A</td>
<td>Ku. Tum. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. Tum. 6</td>
<td>prince B</td>
<td>Ku. Tum. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. Tum. 10</td>
<td>wife of prince D</td>
<td>Ku. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. 9</td>
<td>Alara c. 760</td>
<td>Ku. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. 23</td>
<td>Queen Kasaqa</td>
<td>Ku. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. 21</td>
<td>Kashta’s mother (?) c. 747 BC</td>
<td>Ku. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. 8</td>
<td>Kashta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. 7</td>
<td>Queen Pibata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. 20</td>
<td>child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku. 17</td>
<td>Piankhy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Egyptianization at el Kurru

Interpreting el Kurru, the archaeologist attempts to write history. The different el Kurru chronologies describe and at the same time create

different images of political and religious processes. Kendall’s short chronology and my long chronology represent two extremes. The rst builds a theory of the origin of the Kurru chiefdom that attributes its rapid metamorphosis in character from native Nubian to Egyptian, and its sudden adherence to the Amun cult, to the influence at Kurru of native EgyptiansÉ some of these individuals may have been anti-Tanite clerical refugees from Karnak.127

In a more recent study, Kendall formulates his thesis of direct Egyptianization in an even more radical form: The Egyptianizing kingdom of Kush was almost certainly a continuum of Egyptian historyÉ the Kushite state was a deliberate creation of the Amun priesthood of Thebes, partly to seek security from Tanite or Herakleopolitan interference and partly to regain religious control over Nubia and to restore the long lost symbiosis of cult and kingship that had typi ed the New Kingdom and which gave the Theban establishment its raison d’être.128

By contrast, the long chronology depicts a much slower, more inner-directed process of transformation from (complex) chiefdom to kingdom. It would be a misleading simpli cation to describe this process, which started several generations before Kashta’s contact with Egypt, as a direct Egyptianization of native mortuary religion, burial- and tomb types. In reality, it was a more comprehensive process in which native conceptions were continuously amalgamated with, rather than replaced by Egyptian ideas. Before recalling some of the more signi cant developments at el Kurru, I advance here that, as I see it, this process was gradual and it was not determined by concentrated Egyptian interventions. Moreover, given the vagueness of its absolute chronology, the individual typological stages of the el Kurru cemetery cannot be associated with concrete historical dates, except for the immediately pre-Twenty-Fifth Dynasty burials.129 It must also be remarked that, when accepting the short chronology, one has to accept Reisner’s postulate too that every single generation created a new tomb type. Though comparisons in cemetery analysis must be made with great caution, a confrontation of the supposed rapidity of changes at el Kurru

127 Kendall 1999a 5.
128 Kendall 2002 5.
129 For recent investigations concerning the absolute chronology of the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty, see L. Depuydt: The Date of Piye’s Egyptian Campaign and the Chronology of the Twenty- fth Dynasty. JEA 79 (1993) 269–274; Morkot 1999b 202ff.; Frame 1999; Redford 1999; Kahn 2001; 2004.
with the gradualness of developments at better-known necropoleis such as Qustul and Ballana\textsuperscript{130} may be useful, even in spite of the great distance in time.

The first significant development occurred early in the history of the necropolis. It was the introduction of the rite of 'killing the pots', i.e., the smashing of vessels at the funeral. The vessels were native wheel-turned wares decorated with Egyptian-style paintings representing mourners and other funerary figures.\textsuperscript{131} Janice Yellin argued\textsuperscript{132} that the paintings on the vessels indicate nothing more than the presence of Egyptian craftsmen at el Kurru.\textsuperscript{133} She also assumes that the Egyptian rite of 'breaking the red pots' did not survive the New Kingdom. It must be objected, however, that it was not the rite itself but only its representation in tombs that did not survive the eleventh century BC: but we know that the architecture and decoration of post-New Kingdom royal and elite tombs was in no way the continuation of New Kingdom tomb architecture and decoration. Still according to Yellin, the only post-New Kingdom example of the 'breaking the red pots' would have been recorded from the mortuary chapel of the God's Wife of Amun Shepenwepet I (c. 761–714 BC),\textsuperscript{134} daughter of Osorkon III (c. 777–749 BC) of the Twenty-Third Dynasty,\textsuperscript{135} who was buried by her Kushite successor Amenirdis I.\textsuperscript{136} Consequently, the smashed vessels at el Kurru would testify to an indigenous Nubian, and not an Egyptian tradition.\textsuperscript{137} The existence of a Kushite tradition of breaking the pots is indeed obvious, and there may be little doubt that the introduction of the rite at Kurru could not have been independent from this tradition. It is difficult to imagine, however, that the actual association of

\textsuperscript{130} For a detailed internal chronology of the cemeteries of Qustul and Ballana, see Trpk 1988b 75–173; and cf. Williams 1991c.

\textsuperscript{131} Ku. Tum. 2, 6, Ku. 19; Kendall 1999a gs 10, 11.

\textsuperscript{132} Yellin 1995 246ff.

\textsuperscript{133} Even if we accept this suggestion, it remains still unexplained, why did these craftsmen decorate the vessels with correctly executed scenes taken from the iconography of Egyptian mortuary rites. The Kushite mortuary rite of the killing of the vessels did not require vessels decorated with figural scenes.

\textsuperscript{134} Kitchen 1986 Table 13B suggests 754–714 (?) BC, but she was appointed in all probability around 761 BC, i.e., before the end of Kashta's reign in c. 755 BC, cf. Chapter XIII.3.

\textsuperscript{135} Kitchen 1986 356ff.

\textsuperscript{136} T. H. Ischer: The Excavations at Medinet Habu V. Post-Ramesside Remains. Chicago 1954 20 and Pl. 11/D.

this tradition with a consciously selected figural decoration, taken, as it happens, from the iconography of Egyptian funerary rites, would in no way have been influenced by the Egyptian rite in which the vessels of the funerary banquet were destroyed.

While it is no longer represented in tomb decorations, the traditional rite of the breaking the red pots also occurs in Late Period Egypt in an altered form which is strikingly reminiscent of the el Kurru rite. Namely, in Memphite tomb chapels sherds were found which were painted with mortuary cult scenes after the undecorated original vessels had been broken.\footnote{G.T. Martin: The Tomb Chapels of Paser and Ra’ia at Saqqara. London 1985 20ff., 47f., Pl. 33.}

The presence at Kurru of people familiar with Egyptian mortuary conceptions and Egyptian writing is also indicated by the appearance of the name of the deceased in Egyptian hieroglyphs in Ku. Tum. 2\footnote{Short chronology: c. 865–825 BC, corrected long chronology: c. 935–915 BC. According to Kendall 1999a 24, Reisner recovered from the enclosure debris a small corner fragment of a hieroglyphic name plaque of faience. This nd is not mentioned in Dunham 1950. In the burial also a gold nugget was found which is inscribed in Egyptian hieroglyphs with the formula \textit{Imn nb ‘nh nft di.f Imn nb/E }, Amun, lord of life, that which he gives is beautiful, Amun lord [E ], see Dunham 1950 g. 2d, Pl. LI/II/A.} and Ku. Tum. 6.\footnote{Short chronology: c. 845–825 BC, corrected long chronology: c. 915–895 BC. For the inscription on a faience label, see Kendall 1999a g. 13.} The name from Tum. 6 was read by Priese as \textit{K\ddot{a}mmy\ddot{r}},\footnote{In: Kendall 1999a 23.} by Abdalla\footnote{Abdelgadir Mahmoud Abdalla: \textit{AQO-; LO-}/\textit{E(E, I)}; The Meroitic Name on El Kurru Plaque 19-3-704. in: Wenig (ed.) 1999 428–456.} as \textit{K\ddot{a}mly}. Abdalla as well as Rilly\footnote{Rilly 2007 19.} argue that it contains the Meroitic adjective \textit{mlo}, good\footnote{For the occurrence of \textit{mlo} in Nubian names from the Eighteenth Dynasty onwards, see Rilly 2007 22ff.} and represents an early form of the Meroitic name \textit{Agomloye} (Aqomaloye).\footnote{REM 1049.} The recording of the name of the tomb owner, be it associated merely with items of funerary equipment or mortuary offerings, represents another step towards the adoption of Egyptian conceptions of mortuary religion and, evidently, a higher degree of political organization.

As a second significant innovation, the tombs were complemented from Ku. Tum. 6 onwards with an offering niche or a mortuary cult chapel, and enclosed within a walled precinct. This innovation and the subsequent introduction of the pyramid-on-mastaba superstructure
in Ku. 13\textsuperscript{146} (after the transitional tumulus-on-mastaba [?] type of Ku. 14),\textsuperscript{147} i.e., the replacement of the round tomb superstructure with right-angled monumental architectural forms, mark profound changes in mortuary religion and the ideology of power. From the aspect of cult practices, the erection of funerary cult chapels signals the knowledge and acceptance of some concepts of Egyptian mortuary religion. The enclosure wall indicates, in turn, that the tomb was now regarded as a sanctuary proper: the enclosed chapel was the scene of the rites of a funerary cult, which was, evidently, also a form of ancestor cult.

The mixed Kushite-Egyptian character of the mortuary cult of this phase is indicated by the fact that the chapels were attached to burials from which essential features of Egyptian mortuary religion were still missing: namely, the bodies were not mummi\textit{f}ied, they were not buried in coffins, and there were no \textit{shawabti} figures. In the process of state formation a signi\textit{f}cant stage is reached when the demand for a coherent power ideology and its perpetuation arises. An ideology of power cannot be formulated without creating a concept of continuity with the past on which a civilization would build up its concepts of legitimacy and unity.\textsuperscript{148} Egyptian mortuary religion offered an elementary view of political continuity even if it was only incompletely perceived and accepted in Kush.\textsuperscript{149} The mortuary cult of the ruling ancestors opened the way to the creation of a Kushite kingship ideology, which demanded some sort of readable verbal and visual perpetuation as well.

The new pyramid-on-mastaba superstructure type was unknown in contemporary Egyptian tomb architecture. Yet it was not a recent Kushite invention, either. It seems to have been modelled on the Eighteenth Dynasty period pyramid tombs of the indigenous princes of Tehkhet (Chapter XI.1). A close typological relationship with the pyramid tomb of Prince Amenemhet is also indicated by the tomb substructures, which prevail from Kashta’s burial (Ku. 8) onwards, insofar as the burial pits seem to have opened from vaulted chambers encased partly within the pyramid superstructure.\textsuperscript{150} The Kurru necropolis had other connections too with the region of Debeira. At Cemetery 176

\textsuperscript{146} Short chronology: c. 825–805 BC; corrected long chronology: c. 855–835 BC.
\textsuperscript{147} Short chronology: c. 825–805 BC; corrected long chronology: c. 875–855 BC.
\textsuperscript{148} Kemp 1989 20ff.
\textsuperscript{149} Assmann 1996 25ff., 32ff.
\textsuperscript{150} Cf. Kendall 1999a 36.
at Debeira East\textsuperscript{151} tumulus graves with offering niches were excavated. Some niches contained ritually killed vessels. The superstructures were related typologically to the early tumulus graves at Kurru. The bodies were contracted like in the early tombs at el Kurru. The grave inventories contained Egyptian stone and faience vessels and amulets of types closely related to the material from el Kurru. Besides a similarly composed Egyptian find corpus, Cemetery 176 also produced a special type of decorated Nubian pottery incense burner (\textsuperscript{\textdegree})\textsuperscript{152} which also occurs in the earliest Kurru Tumuli 1, 4 and 5.\textsuperscript{153} The similarities between Debeira East and el Kurru, two cemeteries, which are otherwise without parallels, indicate connections, which we are unable to explain for the time being. Do these connections signal the expansion of the authority of the el Kurru princes to the Second Cataract region in Queen Kadimalo’s times (Chapter XII.4)? So much is obvious that the Debeira East population maintained contacts with Egypt as well as with the el Kurru chiefdom during the entire period of time covered by its burial ground. It is similarly obvious that, on the whole, el Kurru and Debeira East Cemetery 176 were contemporary. It is tempting to consider Cemetery 176 as an argument for the long chronology of el Kurru: but here again, we are in want of a less ambiguous dating of the Egyptian objects recovered in these necropoleis.

\textsuperscript{151} S\textsuperscript{\textdegree}ve-S\textsuperscript{\textdegree}derbergh (ed.) 1989.
\textsuperscript{152} S\textsuperscript{\textdegree}ve-S\textsuperscript{\textdegree}derbergh (ed.) 1989 200ff., PIs 36, 38/1-4.
\textsuperscript{153} Dunham 1950 g. 4b; Heidorn 1994 g. 1/a-b; Kendall 1999a 17f. Short chronology: c. 885 825 BC; corrected long chronology: c. 995 935 BC.