

Napatan Temples: A Case Study from Gebel Barkal

(Author's Note: a computer crash in the last days has resulted in a serious disk error with some corruption of the automatic footnote numbering system. I have not been able to correct this problem easily, so I thought I should send the document off in spite of this flaw. I have tried to indicate in the text which footnotes go with which footnote number. I also send this document without the figures, which are still in preparation. Their omission should not in any way affect one's understanding of the text. Apologies to all!)

Gebel Barkal, the Mythological Nubian Origin of Egyptian Kingship, and the Formation of the Napatan State

Timothy Kendall

Introduction and Abstract.

Some months ago I was asked by the conference organizers to present a paper on "Napatan temples". In looking over what has already been written on this subject - most recently the fine treatment by Laszlo Török (1997, 299-326) - I felt it would be rather pointless for me to plough this same ground. Of course, since Török's work was prepared, important new discoveries of temples have been made in the Sudan, each with rather extraordinary implications. These are the finds at Doukki Gel/Kerma (Bonnet, Valbelle, and Ahmed 2000), at Soniyat, Hageir, and Usli (Zurawski 1998; 2001), and at Dangeil (Anderson and Ahmed 2000). Since the excavators of these sites will be reporting on them directly at the conference, it seemed to me that my own task here ought to be nothing more than to report on the recent discoveries and conclusions of my own team in the Napatan temples at Gebel Barkal.¹

¹ Over the years my expedition has been sponsored officially both by the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (1986-1997) and by the Sudan Archaeological Mission of the University of Rome (1999-present) in collaboration with the National Corporation of Antiquities and Museums, Sudan. Our group has worked generally very short seasons within this period, not always annually: March 18-April 3, 1986, Feb. 14-March 30, 1987, Jan. 8-Feb.24, 1989, April 5-24, 1996, Jan. 1-20, 1997, Feb. 5-16, 1999, Dec. 3-12, 2000. Feb. 6-27, 2002. Besides myself as Director, the staff has consisted of Cynthia Shartzer, Project Manager (1986, 87, 89, 96, 97, 99, 02); Paul Duval, Alpinist (1987, 89); Lynn Holden and Nathalie Beaux, Egyptologists (1987); David Goodman, Surveyor (1989); Susanne Gänsicke, Conservator (1989, 96, 97); Margaret Watters, Geophysicist (2000), Pawel Wolf, Archaeologist (2002), Ulrike Nowotnik, Annett Dittrich, Diana Nickel, Archaeological Assistants (2002), William Riseman, Computer Specialist (in Boston) (1989-1995), Babiker el-Amin, Inspector (1986, 87, 89), El-Hassan Ahmed Mohammed, Inspector (1996, 97, 99, 00), Shadia Abu Rabu, Inspector (2002), and Faiz Hassan Osman, Assistant,

Our knowledge of the Napatan Period at Gebel Barkal is founded largely on the work of George A. Reisner, who spent parts of four seasons there, from 1916 to 1920, excavating the temples for Harvard University and the Museum of Fine Arts (MFA), Boston. Although Reisner published in detail only the results of his 1916 season, his original diaries and photo archives in the MFA preserve a very complete record of the scope of his work, his finds, and his interpretations. Reisner's excavating capability was massive. He worked up to four months at a time with between 250 to 400 workmen and conducted huge clearing operations. He found and recorded thousands of objects, discovered a number of important historical texts and translated them, and reconstructed the history of the site through careful analysis of the texts, statues and statue fragments, and architectural remains.

My own mission at Gebel Barkal has been the beneficiary of Reisner's great work. From the beginning our concession in the sanctuary has been precisely that of Reisner's, and it goes without saying that without Reisner's record to build on, our own contributions would be very small indeed. No one today, of course, could or would excavate on the scale that Reisner did, but the fact that he did so has left us an invaluable record of what he saw on the ground that we will probably never see ourselves. My team thus has had the advantage of being able to use Reisner's superb records to become familiar with the site, to target areas that needed clarification and further excavation, and to recognize areas that had never been probed. Here and there we were also able to correct or enhance Reisner's interpretations in the light of subsequent finds and scholarship.

My own approach to the archaeological record of Gebel Barkal has differed somewhat from Reisner's. His primary response to the material was that of the

Karima University (1997). I would like to thank and to recognize the great assistance rendered to us over the years by Nigm ed-Din Mohamed Sherif; Osama el-Nur; Khidir Adam Eisa; Ahmed Mohamed Ali Hakem, and Hassan Hussein Idress, who have all been directors of the Sudan Antiquities Service/NCAM while we were in the field. I would also like to express deep appreciation to William Kelly Simpson, Edward Brovarski, and Rita Freed, successive Curators of Egyptian Art at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for supporting the expedition. Special thanks, too, are due to F. Sergio Donadoni and Alessandro Roccati, successive directors of the University of Rome Mission, for nurturing our work in the beginning, for agreeing to share their site with us, and then for allowing us to unite with their team in 1999, after my departure from the MFA. Many other scholars, with their helpful suggestions, have given me insights I might not otherwise have found by myself, so I would like to thank especially Lynn Holden, Nathalie Beaux, Ann Macy Roth, Peter Lacovara, W. Raymond Johnson, and Luc Gabolde. Funding of the project through 1987 was provided by the Egyptian Dept. Expedition Fund of the MFA, Boston, through contributions by James and Salle Vaughn, Gertrude Shelley, Angela Fischer, and Esther Anderson. In 1989, we were funded by the National Geographic Society; in 1996, I funded the expedition myself; and since 1997, the expedition has been fully supported by the Schiff Giorgini Foundation through the generous and enthusiastic support of Alan M. May. Thanks, too, to Sue McGovern for donating the cost of my flight from Boston to Khartoum in February 2002.

archaeologist; his focus was distinguishing building phases of temples to establish their chronology and recording the preserved texts within them to anchor the temple phases to a historical framework. My response to the material has been more that of the political and religious historian. The kinds of questions of concern to me have been: "Why was Gebel Barkal important as a religious site? What was the nature of its cult? What did the various temples mean and how were they used? What is the connection here between the New Kingdom and the Napatan Period? What prompted the Napatan rulers to convert to the Amun cult, etc? "

Excavations at many Napatan sanctuaries, especially at Gebel Barkal, reveal that the Napatan temples were generally built directly over the foundations of ruined New Kingdom temples. This indicates that the Napatan rulers of the eighth century BC deliberately restored cults and cult places that had been abandoned by the pharaohs when they evacuated Nubia some three centuries earlier. Other than the Barkal Temples, the best known Napatan temples with New Kingdom antecedents are those of Kawa, Tabo, and Doukki Gel/Kerma, to which we must now add Usli and Hugeir. New Kingdom remains have not yet actually been found at Sanam temple, but Taharqa's inscriptions there allude to its foundation by the "ancestors", by which he seems always to have meant the pharaohs (Griffith 1922, 102). Such data reveal that the Kushites, in the early Napatan Period, undertook a program of reviving long dormant Egyptian cults throughout Nubia. Somehow they had acquired a passionate belief in the Amun cult, where previously they had possessed none. Somehow they had recovered - or learned - a memory of the cults of these old Egyptian centers in order to restore them, even though within Nubia the cult had apparently been absent for three centuries and the temples had fallen to ruin. Somehow, by restoring the old Egyptian cult places, especially Gebel Barkal, they were able to present themselves both within Nubia and especially at Thebes, as the true successors of the pharaohs of the New Kingdom and the direct heirs to their throne. What exactly happened here? How did an obscure dynasty of Nubian chiefs from a village near ancient Napata rise within two or three generations to become the Twenty-fifth Dynasty of Egypt? This would seem to be one of the major unsolved issues of our discipline as well as of Egyptology.

Questions about the origins of Napatan temples and cults are directly related to questions about the origins of the Napatan state itself. Both temples and state appeared simultaneously, mysteriously, almost full-blown, at the end of a nearly three-century cultural/archaeological hiatus separating them from the end of the New Kingdom. One may thus think of the Napatan temples as the archaeological "footprint" of the obscure social and political events that gave rise to the state. In this sense their remains provide critical "foundations" for understanding Napatan origins. At Gebel Barkal the connections between the Napatan Period and the New Kingdom are especially vivid, and I have chosen to use this paper to examine the archaeological and historical implications of this relationship, which are profound.

The contents of my paper may be summarized as follows: It begins with a re-examination of the archaeological record from Gebel Barkal and concludes, from this, that the site was of far greater importance to the Egyptian pharaohs of the New Kingdom than has heretofore been suspected. Extensive use of *talatat* blocks on the site reveals, for example, that, just like Karnak, it had been a major cult place in the early years of Akhenaten's reign. Akhenaten's structures at Barkal, as at Karnak, were dismantled by his immediate successors and the blocks were reused in the major restorations of the Amun temples that took place in the post-Amarna era to early Dynasty 19. Centuries later, the Napatan kings built their own temples as well as their palace directly over the foundations of the later New Kingdom temples and palace, which had by then fallen to ruin. Their aim was clearly to restore the Barkal sanctuary exactly as it had been during the New Kingdom. This restoration, they apparently believed, conferred on them the right to claim the kingship of Egypt (especially Upper Egypt). Since their beliefs and behaviors were modeled on those of the pharaohs, this fact leads us to the almost unthinkable conclusion that the Egyptian pharaohs, too, prior to their abandonment of Gebel Barkal, used the site as a justification for their own claim to the kingship of (Upper) Egypt.

The paper next examines the textual data regarding Gebel Barkal, which reveals that the sanctuary, from at least the time of Thutmose III (and probably Thutmose I), was called by the same name as Karnak ("*Nswt-T3wy*") and that its temple was called by the same name as Karnak Temple ("*Ipt-Swt*"). The texts make it clear that both the Egyptians and later Kushites considered Gebel Barkal to be a southern manifestation of Karnak and understood the Nubian mountain to be the residence of the "*ka*" of Amun of Karnak. From their first forays into Upper Nubia, it seems, the Egyptians considered Gebel Barkal to be the original Karnak and the home of the primeval aspect of Amun. Both Karnak and Gebel Barkal also shared the epithet "Upper Egyptian Heliopolis." Luxor Temple, the "Southern Sanctuary", is shown to have been founded at Thebes by Hatshepsut as a response to the Egyptian discovery (by Thutmose I?) of Gebel Barkal in Nubia. Luxor, it seems, was built as a magical substitute at Thebes for Gebel Barkal, which was the real "Southern Sanctuary."

The mountain's religious importance and presumed power was derived from its shape, which resembled many different things. The Egyptians thus identified Gebel Barkal as a residence of Amun in all his forms, united in a single mysterious being. This theory is confirmed by the so-called "Nubian Chapters" (162-165, 167) of the Book of the Dead, which reveal how the "hidden" meanings of Gebel Barkal were to be understood and "read." This data leads to the conclusion that the Egyptians recognized Gebel Barkal as the ultimate home of Amun Kamutef and the source of the royal *ka*. It also explains why they recognized the mountain as the source of Upper Egyptian kingship and the source of the Upper Egyptian crown. The Egyptians, for their part, apparently used Gebel Barkal to prove that their royal authority as wearers of the White Crown extended southwards to the end of Upper Nubia. The land between Karnak and Gebel Barkal from Dynasty 18, thus, became "Upper Egypt." By the late New Kingdom, this same royal authority was symbolized

by the cap crown with single uraeus, a crown shape that imitated the form of Gebel Barkal, which was the imagined source of the crown. When Gebel Barkal was lost to the Egyptians after Dynasty 20, the "Upper Egyptian kingship" was lost. The Kushites, by restoring "southern Karnak" and uniting it with "northern Karnak" revived this New Kingdom concept of kingship, which justified their assumption of the cap crown. The cap crown symbolized royal authority over the reunited domains of Amun, as granted by the god through Gebel Barkal. When the Kushites assumed control over "Upper Egypt," they wore a cap crown with one uraeus. When they assumed control of Lower Egypt, they added the second uraeus to their crown.

The paper next examines the historic use of Gebel Barkal as a coronation site and describe the discovery by our team in 1997 of temple B 1100, which has proven to be the *Pr-wr* or "coronation temple" at Barkal. Made as a *hemispeos*, this was the shrine entered by the king during his coronation to receive his crown. Our excavations have revealed that the temple had three phases: Egyptian (datable to Horemheb), Napatan (datable to Piye?), and Meroitic (datable to Natakamani and Amanitore). Our finds indicate a) that Egyptian coronations were held here from Dynasty 18 (even if they may only have been magical charades for real ceremonies held simultaneously at Luxor), b) that the Napatan kings renewed this temple in order to celebrate the same coronations and to assume for themselves the same kingship as the Egyptians, and c) that the Kushites, firm in their belief that they were the heirs to the ancient kingship of the New Kingdom, continued performing coronations here well into the Meroitic Period, all the while considering the pharaohs to be their "ancestors."

The results of our excavations in B 1100 in February 2002 are next presented. At this time we found evidence (albeit preliminary) that the New Kingdom *Pr-wr* was destroyed by a rock fall from the cliff above. This event can be shown to have occurred after the reign of Ramses II and before the early Napatan Period. The theory is proposed that the temple was destroyed near the end of Dynasty 20 and that this, more than anything else, may have been what caused the high priests of Amun at Thebes to usurp the southern authority of the king (Ramses XI) and the Upper Egyptian kingship. When they failed to take control of Nubia from Panehsy, Viceroy of Kush, they not only lost control of Nubia but also of the Nubian Amun sanctuaries, which consequently were abandoned. The restoration of Gebel Barkal and southern kingship in the eighth century BC is proposed as a collaborative effort by the Nubian chiefdom of el-Kurru and the Theban priesthood. Its purposes were to end Tanite or Herakleopolitan political domination of Thebes and to restore the kingship of the New Kingdom, in which the Theban Amun priesthood and the ruling dynasty had a symbiotic and mutually supportive relationship.

After commenting on how Gebel Barkal was enriched architecturally and symbolically by the constructions of Taharqa, the paper concludes with a brief re-analysis of the campaign of Psammeticus II, in which it is shown with virtual certainty that Gebel Barkal was its prime objective. This campaign, which devastated of the Barkal sanctuary, is presented as the event that forced the Kushites

to give up their dream of ruling the Thebaid, to reconceive their kingdom in religious and political terms, and to establish a new kingdom with a more southerly orientation.

II. The Archaeology of Gebel Barkal: A Reappraisal.

Gebel Barkal lies on the right bank of the Nile at the approximate mid-point of the river's great bend, about 325 km NNE of Khartoum (**aerial photo, fig. 1**). It is a small isolated sandstone butte on the western edge of Karima, and stands about 2 km from the river, which it confronts with a spectacular cliff 200 m long. The mountain's height, measured from the ancient floor level of the Great Amun Temple (B 500), is 104.5 m.; the cliff is between 80 and 95 m. high. The mountain is an anomaly in the local landscape, for, apart from its sheer cliff, it stands in an otherwise flat desert plain, and it possesses an immense, free-standing pinnacle on its south corner that rises vertically 74.6 m. It was this last feature that distinguished the mountain from all others in the Nile Valley. Very early, it seems, all these unusual characteristics played on the minds of the ancients, who made Gebel Barkal the subject of intense theological speculation and identified it as a sacred site.

Doubtless long before the Egyptians had set eyes on it, Gebel Barkal had been venerated by the Nubians. Although no pre-Egyptian settlement or cultic remains have yet been identified here, unstratified Nubian pottery has been recovered from the site dating from the Neolithic, Pre-Kerma, and Classic Kerma periods.² This confirms that the area surrounding the mountain had been occupied from at least the fourth millennium BC. The discovery on its summit of thousands of chipped stone wasters, made of types of stones that can only be found on the desert floor, suggests that people carried stones to the mountain top to work them, a practice that implies a religious motivation.³ Another indication

h the generous and enthusiastic support of Alan M. May. Thanks, too, to Sue McGovern for donating the cost of my flight from Boston to Khartoum in February 2002.

² In 1989 and 1996, the MFA Boston Expedition found many such early varieties of potsherds mixed with later debris, both in the sanctuary as well as on the western cliff of Gebel Barkal, outside the mouth of a shallow cave where an outcropping of kaolinite had been anciently mined. Kerma sherds were also found in small numbers in siftings of Reisner's dumps from the debris of the kitchen area of the Napatan palace B 1200 (Kendall 1997, 336). Reisner also discovered two intact pre-Egyptian Nubian graves under the level of the sub-structure of B 600, built by Thutmose IV (Reisner 1918, 100; Dunham 1970, pl, 59, f-g).

cture of B 600, built by Thutmose IV (Reisner 1918, 100; Dunham 1970, pl, 59, f-g).

³ This was observed in 1988 by Isabella Caneva of the University of Rome Mission. During the work of the NCAM Bayuda Expedition at el-Meragh in 1999 and 2000, I observed an identical situation on the summit of Jebel Jumal, a small isolated flat-topped conical mountain about 3 km west of al-Meragh. This site and mountain are located 270 km north of Omdurman and 66 km south of Korti. The top of Jebel Jumal was strewn with wasters from chipped pebbles that had been brought up from the base of the hill. For a map placement of Jebel Jumal, see Kendall 2001, fig. 12.

that the mountain may have been a pre-Egyptian cult site is the undeniable similarity of its sanctuary, as it appeared in the Egyptian and Napatan Periods, with that of the Western Defuffa at Kerma as it appeared at the end of the Classic Kerma Period. It is just possible that by that time the Defuffa, a rectangular, brick built, mountain-like platform 19 m high, may have evolved to be conceived as a kind of local magical "double" of Gebel Barkal. After all, complexes of temples were built in front of each, facing the river, and each was conceived as the dwelling place of an important god (Bonnet 1990, 32, 59-67; Kendall 1997, 79).

Although the Egyptians were probably well aware of the geography and chief landmarks of Kush long before their attempts to conquer it, they first invaded Upper Nubia militarily during the reign of Thutmose I (ca. 1504-1492 BC).⁴ Thutmose I penetrated the great bend of the Nile to Kurgus, 235 km upstream from Gebel Barkal, in his Year 2 and left an inscription there (Davies 1998). Until now, it has generally been assumed that his forces took the desert road from Korosko to Abu Hamed in order to bypass the Dongola Reach (Morkot 2000, 72). But evidence presented below (in Section III) makes it very clear that the king not only passed by Gebel Barkal on his way to Kurgus but also immediately identified it as a sacred place of supreme importance. The meaning he and his entourage accorded Gebel Barkal would transform the way in which cult of Amun, the origin of the world, and the nature of Egyptian kingship were thereafter understood and celebrated at Thebes.

The earliest archaeological evidence for an Egyptian presence at Gebel Barkal dates to the reign of Thutmose III (ca. 1479-1425 BC). This king's Barkal Stele, dated to his Year 47 (about 1432 BC) is the first historical document known from the site and the first to name the mountain. From this we learn that the Egyptians called it *Dw-w'b* ("Pure Mountain" or perhaps "Mountain of Pure Waters"). This name, I speculate, may have been derived, by phonetic and hieroglyphic pun, from an earlier, non-sacred name *Dw-'b* ("Horned Mountain"), which would have resulted from the mountain's curious pinnacle. Thutmose's stele also speaks of a pre-existing Nubian community at "Pure Mountain" (l. 33) as well as an Egyptian fort called *Sm3-h3styw* ("Slaughter of the Foreigners") (l. 2). Reisner, who recovered the stele, likewise found fragments of a seated statue of Thutmose III, wearing Heb-Sed garb.⁵ The earliest level of the Amun Temple B 500 ("B 500-sub"= chambers 504a, b) may also date from this period (Reisner 1917, 219, pl. 43). (**Map, figs. 2, 8**)

base of the hill. For a map placement of Jebel Jumal, see Kendall 2001, fig. 12.

⁴ The dates used in this paper are those provided in Baines and Malek 1984, 36-37..

The dates used in this paper are those provided in Baines and Malek 1984, 36-37..

⁵ Statue: Boston MFA 23.737: Reisner 1931, 81, nos.2, 3; Dunham 1970, 17, fig. 4, pl. IV a,b; 81, no. 3, and Stele: Boston MFA 23.733: Reisner 1931, 80, no. 2; Reisner and Reisner 1933a, .24-39. In the rubble around B 300, Reisner also reported finding a block bearing a fragmentary cartouche inscribed "Thutmose" (Reisner Diary, Jan. 13, 22, 1919).

At this point there is no evidence that Amenhotep II (ca. 1427-1401 BC) undertook any construction at Barkal, but a unique fragmentary statue of the king as a rising sphinx trampling Nubian foes was found there (Boston: unregistered: Reisner 1931, p.81, no.4; Dunham 1970, p. 25). It is also this king, in his Amada and Elephantine Stelae, who first mentions a town called "Napata." The context, however, suggests that the name would have been familiar to the ancient reader and that the town was probably no recent foundation. The king states that he hung a Syrian prince from its "walls" (Breasted 1906, vol. II, p. 313; Der Manuelian 1987, 94). Until now, no such "walls" have ever been known at Gebel Barkal, but last year (2001) work crews, digging a ditch for a drainage pipe on the river side of the road in front of the mountain, discovered remains of a massive mud brick wall extending nearly 200 m. parallel to the road. Although this wall is probably not the original New Kingdom wall, it must be the remains of the ancient *temenos* that ringed the sanctuary for much of its existence. It suggests, at least, the sort of "wall" to which Amenhotep was alluding.

The activities of Thutmose IV at Barkal are revealed by a fragment of a statue of that king found in rubble beside B 700 (Reisner 1931, 81, no.5; Dunham 1970, 25, fig. 19, pl. 24). This statue may actually have come from B 600, a small temple the king built against the cliff. Beneath the rear corners of this structure Reisner found Thutmose's foundation deposits. The temple may even have survived reasonably intact to the Napatan Period and continued in use without significant modification until it was destroyed by a rock fall from the cliff in Meroitic times. It was then restored with blocks from the old temple, some of which bore the king's cartouches and were recorded by Reisner (1918, 99-100). A stele from B 501, depicting a king called only "Thutmose" standing before the ram-headed Amun of Gebel Barkal, is probably also to be attributed to Thutmose IV (Dunham 1970, 43, pl. 47 H).

Amenhotep III is not known for any construction at Barkal. Excluding from consideration his Soleb statues, which were brought to the site in the early Napatan Period, his original presence there is attested only by a standing statue of the king wearing the White Crown and by fragments of a statuette of Merymose, his Viceroy of Kush.⁶ A head of Queen Tiye from a royal pair statue, said to have been found at Merowe, may also have been found nearby (Kozloff and Bryan 1992, 178-179).

In his published reports, Reisner noted at Barkal a peculiar type of Egyptian masonry that he observed in the foundations of several of the Napatan temples, especially in B 500 and 300. He observed it also in the remains of several small structures erected both beside and in front of temples B 500, 800/900 and 700. Since the stones used in this masonry were associated with buildings that he

ng a fragmentary cartouche inscribed "Thutmose" (Reisner Diary, Jan. 13, 22, 1919).

⁶ Boston MFA 23.734: Reisner 1918, 102-103; 1931, 81, no.15; Dunham 1970, 17, pls. 5-6; Reisner 1931, p.81, no.16; Dunham 1970, p. 28).

could date confidently to late Dynasty 18 and early Dynasty 19, he dated the blocks to this period. They were small and rectangular, and were made of grayish or whitish sandstone; they were also laid in header and stretcher courses and were bonded together with cement. They regularly had the dimensions 1 cubit x 1/2 cubit x 3/7 cubit (52.3 x 26.3 cm x 23 cm). Today this type of masonry is well known. It is what we call *talatat* and recognize as an archaeological signature of the early reign of Akhenaten (**Map of talatat, fig. 3**).⁷ It was used in his constructions up to his Year 5 at Karnak and elsewhere (Reisner 1917, 220, 222-224; 1918, 111; Redford 1984, 63-71; Redford 1999; Vergnienx 1999). We know that Akhenaten also used these blocks in other sites in Upper Nubia: in particular at Doukki Gel/Kerma (Pnubs) and Sesebi, and perhaps also at Kawa and Tabo.⁸ Their abundant presence at Barkal reveals that Akhenaten considered this site to be very high in cultic importance and that he built extensively there. The distinctive white sandstone from which the blocks were cut appears to have been quarried right on the site from an outcrop on the west side of the mountain, immediately beside B 200. This outcrop formed the mountain's basement stratum.

Apart from their appearance in the foundations of some of the larger temples, *talatat* blocks were also found by Reisner in some very small, temporary-looking rectangular structures built near the later "south" end of the pylon of B 501 (Reisner 1917, 218, pl. 41). He noted others ("B 520" and "B 522") on either side of the nucleus of B 500 (Reisner 1917, 224, pl. 43), as well as under the portico of B 700 and immediately to the "north" of that temple ("B 700 sub-1" and "B 700 sub-2") (Reisner 1918, 111, pl. 10). Still another appeared beside B 904 (Reisner Diary, Dec. 24-27, 1919). All of these buildings looked like small, hastily constructed shrines or shelters for statues. The one beside B 904 still contained a head from a large granite statue of a uraeus, which had carried a crown (Dunham 1970, 78, fig. 49; Reisner Diary, Dec. 26, 1919). Most of these structures had been only one block thick, a feature also observed in some of Akhenaten's structures at Karnak (Redford 1984, 75). Possibly these were the remains of some of the original structures built here by Akhenaten as shrines for statues in use during his early Heb-Sed, which was perhaps celebrated here in facsimile form concurrently with the real ceremony held at Karnak (Redford 1984, 125; Gohary 1992, 29-36 and see below, Section III). On the other hand,

, no.15; Dunham 1970, 17, pls. 5-6; Reisner 1931, p.81, no.16; Dunham 1970, p. 28).

⁷ I am much embarrassed that I did not recognize these stones as *talatat* years ago. I can only blame my limited field experience in Egypt and my Napatan historical focus. Fortunately, during a visit to Luxor in March, 2002, I was able to have several fruitful discussions about Gebel Barkal with Dr. W. Raymond Johnson, Director of the University of Chicago's Epigraphic Survey. He immediately pointed out to me that "my" stones were *talatat* and identical to those now stacked in rows on the west side of Luxor Temple. Indeed they were. I am extremely grateful to him for "putting me on the right track." The Barkal site obviously now acquires a major new historical dimension.

rack." The Barkal site obviously now acquires a major new historical dimension.

⁸ See Bonnet, Honegger, and Valbelle 1998-1999, 84; Bonnet, Valbelle, and Ahmed 2000, 1107-1113; Jacquet, Bonnet, and Jacquet 1969; Blackman 1937; Fairman 1938.

they could have been the first structures built by Akhenaten's successors from his dismantled buildings and could have been temporary shelters for the cult statues brought from Egypt when the site was rededicated to Amun.

Akhenaten's presence at Gebel Barkal is further attested by a fragmentary statuette of his Viceroy of Kush, Thutmose, which was found beside the small *talatat* structures "south" of the B 500 pylon.⁹ Akhenaten's activities are also manifested in the erasures of the images of Amun on the Barkal Stele of Thutmose III (Reisner and Reisner 1933a, 25, pl). They are also seen in the erasures of the names of Amun on the statue of Amenhotep III from B 700 (Dunham 1970, fig. 5) and the fragmentary statue found in debris "south" of B 904 (Reisner Diary, Jan. 7, 1920).

At Barkal Akhenaten's *talatat* blocks were heavily reused in the construction of the post-Amarna Amun Temple B 500 (**fig. 4**). This suggests that the pre-Amarna Amun temple (B 500-sub=504a,b) may have been so unacceptably altered by Akhenaten that it had to be entirely rebuilt. The initial work on the renewed temple seems to have been undertaken by Horemheb, to whom the nucleus chambers B 505-507, 514-519 and the fourth pylon can probably be attributed. The first extension of this shrine (B 503), together with the third pylon and its small added "southern" chapel (B 504c) were probably all constructed by Seti I, since his Barkal Stele, dated to his Year 11, was found in the debris of the chapel (Reisner and Reisner 1933b, 73). More *talatat* were used in the larger "southern" chapel (B 508-510), which was added by Ramses II, as is clear from the presence of his cartouches on several *talatat* blocks and a large roofing stone found there (Reisner 1917, 223-224, pl. 46). Ramses also enlarged the temple with a huge hypostyle hall (B 502). By excavating beneath the Napatan level, Reisner determined that the original Ramesside colonnade in B 502 had consisted of six rows of 12, 13, or 14 columns - or between 72 and 84 columns (Reisner Diary, Boston, Jan. 26, 1919).

Talatat blocks remain *in situ* in two - possibly three - other temples at Barkal. For example, they form the foundations of the outer court (B 301) of B 300, Taharqa's Mut temple (**fig. 5**). This indicates that the temple had an original New Kingdom phase, a fact borne out by Taharqa's own inscriptions.¹⁰ This first temple, however, was not rock-cut but a free-standing tripartite shrine built entirely in front of the mountain. Additionally, in front of Taharqa's Hathor temple, B 200, there is a single *talatat* block that can be seen resting in a cut niche in the gebel, as if it had been used (with hundreds of others, now quarried

ed 2000, 1107-1113; Jacquet, Bonnet, and Jacquet 1969; Blackman 1937; Fairman 1938.
irman 1938.

¹⁰ Reisner 1917, 216; 1931, 81, no. 81; Dunham 1970, p. 28, pls. 27a-c.

¹⁰ "What he (Taharqa) made as his monument for his mother Mut of Napata: he rebuilt for her a temple-compound of beautiful, fine, white sandstone. Now His Majesty found this temple-compound built of stone by the ancestors in humble workmanship; then he had this temple-compound built in excellent, enduring workmanship..." (FHN I 132)

away) in a built forecourt of that temple. This could suggest that it, too, was part of a New Kingdom version of B 200, now totally destroyed, or it could simply be a New Kingdom block reused by Taharqa's builders. A third temple utilizing *talatat* is the ruined Napatan-Meroitic B 1100, about 30 m to the east ("south"=right) of B 300, which has *talatat* foundations. The date of the earliest version of this structure is suggested by a block, bearing the throne name of Horemheb, which our Mission recovered in nearby rubble in 1999 (**fig. 33**) (See below, Section VIII). Finally, the 19th century *gubba* of Sheikh Ahmed Karsani, built in the Muslim cemetery less than 100 m west of B 200 and 300, is made almost entirely of *talatat* blocks, many of which bear traces of Egyptian relief and fragmentary cartouches of Ramses II (**fig. 6**). Obviously these blocks were taken from the nearer temples by local residents in relatively recent times. None of the blocks, however, bears any trace of relief in an overtly Amarna style.

Following the reign of Ramses II, there is no further evidence of New Kingdom building at Gebel Barkal. The only remaining datable New Kingdom object found on the site is a fragment of a statuette of a high official of Ramses IX (ca. 1131-1112 BC). Its fragments were found both in B 503 and in debris in front of B 700 (Reisner 1931, 81, no. 22; Dunham 1970, 29, pl. 28 c-f).

The above data indicate that Gebel Barkal had considerable importance and royal patronage throughout the New Kingdom. Although the Egyptian construction program appears to have ended with Ramses II, the site probably continued to function well into Dynasty 20, probably at least until the reign of Ramses IX. Not long afterwards, however, the cult seems to have been suspended; the temples were abandoned; and they rapidly fell to ruin. The evidence for this is suggested by several of Reisner's observations. He noted, for example, that the New Kingdom columns standing in B 506, directly outside the sanctuary of the temple nucleus, had been badly worn by blowing wind and sand at the time they were enclosed with new masonry by Piye (Reisner 1917, 220). This suggests that the temple had been roofless for some time. Since the king also completely rebuilt the old hypostyle court (B 502) of Ramses II with a new configuration of 46 columns (at least 28 of them new), we can also draw the same conclusion here. The old columns must have been so worn as to be unsalvageable, requiring all new work. Finally, Reisner noted that a part of Taharqa's temple B 300 was erected directly over a collapsed wall of its New Kingdom antecedent (Reisner Diary, Boston, Jan. 28, 1919), which suggests again that the earlier temple was in a tumbled state when the latter was built. All these clues suggest that the Barkal sanctuary had been a site in decay for three centuries when the Napatan Dynasty suddenly emerged on the scene to rebuild it.

The first Napatan king who seems to have converted whole-heartedly to the Amun cult, judging by Taharqa's remarks in his Kawa stelae (FHN I 139-141, 173-174), was his great uncle Alara, who probably began his reign about 785

BC (Kendall 1999, 31-34, 58, 63-65, 97; Vinogradov 1999). It is most likely he to whom we can attribute the first Napatan temples, which were built of crude mud brick. One such structure was said to have existed at Kawa (FHN I 140); Reisner found another at Gebel Barkal that formed the first level ("B 800-sub") of the later Napatan Amun temple B 800/900 (Reisner 1920, 247-254).

B 800/900 was at first thought by Reisner to be two separate temples, hence the double numbering. As his excavations progressed, however, he realized that these structures had originally been two parts of a single temple. The first building was B 800-sub, to which was added on its "south" side B 900, a series of side rooms. This temple was built parallel to the old Amun Temple B 500, about 30 m to the "north" or downstream side of courts B 502 and 503. Although B 800/900 was smaller in scale than B 500, one can see from its plan that its builders tried to follow closely the original plan of the older temple, which would have been lying in ruins at the time the other was built. Its nucleus, like that of B 500, was a tripartite shrine, indicating sanctuaries for Amun, Mut, and Khonsu. As the temple grew forward with added courts B 802 and 801, side chambers (B 903-908) were built on its left ("south") side. These chambers, including a hall bisected by a single row of columns, seemed designed to imitate rooms B 504a and b of the presumed Thutmosid Amun temple (B 500-sub). In its earliest mud brick phase, B 800-sub had the look of a structure built hastily as a working substitute for B 500 and a temporary shelter for three cult statues, while preparations were being made for the complete renovation in stone of B 500.

B 800-sub was built of crude unbaked mud brick, but its walls were founded here and there on pavements of reused *talatat* blocks (Reisner Diary, Feb. 6, Mar. 14, 27, 1920). Since a few of these stones were inscribed with the name of Ramses II, it is apparent that these pavements were constructed in early Napatan times with stones reused from nearby ruined buildings of Ramses, which themselves had been built of blocks reused from buildings of Akhenaten. Perhaps these stones were removed from B 500 in order to give the new Amun temple the sanctity of the old. Reisner noted that he was unable to find any foundation deposits associated with the new temple, so he assumed that the practice was unknown to the first builders. On the other hand, they may have believed that the old blocks gave it appropriate continuity with the old, negating its need for foundation deposits (Reisner 1917, 220-223).

No Napatan royal names were identified with B 800-sub, but Reisner speculated that it had been built by "Kashta or his immediate predecessor" (Reisner 1918, 254). Possibly the nucleus of B 800-sub (B 803-807) was built by Alara, and its outer courts B 802-801, by Kashta. Either king, however, could have built the entire temple. Later, during or after his restoration of B 500, Piye refurbished B 800-sub. In its outer court B 801, Reisner found an abacus for one of its columns bearing his name "Piye Snefer-Re" (Reisner Diary, Feb 29 and Mar. 3,

1920). Then again, in the later Napatan walls of B 900, Reisner found large reused sandstone lintel fragments bearing a building inscription of the king:
[P](nh)y di 'nh dt ir.n.f m mnw.f n it.f lmn nb Nswt-T3wy hry-ib Dw-w'b kd.f pr.f s'h[f sw] "[P]iye, given life forever, he made (it) as his monument for his father Amun, Lord of the Throne of the Two Lands. He built his house causing that [he] live..." (Reisner Diary, Mar. 13, 1920). Other reused stones from the same building preserved relief fragments of over-lifesize figures, including a partially preserved portrait of the king wearing an Atef crown (**fig. 7**).

Unique among the known Barkal temples, B 800-sub was constructed in a location where there had been no previous or underlying New Kingdom temple. During his probings beneath the earliest level of the temple, however, Reisner reported finding traces of even older mud-brick walls, some of them white-plastered (Reisner Diary, Jan. 14, Mar. 22-27, 1920). These were of a different plan than the temple and had a "north-south" orientation.

The palaces of the New Kingdom were temporary structures built of mud brick. The largest, most luxurious, were built at the capitals, but every major town had one for use as a lodging place for the king whenever he came to visit. The palaces were always built beside the most important temples and, other than living quarters for the king and his family, they were used as places where the king prepared himself for ceremonies, or rested between ceremonies and changed his ritual garb (Gohary 1992, 35). We know that they were regularly situated at a right angle to a temple's entrance. They were said to lie "on the starboard side" of the god's bark when it was carried forth from the temple (O'Connor 1989, 79). In other words, they were built immediately to the right of the entrance of a temple as one exited it (cf. Kendall 1997, 321, n. 4.). When a temple was enlarged and its entrance moved forward, the old palace was demolished and a new one erected perpendicular to the new entrance. Looking at the position of B 800/900 with respect to B 500, we realize that it occupied the very ground that would have been occupied by one or possibly two of the New Kingdom palaces associated with the earliest phases of B 500.

When the nucleus of the first post-Amarna Amun temple was built, probably by Horemheb, we may assume that a palace was built immediately "north" and perpendicular to its pylon. It may have occupied the site of an even earlier Thutmosid palace. When the entrance to B 506 was extended some 25 m by Seti I with the addition of court B 503, the old palace may have been replaced with another which would have faced the entrance of the third pylon. When Ramses II completed his hypostyle hall B 502, pushing the temple entrance forward another 55 m, the old palace would have been replaced with another, which would now have been perpendicular to the entrance of the second pylon. This, it will be seen, is exactly the position now occupied by the Napatan palace B 1200, which lies perpendicular to the entrances of both B 800/900 and B 502.

During his excavations of B 1200, Reisner actually found two blocks inscribed with the name of Ramses II in an excavation in the lowest levels of room B 1201 (the kitchen area of the Napatan palace) (Reisner Photo Register, negative C 8587). This leads us to suspect that the Napatan builders of B 800-sub and rebuilders of B 500 also labored to restore the ancient palace of Ramses II. Since the ruins of that structure would have been very conspicuous to the early Napatan rulers, we may suppose they planned the building of B 800-sub, the restoration of B 500 as far as B 502, and the restoration of the Ramesside palace as a single project.

Piye's renovation of B 500 seems to have taken place in two stages. The first, complete to court B 502, was probably initiated soon after his accession. The construction was probably completed before his Egyptian campaign of Year 20, and the decoration was added shortly afterwards. The inner walls, adorned with ritual scenes and the emergence of the bark of Amun from the temple, include a scene of the king, in overlarge scale, with his first "great royal wife," Pekereslo (Kendall 1999, 42-43, 116, fig. 19). The outer walls of the court were filled with a pictorial narrative of his Egyptian campaign (Kendall 1986, 9-20). The second stage was his addition of court B 501, which would have been initiated and completed after his campaign. The reliefs on the "north" wall depict his receipt of the tribute and homage of the vanquished Egyptian kings (Kendall 1997b, 164-165, fig. 28), while the reliefs on the "south" wall depict his building and dedication of the temples in Napata and his celebration of his Heb-Sed (Kendall 1999, 117, fig. 20, and see below Section X) (**figs 47, 48**).

By the end of Piye's reign, the Gebel Barkal sanctuary had at least two parallel operating Amun temples and a palace. There were surely other contemporary shrines that are now no longer extant or recognizable. The great temple of Amun of Napata (B 500) had been fully restored to its New Kingdom grandeur, and a huge new court (B 501) had been added to it (**fig. 8**). The work had probably been done largely by Egyptian masons and artisans supplied to the king by his sister Amenirdis, now seated at Thebes as God's Wife of Amun. B 800-sub, at first apparently thrown up by Alara (?) as a temporary shrine for use during the restoration of B 500, was now reconceptualized and seems to have become an important institution in its own right, being refurbished for this role by Piye with new stonework. These two Amun temples now apparently had the purpose of honoring the distinctive "southern" and "northern" aspects of Amun, whose separate images, criocephalic and anthropomorphic, began to grace the local monuments. It was to these dual aspects of Amun that Piye attributed his kingship at the very beginning of his reign (FHN I 57).

There may have been other standing temples at Barkal during the reign of Piye. Their existence is suggested by the number of important deities named on the surviving abaci of B 500 - deities for whom no local shrines are yet known. These gods may have had their own cult places on the site or else they may have occupied special shrines within the two temples. Among these gods are: "Onuris

who is in Ta-Seti"; "Shu, son [Atum]"; "Amun-Re of Gem-Aten"; "Amun-Re of Pnubs"; "Horus, Avenger of his Father"; "Montu-Re, lord of Thebes"; "Atum-Re, lord of Heliopolis"; and "Ptah, foremost of Ta-Seti" (Dunham 1970, 55, fig. 40). Other deities, such as "Eye of Re"; "Bastet, daughter of Amun"; and "Tefnut, daughter of Re" were probably venerated in early Napatan precursors of the temples that later served the goddesses: B 200 and 300, built by Taharqa. "Dedwen, foremost of Ta-Seti" later apparently dwelt in Atlanersa's B 700, and surely there was an "Osiris" temple somewhere on the site. Piye's mention of Weret-Hekau (FHN I 58), the crown goddess associated with temple B 1100 (see below, Section VIII and IX), suggests that some sort of a functioning sanctuary existed there also for her at the beginning of his reign. It was Weret-Hekau, after all, who crowned the king (Gardiner 1953, 15; Macadam 1955, 95, pl. 22)

One New Kingdom temple that may have survived nearly intact into the Napatan Period was B 600, built by Thutmose IV. This small shrine may also have been restored by Piye, for it is doubtful that, had it not been standing, B 700 would have been built where it was and not over that hallowed site. It appears, in other words, that B 600 was already standing when B 700 was built (in the later seventh century BC). The form of B 600 was as a raised stepped kiosk with a columned portico, the type of structure that seems to have been used by the king during his Heb-Sed and which is even pictured in Piye's reliefs in B 501 (**figs. 9, 48**). Inside the temple there is a stepped plastered podium for a statue or a throne; the walls are uncarved. One can hardly avoid the conclusion that this shrine was dedicated either to the living king, where he sat during ceremonies, or to his *ka* in the form of a statue (see below, Section VI).

Neither Shabaqo nor Shebitqo undertook any construction at Barkal, as far as we know, but Taharqa energetically beautified the site by creating the dual rock cut temples of Hathor (B 200) and Mut (B 300). The old ruined free-standing "B 300-sub" of the New Kingdom, with its shrines for three goddesses, Taharqa now turned into to a fine rock cut temple dedicated to Mut in her transformations (as "Eye of Re" from Sekhmet to Mut) (Robisek 1989). B 200 was dedicated to Hathor in her transformations (as "Eye of Re" from Tefnut to Hathor) and retained the tripartite plan of B 300-sub (Bosticco 1988). He also undertook the extraordinary task of carving and inscribing a panel on the summit of the pinnacle on Gebel Barkal and sheathing it in gold. He then lifted a small statue (probably of himself) to this great height and installed it in a niche just underneath the gilded text (Kendall 1994). The probable significance of this effort will be suggested below (Section XI). The ruined New Kingdom temple B 1100 and its now destroyed companion B 1150 were probably also rebuilt by Taharqa as part of the B 200-300 series. These, too, will be discussed at length below (Sections VIII and IX).

After Taharqa's reign, no new building was added to the Barkal site until the reigns of Atlanersa (ca. 654-640 BC) and Senkamanisken (ca. 640-620 BC).

These kings, one after the other, both labored on B 700. The first king initiated it (with foundation deposits) and the second completed it. If B 600 was a shrine to the living king or his *ka*, as suggested above, B 700 seems to have served as a royal mortuary temple dedicated to the Osirian forms of Amun, the god Dedwen, and the deceased king as Osiris (Reisner 1918, pl. 16) (**fig. 9**). It is doubtful, however, that it was originally designed with this meaning; the temple probably assumed its mortuary significance only upon Atlanersa's unexpected death. Votive bronze figurines found in the sanctuary (B 704) represented Osiris (Dunham 1970, 69, fig. 47), and statues found in the sanctuary represented a ram-headed Amun, Amenhotep III, and several other Meroitic kings in poor condition (Ibid, 69, pl. 57). Fragments of a large funerary-style false door with reliefs of the canopic gods were found by our team in 1987 in B 703. Like the Theban mortuary temples, B 700 probably integrated the cult of the dead king directly into the main cult of Amun, but unlike them it seems to have served all rulers, who at death became Osiris. The fragmentary reliefs in the outer court B 702 might have been those found in any Amun temple, for they depict on the "south" wall the presentation of offerings by the king (Senkamanisken) and his chief queen to Amun and Mut. On the "north" wall the same king was doubtless pictured, followed by the royal women (Wenig 1978, 58, fig. 33), greeting the emergence of the bark of Amun from the temple. The fragments of the bark scene are still unpublished. The superb bark stand from B 703 is now in Boston (MFA 23.728: Reisner 1918; Dunham 1970, 67-74, pls 30-31).

At this point the Napatan sanctuary of Gebel Barkal was near completion (**fig. 10**). Under Anlamani, B 800/900 seems to have been rebuilt entirely in stone,¹¹ and the sanctuary was now remodeled to house only one deity, doubtless "Amun of Karnak". There was no longer a need for a tripartite shrine with Mut and Khonsu, for each god now probably had its own temple. Certainly Mut was housed in B 300. B 900 (Khonsu?) became a separate small temple on the "southeast" corner of B 800.

Both Anlamani and Aspelta also completely rebuilt the palace B 1200, which in their time was probably well over a century old and in need of renewal. This palace now included, besides a new throne room, a large, elegant sanctuary for celebrating New Year's rites (Kendall 1997a, 324-334).

During Aspelta's reign, the palace as well as B 500 and B 800/900 were destroyed by fire, which was set deliberately. The palace was so badly burned that its rooms were simply filled solid with earth by the builders of the next

he had this temple-compound built in excellent, enduring workmanship..." (FHN I 132)

¹¹ "B 800 second", Reisner supposed, had been built after the reign of Aspelta (Reisner 1920, 259; 1931, 87). In Feb. 1988, however, I had the chance to examine the notes of Maj. Orlando Felix in the Burton Ms. 25651 (p. 21) in the British Library. These reveal that the now destroyed walls of B 803-804 were still standing sufficiently high in the 1820's to preserve the fragment of a cartouche of Anlamani.

generation and used as foundations for the renewed palace (mid-sixth century BC). The wooden roofs of the Amun temples were also torched and the statuary within toppled and broken. It is hard to imagine any other cause for this destruction than the invasion of Kush in 593 BC by the army Psammeticus II. Since much doubt has recently been expressed that the Egyptian army ever reached Gebel Barkal, I will try once again to convince the doubters (Section XI).

Because the primary intent of this paper is to examine the relationship between the New Kingdom and the Napatan Period through the record of Gebel Barkal and to understand the mountain's cultic significance, I will suspend my description of the site here in order to summarize what conclusions we can draw from the preceding. It should be abundantly clear by now that Gebel Barkal was extremely important long before the rise of the Kushites in the eighth century BC. In fact, it was the site's very importance and meaning during the New Kingdom that led the Kushites to restore it. The Kushites, in other words, did not give the site importance. It already existed. It was the site that gave them importance. By restoring the site and revivifying its god, they were able to justify their claims to the Egyptian throne.

Surprising as it may seem, the site was probably visited by most or all of the pharaohs from Thutmose I to Ramses II, all of whom, at least from Thutmose III, patronized it and actively built temples and erected statues and monuments there. How often they visited it is unclear. It remains for me now to try to suggest what meanings the pharaohs may have assigned to Gebel Barkal, and to show what effect these meanings may have had not only on subsequent Egyptian history but also on the formation of the Napatan state in the Sudan.

Good archaeological evidence persuades us that the Barkal site ceased to function as a cult place at about the time the New Kingdom ended, sometime during the eleventh century BC. The temples were evidently abandoned and remained untended and derelict throughout the Third Intermediate Period. The Napatan revival of the site and the rebuilding of the temples did not begin until the early eighth century BC. Despite this three-century hiatus in the site's use, we see from the surviving record that there was no loss of memory of the site's cult during this period, for it was fully restored under the Napatans. For the most part, the Kushite kings built their new temples directly over the foundations of the old Egyptian temples and revived the worship of the same gods. They also restored the old Ramesside palace and reoccupied it. The Egyptian statues and stelae that had been erected on the site they re-erected in the new buildings, and they modeled their own statues and stelae after these. It was as if, through the restoration of the Barkal sanctuary, they could present themselves confidently to the wider world as the direct successors of the pharaohs of the New Kingdom.

The great imponderable in all this is that prior to the early eighth century BC there was no obvious "Egyptianization" of the Nubian royalty. As revealed by

their graves at el-Kurru, the Napatan chiefs of the mid-ninth century BC were still adhering to traditional Nubian burial practices. They were interred lying on beds in side-chamber pits under tumuli. Nor apparently were they literate. They had little or no knowledge of Egyptian language and writing. They erected no stone monuments, built nothing in stone, and had no developed art that we are aware of. They had no pretensions to kingship in the pharaonic style, nor did they honor, in more than a superficial way, the Egyptian gods (Kendall 1999a; 1999b). These facts alone would seem to confirm that there were no Egyptian temples functioning in the region and that there was no active local priesthood present that was maintaining or disseminating Egyptian religious beliefs, especially among the royal family. There is no evidence, at least initially, for any royal patronage of a cult, nor for any cultic support of the dynasty. If the Nubian chiefs of el-Kurru had never set foot in Egypt, and if there was no local Egyptian community to acculturate them, we might wonder why they suddenly abandoned their native burial customs and adopted the Egyptian. Why did they adopt the Amun cult with such a passion, when it had been dead in Nubia for at least three centuries? Why did they begin to venerate the other Egyptian gods, and to use the Egyptian language and writing for their formal inscriptions? Why they adopt the Egyptian royal style and rebuild the temples at Gebel Barkal and elsewhere in Nubia with such single-mindedness? By the time of Piye - hardly more than a generation beyond the first Napatan ruler known even by name - the "Egyptianization" of the Napatan ruling family was so complete that they did not even look back to a pre-Egyptian past. All models for their state and kingship had become Egyptian, and the pharaohs of the New Kingdom had become their "ancestors."

What and who had caused these changes? And why? Obviously, if there were no existing Nubian groups that could have influenced the early rulers, the changes can only have been effected by outsiders - from Egypt (Kendall 1999a, 49-77). If Egyptians came to el-Kurru to missionize the Nubian dynasts and to convert them to the Amun cult, would it not also be correct to assume that these were the same individuals who encouraged and directed the Kushite revival of the Barkal sanctuary and the other Nubian sanctuaries of Amun? Furthermore, if the new kings of Napata believed their royal power came from Gebel Barkal and that it was this same power that had belonged the pharaohs, would it not be likely that they had learned this tradition from the same Egyptian visitors? If this tradition was Egyptian rather than Nubian, then shouldn't we assume that during the New Kingdom the pharaohs, too, had believed their royal power derived from Gebel Barkal? This last question will sound almost preposterous, but let us consider the evidence.

III. Gebel Barkal as southern Karnak; Luxor Temple as northern Gebel Barkal; Karnak and Gebel Barkal as Upper Egyptian Heliopolis.

Royal inscriptions from Gebel Barkal reveal that Napata, both during the New Kingdom and in the Napatan Period, was conceived as a far-flung extension of Thebes. The Amun sanctuaries of the two cities, although separated by some 1150 km of Nile Valley, were thought, in religious terms, to be manifestations of each other - or indeed, to be "the very same place." They were so often called by the same names in texts that it is sometimes impossible to distinguish which is meant, and the confusion was deliberate.

During the New Kingdom, Thebes had two major, non-mortuary temples to Amun, while Napata had only one. In the early Napatan Period, however, Napata added a second Amun temple so that it, too, had two large Amun temples. At Thebes, Karnak Temple was known as *Ipt-swt* ("Sanctuary of the Thrones"),¹² while Luxor was called *Ipt-rsyt* ("Southern Sanctuary"). At Napata, during the New Kingdom B 500 was also called *Ipt-swt*. During the early Napatan Period, after B 800/900 was built, B 500 still retained its original name (FHN I 62). In later Napatan times it continued to be called variously "*Ipt-swt* of Napata," "*Ipt-swt* of Amun of Napata," "Golden *Ipt-swt*", and "*Ipt-swt* House of Gold" (FHN II 443, 444, 478, 480). It is not clear what B 800/900 was called, but Harsiotef, who is known by archaeological evidence to have rebuilt this temple (Reisner Diary, Mar. 28, 1916; Reisner 1920, 263), mentions in his stele that he rebuilt for Amun his *Pr-p3-h3-rnpt* ("House of the Thousand Years"). Nastasen in his stele mentions the god of Luxor, Amenemipet ("Amun in the Sanctuary"), as if housed at Napata (FHN II 484). He also speaks of a *r3-pr W3st* ("temple of Thebes") at Napata (FHN II 488).

In both cities, it seems, one temple was dedicated to Amun's northern aspect and the other, to his southern. At Thebes, Karnak was home to the god's local or northern aspect; Luxor was home to his southern. At Napata, B 500 was home to his local or southern aspect, while the smaller temple, B 800/900 was home to his northern. Prior to Dynasty 19, there was only one Amun temple at Napata, dedicated to a god seen as the southern aspect of, but identical to, the Theban (fig. 17). By the time of Seti I and Ramses II, however, a "southern" aspect of the god of Napata may have been distinguished in chapels B 508-11 and B 504c. Although B 800/900 is poorly preserved today and has left no image of its god, its earliest mud brick sanctuary (B 800-sub) was tripartite, suggesting its occupancy by the Theban triad.¹³ Its later sanctuary (apparently built by Anlamani) was modified to house only one deity, perhaps because Mut and Khonsu had in the meantime found other homes. The form of Amun housed

efficiently high in the 1820's to preserve the fragment of a cartouche of Anlamani.

¹² Or "Most Select of Places." On the scholarship history of the interpretation of the name, see Pamminger 1992, 97-99.

e scholarship history of the interpretation of the name, see Pamminger 1992, 97-99.

¹³ Notice that Amun, Mut, and "Khonsu of Thebes" are depicted on the "Aryamani" Stele from Kawa (Macadam 1949. Pls. 32-33; FHN II 521-526) There seems no reason seriously to doubt that this king is really Alara, the probable builder of the earliest Napatan temples at both Kawa and Gebel Barkal. See note 57.

here can confidently be identified from Napatan wall reliefs and stelae where the northern and southern aspects of Amun are distinguished and regularly appear in their proper directional relationship (cf. Robisek 1989, 53 and 113, 117 and 118, 69 and 70). Here it will be seen that the northern Amun at Napata was anthropomorphic and was identical to the Amun of Karnak, while the southern Amun at Napata was criocephalic and identical to the Amun of Luxor (Pamminger 1992, 99-105).

Although today Luxor nowhere preserves in its reliefs an image of a ram-headed god like that of Gebel Barkal, a number of ram-headed statuettes and reliefs of Amun in his Gebel Barkal form survive from Western Thebes and date from the New Kingdom. These are all identified as the god of *Ipt-rsyt*, ("Southern Sanctuary"), which is the name of Luxor (See Ibid, 99-105). During the Opet festival, celebrated at Luxor, the king also donned a crown with rams' horns to signify his union with the deity (Bell 1985, 266-269). Generally, however, the Luxor god is represented as a mummiform ithyphallic man with one arm upraised supporting a flail (Pamminger 1992, 93-95). In this guise he was called variously Kamutef or Amen-(em)-ipet, a form that symbolized his primeval or procreative aspect. In his Kurgus inscription, Thutmose I provides for us the first known image of Amun with a ram head and identifies the god as "Kamutef" (Davies 1998, 27). Given these data, we must conclude that the ithyphallic, procreative Amun of Luxor and the criocephalic god of Napata were merely alternate symbolic ways of representing the same being. We must also assume, as proposed by Pamminger (Ibid, 106), that Napata, the "southern Karnak," was the real *Ipt-rsyt* ("Southern Sanctuary") and that Luxor Temple was its magical Theban manifestation. We may even suspect that the name of the Luxor god, Amen-(em)-ipet (*Imn-ipet*), formed a pun with that of Amun of Napata (*Imn-Npt*), indicating their cultic convergence.

The god of Karnak was known as *Imn nb-Nswt T3wy* ("Amun, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands"), while the god of Gebel Barkal was called *Imn nb-Nswt T3wy hry-ib Dw-w'b* ("Amun, Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, who dwells within Pure Mountain") (FHN I 193-194). These gods (or manifestations of the same god) were said to be "*ka's*" of each other (Reisner and Reisner 1933a, 26).¹⁴ In his Barkal Stele, Thutmose III provides the earliest explicit explanation for the mythological link between Barkal and Karnak by stating that, "before it was known by the people," Gebel Barkal was called *Nswt-T3wy* ("Thrones of the Two Lands") (Ibid, 35). In other words, by early Dynasty 18, the Egyptians had identified Gebel Barkal as the source of the name of the god's earliest temple at Karnak, founded by Antef II (ca. 2118-2069 BC) and first rebuilt by Sesostri I (1971-1926 BC) (Gabolde 1998, 1999). Obviously, when confronted by this remote mountain in Nubia, the Egyptians saw in it something so important that they felt at once compelled to revise their own history and their

uilder of the earliest Napatan temples at both Kawa and Gebel Barkal. See note 57.

¹⁴ Note that at Medinet Habu, offerings are said to be given to the cults of Amun-Re and his *ka*, Amun-Re Kamutef and his *ka*, the Ennead and its *kas*, and the *ka* of the king. Walker 1991, 136

understanding of the origin of their state god. Amun, they must have concluded, came originally from Nubia, the source of the inundation, and settled in Egypt. Gebel Barkal must have been the god's first home: the primeval Karnak. All of Nubia, they further reasoned, must be an extension of Upper Egypt and the Thebaid. Consequently, the "northern" and "southern Karnaks" and all lands between must be united and controlled by Pharaoh - and the Amun priesthood. This was obviously the origin of the tradition echoed so many centuries later by Diodorus Siculus 3.2.1-7.3 (FHN II 644-645).

Thousands of times in the Theban temples, and wherever Amun's cult was carried, the god was called "Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands." Given Thutmose III's explicit statement that Gebel Barkal was the original "Thrones of the Two Lands," one could understand that every time the Egyptians (after the invention of this tradition) wrote that epithet of the god it acknowledged Gebel Barkal as the god's birthplace. On the other hand, since Gebel Barkal was simply "Karnak," and *vice versa*, we must wonder if the Egyptian theologians recognized any formal distinction between the two places. To say that the god was born at "Karnak" was also to say he was born at Gebel Barkal. Amenhotep Huy, Tutankhamun's Viceroy of Kush, tells us that his authority extended from "Nekhen to *Nswt-T3wy*" - meaning Napata (Davies and Gardiner 1926, 11)!

Equally ambiguous is another of the god's common epithets, "Lord of Heaven" (*Nb-pt*), which also appears thousands of times at Thebes and elsewhere. At Abu Simbel, criocephalic images of Amun are called both *Nb-pt* and *Npt* ("of Napata"), strongly suggesting double-entendre.¹⁵ In Napatan times a pun is clearly intended when *Nb-pt* (in the masculine form) is repeatedly used, instead of the feminine *Nbt-pt* ("Mistress of Heaven"), to describe various goddesses "of Napata." (Robisek 1989, 10, 11; FHN I, 56, 133, 135, 147, 233). Given the frequency of the use of *Nb-pt* to describe Amun, even in his ithyphallic form, at Karnak and especially at Luxor (45 times out of 106 images: Brunner 1977, 75), we must wonder if this epithet, too, was used as a coded evocation of the god's supposed origin at Napata. In Aspelta's "Banishment Stele" from Gebel Barkal, for example, three gods are invoked: Amun "Lord of the Throne(s) of the Two Lands, who is in Pure Mountain," Mut *nb-pt* and Khonsu *m W3st* ("of Thebes")!

The special relationship of Karnak to Gebel Barkal, even in mid-Dynasty 18, is emphasized in the Amada and Elephantine Stelae of Amenhotep II, where we read that of seven captive chieftans brought from Syria, the king executed and hung six from the walls of Thebes and one from the walls of Napata (Breasted 1906, II 313; Der Manuelian 1987, 94).

Amun of Karnak was known by such descriptives as "Creator uncreated," "Self-made One," "Oldest of the Two Lands," etc. (Lichtheim 1976, 87-88; Murnane 1995, 58-59). To the Thebans, he was the ultimate god, unfathomable, dual-sexed yet inherently male, who was at once the primordial *Nun* and the being,

he Ennead and its kas, and the ka of the king. Walker 1991, 136

who, according to myth, pulled himself up out of these waters onto a lone hill, which was an island. There he grasped his phallus, masturbated, and ejaculated the first gods. In this myth his identity was merged with the ancient solar creator god of Heliopolis, Re-Atum,¹⁶ as well as with the primeval god Ptah-Tatanen of Memphis.¹⁷ Thutmose III in his Barkal Stele describes Amun of Gebel Barkal/Karnak with another of his typical epithets: *ntr '3 n sp tpy p3wty* ("great god of the first time, the primeval god") (Reisner and Reisner 1933a, 37), which echoed through Napatan texts (FHN I 55, 237, 243). It is most interesting that Seti I, in his stele from Gebel Barkal, explicitly associates Amun of Gebel Barkal with Re-Atum and Ptah, and the mountain itself with their shrines in Heliopolis and Memphis (Reisner and Reisner 1933b, 77). The same associations also carried over into the Napatan Period¹⁸

Seti I calls Gebel Barkal *Hwt-bnbn m Iwnw* ("Mansion of the *Benben* stone in Heliopolis") (Reisner and Reisner 1933b, 74, 77). The *Hwt-bnbn* was the shrine of Re-Atum that was believed to occupy the supposed original Primeval Hill of Heliopolis, the city known in Egyptian as *Iwnw* ("Pillars"). One can easily see why Gebel Barkal was a duplicate Heliopolis. Not only did it look like the mythical Primeval Hill, but its towering pinnacle seemed to be the ultimate *benben* and "Pillar," a stone that since hoary antiquity had been identified with Heliopolis and had phallic, procreative symbolism (Baines 1970; Kemp 1991, 85-89). Three other massive pilaster-like projections on the Barkal cliff would have evoked "Pillars." Like Gebel Barkal, Karnak was also called *Iwnw sm'w* ("Upper Egyptian Heliopolis") (Redford 1984, 95), and the kings of Dynasty 18 used Karnak for the erection of their obelisks, which evoked the *benben* and were probably thought to promote the fertility of the land (Ibid, 74-75).

The presence of reused *talatat* blocks at Karnak, Luxor and Gebel Barkal indicates that Akhenaten built at Thebes and Napata simultaneously (prior to his Year 5). Horemheb and his successors later dismantled all of these structures at virtually the same time. We know that at Karnak Akhenaten built four important sanctuaries. One was called the *Hwt-bnbn*, which was said to lie within another called *Gm-p3-itn* ("Finding the Aten") (Redford 1984, 71-78; Gohary 1992, 34-36). Obviously the latter name is recognizable as that of the ancient Nubian Kawa, near the Third Cataract. Since *Hwt-bnbn* was one of Seti's names for Gebel Barkal, we must conclude that Akhenaten's *Hwt-bnbn* at

15. See Kormysheva 2002, pagination yet unavailable.

e.

¹⁷ (16!) See Walker 1991, 55, 170-171, 179-180; FHN I 138, 195, 219.

¹⁸ (17!) Rundle-Clark 1991, 66.

¹⁸ "Ptah foremost of Nubia" is mentioned on an abacus in B 500; the same god appears on the south wall of the first chamber at Abu Simbel, associated with Re and Amun of Gebel Barkal. "Atum of Heliopolis" is also mentioned on an abacus in B 500. Following normal pharaonic practice, the Napatan kings likened themselves to Amun's procreative manifestations as Atum and Ptah, and even Thoth (FHN I 59, 137, 161, 195, 196, 201, 254, II 405, 474.

Karnak was the ritual "double" of the *Hwt-bnbn* that he had built at Gebel Barkal within a Nubian district called *Gm-p3-itn*. This suggests that the pharaohs built temples in Nubia and duplicated them at Karnak with shrines of the same names. They probably imagined that the magic power of each was transferred to the central shrine, which in turn imparted its own magic power back to them, thus strengthening both parts of the kingdom. Although Akhenaten tried to purge both Karnak and Gebel Barkal of their Amun cults, he obviously wished to honor both simultaneously as manifestations of Heliopolis. It was Heliopolis that he initially favored as the birthplace of the original solar creator god, Re-Atum, whose cult he promoted in the form of himself, with his "father" represented as the sun disk, the Aten. Even in Napatan times, an "Aten of Napata" was still venerated at Gebel Barkal (FHN I 233, 254).

Akhenaten's construction of like-named sanctuaries at Karnak and in Nubia was not unique. Amenhotep III built his *H3-m-m3't* ("Appearing as Truth") at Soleb, which had a like-named sanctuary at Karnak (Kozloff and Bryan 1992, 101). It has always seemed strange that Amenhotep III did no obvious work at Gebel Barkal. His vast expansion and beautification of Luxor, however, was probably thought to have honored the same god and to have fulfilled the same obligation. It also made it possible for the kings to "visit" Gebel Barkal easily, symbolically, without having to make the tedious two to three month journey upstream to reach the real site. Amenhotep III had probably visited Gebel Barkal as a young man (Breasted 1906, II 337-342, Kozloff and Bryan 1992, 37-38, 97). Ramses II, after having visited Kurgus,¹⁹ not only grandly enlarged the Amun temples at Karnak, Luxor, and Barkal, but also added numerous other temples to Amun and his various aspects throughout Nubia, including erecting his own *ka* temple at Abu Simbel. These were probably built largely as way stations and rest stops for the royal journey(s) between the "two Karnaks".

Luxor Temple has an unusual south-directed axis, unique among Amun temples in Egypt, but paralleled by those in Nubia at Kawa (Temples A and B) and by those presently being excavated Doukki Gel/Kerma (Macadam 1955, pl. 3; Bonnet, Valbelle and Ahmed 2000, figs. 2, 4). There is really no satisfactory explanation for this unless we see in it some relationship with the south and with the source of the Nile's inundation, which was associated with the procreative Amun who dwelt in Nubia (Pamminger 1992, 115; Kormysheva 2002). Bell has shown convincingly that Luxor was dedicated to the cult of the royal *ka*, which derived from the ithyphallic form of Amun, said to reside on a "Primeval Hill" at the south end of the temple (Bell 1985, 258-259, 290; 1997, 156). The most important festival held at Luxor was the Opet, which occurred during the second month of the inundation (modern September) (Ibid, 157-177). This festival involved the transport of the cult image of Amun of Karnak to Luxor,

tum and Ptah, and even Thoth (FHN I 59, 137, 161, 195, 196, 201, 254, II 405, 474.

¹⁹ W.V. Davies, "New Fieldwork at Kurgus: The Pharaonic Inscriptions." Lecture presented at the Ninth International Conference of Nubian Studies, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. August 21-26, 2002.

where it was ritually merged with the cult image of Amun of Luxor. The king, too, mystically united with the Luxor god, which was believed to transform him fully into his *ka*. The *ka* was a unique manifestation of the god in the person of the king. The merging of the god and king into the *ka* during the Opet was thought to return them both to the *sp-tpy* ("moment of creation"), when divinity and kingship and all the myriad, disparate divine aspects of nature were all one within the Creator (Ibid, 174-175). This seasonal union of the king and the god of Karnak within the mysterious medium of the Luxor god was thought to have the effect of renewing the creative powers of both for another year and giving them a kind of rebirth.

Looking at the sanctuary of Luxor Temple, we see that there is really no obvious "Primeval Hill" there, and no obvious sanctified site of great antiquity. The earliest archaeological evidence for a Luxor cult dates from the reign of Hatshepsut, who seems to have been the first to represent the Opet Festival and the first to create a processional way between Karnak and Luxor (Bell 1997, 147). Where did the idea of a "Primeval Hill" at Luxor come from, superseding even that of the (actually) much earlier Karnak? Why was this piece of real estate in south Thebes conceived as a place of Creation and rebirth for the god, the kingship, and the entire state? Why did the king grow rams' horns during the Opet Festival to symbolize his physical union with his primordial parent? Why is a ram-headed god associated with Luxor, when no ram-headed figures appear in the temple reliefs? If the god of Luxor was really the source of the royal *ka*, why did Amenhotep III and Ramses II construct temples to their *kas* in Nubia? The answers to all these questions must be that Luxor was not the real "Southern Sanctuary" but only its ritual substitute at Thebes. The real "Southern Sanctuary" - the "real" birthplace of the demiurge - was Gebel Barkal.

At Gebel Barkal, as we have seen, the earliest archaeological evidence for an Egyptian presence dates to year 47 of Thutmose III, whose Barkal Stele suggests that it was during his reign that the "miracle" took place that revealed Amun's presence there (Reisner and Reisner 1933a, 35). If Gebel Barkal was not discovered until the reign of Thutmose III, it obviously post-dates Luxor. But does it? Over his Kurgus inscription, near Abu Hamed, Thutmose I in his Year 2 (ca. 1502 BC) displayed the first known image of the ram-headed Amun, who was later associated with both Gebel Barkal and Luxor (Davies 1998, 27). The text also gives special emphasis to the god's name, Kamutef. This reveals that the ram-headed "southern Amun" of Luxor and Gebel Barkal was an alternate aspect of the ithyphallic, self-generating, primeval deity of "the first moment" (Paminger 1992, 93-95). This suggests that, by early Dynasty 18, the Egyptians had already identified Gebel Barkal, and Nubia in general, as the true source of Creation and the home of the primeval god who annually brought forth the inundation. In view of Hatshepsut's keen interest in developing the Luxor cult, we must suspect that she had already been apprised of the significance of Gebel Barkal by her father, and that Thutmose III, as probable first builder at Barkal, simply took the credit for the discovery of the cult. There actually

seems to be proof of this, which is preserved in Hatshepsut's Red Chapel at Karnak (Lacau and Chevrier 1977-1979, 133 ff; Yoyotte 1968, 85-91; Dorman 1988, 18-28; Callender 1995, 25-26). Here the queen, describing her elevation to the kingship, makes this remarkable declaration:

[My father Amun made a] very great oracle in the presence of this good god(=Thutmose I), proclaiming for me the kingship of the Two Lands, Upper and Lower Egypt, being under the fear of me, and giving to me all foreign lands, causing the victories of My Majesty to shine. Year 2, second month of Prt, third day of the festival of Amun, corresponding to the second day of these offerings of Sekhmet, being the ordination of the Two lands for me in the broad hall of 'Southern Sanctuary', while His Majesty [Amun] delivered an oracle in the presence of this good god.²⁰

The "good god" in question can hardly be anyone other than her father Thutmose I. The "Southern Sanctuary" can hardly be Luxor, since in the time of Thutmose I there was no known structure there, and even if there was, in his Year 2 Thutmose I was campaigning in Upper Nubia, in the vicinity of Gebel Barkal (Breasted 1906, II 29-32). One can only conclude, therefore, that "Southern Sanctuary," mentioned here, was Gebel Barkal. From this it is apparent that even in the reign of Thutmose I, Gebel Barkal was associated with Amun in his primeval form. Even then (at least in the imagination of the queen) it had a *wsht* ("broad hall"); it had an oracle that proclaimed and confirmed kingship for the pharaoh; it was associated with the goddess Sekhmet; and it was known as *Ipt-rsy*.

IV. The "Secrets" of Gebel Barkal.

In Dynasty 18, the Egyptians seem to have accorded Napata the same ritual status as some of their most ancient cities: Thebes, Heliopolis, Hermopolis, and Memphis. Each of these centers was connected with the cult of a major creator god and with a variant of the myth of the Primeval Hill. (eg. Rundle-Clark 1991, 35-67). Napata was obviously assigned this meaning because of the unusual aspect of Gebel Barkal, which evoked, perhaps better than any other landmark in the Nile Valley, the imagined form of the mythical mound-island of Creation. Set back some 2 km from the right bank of the Nile, its sheer front face was sometimes lapped by the river in flood, reminiscent of the *Nun*, the all-engulfing waters that enshrouded the Hill at Time's beginning (**fig. 11**).

Although the form of Gebel Barkal was highly suggestive of the Primeval Hill, the confirming feature, in ancient eyes, was its enormous pinnacle. This

nal Conference of Nubian Studies, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. August 21-26, 2002.

²⁰ Translation: Dorman 1988, 22. I am exceedingly grateful to Dr. Luc Gabolde of the Mission CNRS at Karnak for bringing this passage and the implications of Block 287 of the Red Chapel to my attention in March, 2002.

monolith, probably one of the great natural wonders of the ancient Egyptian experience, was phallic in shape and must have convinced all ancient onlookers immediately that Gebel Barkal was the very hill on which the Creator raised himself at the *sp-tpy*. There the god was said to have masturbated, and, by this act, to have engendered the first gods.²¹ The phallic pinnacle would have suggested to those present that the Creator must still be resident in the mountain and that his procreative powers must still emanate from there.

Among traditional Sudanese animist peoples of the Nuba Hills in Kordofan, large tubular stones or upright rock formations in phallic shape are still identified and worshiped as sources of generative power.²² Given the colossal size of the Barkal pinnacle, one can probably assume that the mountain had been the focus of just such a cult since prehistoric times. The Egyptians, encountering this cult, must readily have accepted its primacy and antiquity, for they were, after all, animists themselves - and probably by then the Egyptian and Nubian cults had already begun to coalesce at Kerma. Judging by the Kurgus inscription of Thutmose I, the Egyptians had obviously understood and accepted its meaning instantly and had integrated it into their state cult before the king's party had reached Kurgus. By that time, Gebel Barkal had probably long been associated with an indigenous Nubian ram god with phallic associations. When the Theban Amun arrived on the scene, he must immediately have absorbed the native god into his own being, just as he did all the major Egyptian gods. The result was that Amun and the Nubian god became one in name, with a shared dual being. He was both the ram-headed god that presided over Nubia and the ancient ithyphallic occupant of the Primeval Hill, who renewed creation each year by sponsoring the Nile inundation. Since the inundation sprang from uppermost Nubia, the Egyptians must have recognized in this newly discovered hill the prototype of all Primeval Hills in Egypt. Even though there were historically older sanctuaries of the Primeval Amun, such as that at Medinet Habu, which may have dated to Dynasty 11 (Hölscher 1939), the Egyptians probably came to believe that this temple was only a manifestation of Gebel Barkal and its "double", which was Luxor Temple. This explains why during the New Kingdom Luxor and Western Thebes were associated with the ram god of *Ipt-rsyt* (Pamminger 1992, 99-105) and why the Kushites later lavished attention on them.

The modern Nuba animist cults and that of Gebel Barkal, however, had still other features in common. Their venerated phallic stones also had multiple identities as male and female ancestor spirits and serpents, and they, too, were associated with fire.²³

nd the implications of Block 287 of the Red Chapel to my attention in March, 2002.
arch, 2002.

²² (21) See, for example, Pyramid Texts 1248-49; 1652-53; Coffin Texts II 18
xts 1248-49; 1652-53; Coffin Texts II 18

To understand the theology at work at Gebel Barkal, it is necessary first to understand how the Egyptians themselves understood the nature of Amun. His static images in temple reliefs or statues hardly reveal his extraordinary conceptual complexity (eg. Tobin 2001; Parker, Leclant, and Goyon 1979; Murnane 1995, 58-59; FHN I 181-184). His name meant "Hidden," which meant that he was really unfathomable, although one could gain knowledge of him by knowing "secrets," which were never publicly revealed or explained (eg. FHN I 59, 198, 199). Amun was said to be the oldest god, the father of the gods, and the king of the gods. He was the watery abyss, or *Nun*, of pre-Creation; he was the primordial serpent Neheb-kau ("Combiner of *kas*"); he was the Creator god of the Primeval Hill; he was also the Hill itself (Rundle-Clark 1991, 37-40). He was the Sun in all its separately deified aspects, as they were all aspects of him. He was thus one with Atum, Re, Khepri, and Horakhty, yet at other times he was separated from them (Morkot 2000, 147; FHN I 55, 233, 237, 272). He was god of heaven, god of the Nile inundation, god of fertility, and god of earth and mountains (FHN I 181-184). He was fertility personified, and thus was identified with all the ithyphallic and water gods, such as Min, Osiris, Khnum, and Sobek (Parker, Leclant, and Goyon 1979, 72; Kormysheva 2002). He was both male and female; he was called the "great He-She" and "Mother of Mothers and Father of Fathers." He was the king's own father, and as such he was also Re and Osiris, both of whom were fathers of Horus. Since his essence was manifested in the living king as the royal *ka*, he became all deified forms of his own son: Shu, Horus, Khonsu, etc. (Murnane 1991, 229; Bell 1985, 258-259). As Khonsu was the Moon, Amun was therefore not only the Sun but also the Moon, and these orbs became his two "Eyes" (Parker, Leclant, and Goyon 1979, 74-75). These "Eyes" were also personified as the divine uraeus ("Eye of Re") and the royal uraeus ("Eye of Horus"), and they, in turn, personified the royal crowns.²⁴ It was through these "Eyes" that the god incorporated within himself all forms and all identities of all the goddesses. Amun thus became his own mother, consort, and daughters (see below, Section VI). His titles were often those of the king; his own crowns and uraei were shared with the king, and in the being of the royal *ka* he was the king.²⁵ He gave existence to the king just as the setting sun gave existence to the rising sun. Both were aspects of the same being, passing eternally from one to the other. Amun, in short, was one "through whose manifestations all manifestations manifest themselves" (FHN I, 182).

52-53; Coffin Texts II 18

²⁴ (22) Bolton 1936, 92-108; Bell. 1936, 314-316.

²⁴ Walker 1991, 142-143; see also PT 1624-25: "The Eye has issued from your head as the Upper Egyptian Crown Weret-Hekau; the Eye has issued from your head as the Lower Egyptian Crown Weret-Hekau; PT 56: May the Eye of Horus which is in the mansions of the Red Crown awake in peace; PT 635: Horus has given to you his Eye that you may take possession of the *Wrrt*-crown by means of it at the head of the gods." gods."

Incredible as it may seem, Amun's strange polymorphic nature was ascribed and transferred directly and absolutely to the Gebel Barkal pinnacle. This strange statue-like rock early came to be conceived as a colossus of Amun in all his forms and became the ultimate "pantheistic" effigy (cf. Dunham 1950, pl. 54; Bongioanni and Croce, eds. 2001, 544-545). This rock never had only one identity or meaning; it was conceived in dozens, perhaps hundreds, of different esoteric ways, and all of these meanings and "manifestations" were accepted simultaneously. It was the intellectual challenge and perfection of this natural wonder that ensured Gebel Barkal its religious and political importance, for the mountain could be visibly "proven" to be the place where Creation had commenced. It was here, before the *sp-tpy*, that all divine power had been concentrated in the supreme One, and where, at that moment, it had then been released into the world in its myriad separate parts ("*kas*" and "*bas*"). Gebel Barkal thus was perceived not only as the place where time began but also as the place where it began over and over again: every day, every year at New Year, at every coronation, and at every Heb-Sed, all of which were metaphoric and ritual renewals of the "first moment."

I shall now examine some of the "manifestations" of Amun in the pinnacle. We have seen that this towering shaft was suggestive of an erect phallus, thus evoking the presence of Amun-Kamutef and Atum and any and all of the other ithyphallic deities such as Geb, Min, and Osiris. For this reason, it was likened to Atum's special symbol, the *benben* stone of Heliopolis, which meant that Gebel Barkal itself "was" Heliopolis, just as it "was" also Karnak. In the same way, the pinnacle was surely also associated with the tall, phallic-like *shnt* shrine of Min, which is featured prominently in the reliefs of both Luxor and Soleb (Munro 1983; Ogdon 1985-86; Isler 1991, 158-161; Schiff Giorgini 1998, pl. 122) (**fig. 12**). When viewed from the east, the rock had the vague appearance of a gigantic standing royal figure, wearing the White Crown (**fig. 13**). This was how nineteenth and twentieth century observers imagined it, and some were convinced it was the remains of an actual statue (Cailliaud 1826, III 200; Budge 1907, 130-131; Arkell 1947, 214-215; Chittick 1957). There is now no doubt that the ancients imagined it in same way (see below, Section V). In this form it was a royal figure, symbolizing the living king or the recently deceased king, or a remote royal ancestor, or the eternal king, Osiris, or Atum wearing a Double Crown. Atum was, after all, the reflection of the living king (Mysliwiec 1978; 2001; Walker 1991; FHN I 59, 137, 147, 195, 254).

The ancients believed that Amun dwelt behind the pinnacle, "hidden" (= *Imn*) within the mountain. In art he is shown either as an anthropomorphic or criocephalic man, standing or sitting within the mountain, which is shown in cross-section (Macadam 1949, 33, pl. 12). Sometimes he is accompanied by Mut (Robisek 1989, 53; Dunham 1970, pl. 56c). Once, he is represented within the mountain as his son Shu, accompanied by Tefnut (Wildung 1997, 270). In one of these scenes, the mountain is rendered entirely as a rearing serpent, whose body arches protectively over the god seated beneath it (**fig. 14**) (Priese 1993,

34, fig. 31a, and see below).²⁶ In other scenes the mountain appears as a cut-away shrine with the pinnacle represented as a uraeus rearing from its front. Normally the uraeus-pinnacle is shown crowned with a sun disk, a form the rock actually assumes when viewed from the west (Robisek 1989, 53; Griffith 1922, pl. 47; Hintze 1971, Taf. 59; Gamer-Wallert 1983, Taf. 59, Bl. 11a) (**figs. 15, 16**). In a scene from Abu Simbel, however, the pinnacle is shown as a uraeus crowned with the White Crown, a form which the rock assumes when viewed from the east (Kendall 1997b, 169; cf. also Dunham 1970, pl. 56c) (**figs. 17**). Already here we see that the pinnacle had different forms and meanings depending upon the direction from which one viewed it, yet these meanings were all always united in the one being of the pinnacle. This meant that the pinnacle possessed all these meanings and identities simultaneously, just as did Amun.

When Gebel Barkal was represented entirely as a serpent under which the god sat, it probably assumed the identity of a number of mythological mounds that appeared in art and religious literature as serpents over-arching gods. Doubtless Gebel Barkal was imagined to be any or all of them, depending on the context, just as they each probably were imagined to be manifestations of it. To recognize these sacred mounds we need to remember that Amun shared identities with Atum, Osiris, Khnum, and even Sobek, so that all their respective mounds became one with Amun's. We also need to remember that Amun himself was both the Primeval Mound personified as well as the serpent god of the waters, Nehebkau, who, in Taharqa's Edifice at Karnak, was called "the god of those who are in their mounds" (Parker, Leclant, and Goyon 1979, 72-73). Amun, then, represented at once the god inside the mountain in all of his different forms, the mountain itself and all mountains, and the enveloping serpent of all mountains in all of its forms.

In the most common scene of this type, the god appears standing on the deck of the night bark, enshrouded by the protective serpent god Mehen, whose figure, like the serpent-mountain itself, assumes the figure of a tall sideways "S" (Piccione 1990 and refs.) (**fig. 18**). That the snake actually represents a "mound" on the deck of the bark and not just a serpent is indicated by occasional comments in the Book of the Dead.²⁷ The god on the boat beneath the serpent is Atum, but typically he has a ram's head with the long straight horns of Khnum, associating him with the inundation and the primordial waters (Kormysheva 2002, [pagination unavailable]). In this case, the god is closely associated with

ds."

²⁶ (Ignore).

²⁶ It was our colleague Lynn Holden who in 1987 first recognized the serpent as the pinnacle in the relief in B 300. This was the major breakthrough leading to all subsequent discoveries. It was also he, shortly thereafter, who brought the Abu Simbel relief to my attention.

was also he, shortly thereafter, who brought the Abu Simbel relief to my attention.

²⁷ Eg. Spell 15B1b2 "I shall establish for him a mound in the bark of millions of years..." (Allen 1974, 20).

Osiris, the underworld, night, death, and primeval time as he sails through the river below to reach rebirth at dawn. In Pyramid Texts "south" is sometimes identified with "west", "night", "death", and "primeval time". "North" is identified with "east", "day", "life", and "present time".²⁸ Thus it is easy to see how Gebel Barkal (=South) became associated with the Mound of Atum (=Heliopolis) on the night bark. It is also easy to see how they and the "Mound of Djeme" in Western Thebes became associated, as well as with the ram-headed Amun (Pamminger 1992, 101-103), and how Atum, Amun, Khnum and Osiris all merged into the same being.

In rarer scenes, Atum, with or without the horns and crown of Khnum, has become the "S" shaped Mehen/Nehebkau serpent himself (eg. Ogdon 1985-86, 38, fig. 2, 3; Myslewicz 1978, 95-124) (**fig. 19**). Sometimes he appears in transformation from human to serpent in images of the god with serpent or eel body and human head, wearing the double crown (Ibid, 279-283). Since the snake/eel was associated with the primeval waters and personified the inundation, and since the waters were closely associated with the far south, one sees that the serpent was a symbol not only for the Primeval Mound but also for the Primeval river itself - the river of the South. The common form of the god, as a tall sideways S, may therefore be an iconic symbol for the great bend of the Nile in Nubia, with Gebel Barkal protected under its meandering coil (**fig. 20**).

The motif of the serpent-mountain enshrouding a god appears several times in the tombs of Thutmose III and Amenhotep II (Piankoff 1954, fig. 80) (**fig. 21**). That these scenes were inspired of confirmed by Gebel Barkal is suggested by their close association with female headed uraei (Weret-Hekau) and the goddess Sekhmet, motifs closely associated with the mountain, as I will explain below. Also strongly reminiscent of Gebel Barkal is another scene from a mythological papyrus of Dynasty 21, in which Osiris appears as an ithyphallic being resting on a mountainside surrounded by a great serpent (Piankoff 1957, 76, pl. 2). I do not wish to suggest that these were intended to represent Gebel Barkal, but I mention them to show that Gebel Barkal must have absorbed and projected all of the same mythology.

In a relief at Abu Simbel, Amun is represented with a crocodile head, which emphasizes his association again with the Nile, with the inundation, and with river creatures, and reveals his syncretism with the crocodile god Sobek (Brovarski 1984; Kormysheva 2002 Parker, Leclant, and Goyon 1979, 72). Sobek was a god originally linked to the Fayum, but he subsequently fused with Re and hence with Amun and became a creator god with universal standing. In the Book of the Dead, Sobek is associated with a "Mound of *B3hw*", which was associated with the mountain at el-Hibeh (Brovarski 1984, 2002). The mountain, which marked the northern border of the Thebaid and Upper Egypt,

hall establish for him a mound in the bark of millions of years..." (Allen 1974, 20).

²⁸ For example, CT I 185: "May you sail southward in the Night Bark and northward in the Day Bark....O *Nt*-Crown, O *In*-Crown, O Weret-Hekau, O fiery Serpent..." (Faulkner 1994, I 36).

was also known as *T3-Dhnt* ("The Cliff") (i.e. modern Tehne) (Aufrère and Golvin 1997, 221-223), a name it shared with Gebel Barkal, which marked the southern border of the "Thebaid" and "Upper Egypt".²⁹ In the Book of the Dead the Mound of *B3hw*, like Gebel Barkal, was also identified with the shrine-mound on the night bark (Allen 1974, 19, Spell 15A4). What is extraordinary is that in these texts the mountain is said to have a projecting "snake... of flint", "30 cubits long", remarkably suggestive of the uraeus-serpent of Gebel Barkal (Allen 1974, 85, Spell 108; cf. also Spell 149d). Thus we see that "the Cliff" of the north and "the Cliff" of the south, were reflections of each other, as were their deities, and these established the poles of the authority symbolized by the White Crown, as did the "two Karnaks."

Normally the serpent on Gebel Barkal was represented as a uraeus and had female associations. When the pinnacle was conceptualized as a uraeus, crowned with a sun disk, it was seen as the uraeus-protector of the Sun God and was known as the "Eye of Re." The words *irt* ('eye') and *i'rt* ("uraeus") were puns on each other and constantly shared each other's meanings (fig. 26).³⁰ The "Eye of Re" was the name of the ultimate female divinity, for she was the great goddess in whom all goddesses could manifest themselves singly and in whom all the goddesses could unite as a single being (Walker 1991, 109-117). The Eye of Re was most commonly associated with Hathor, Mut, Isis, Nephthys, Ma'at, Bastet, Anukis, Satis, Tefnut, Sekhmet, Weret-Hekau, and others, who were all thought to be the god's daughters, mothers, and defenders (Ibid 1991, 185-191; Zabkar 1988, 69, 107). The uraeiform pinnacle would have seemed to confirm the presence at Gebel Barkal of each goddess and all goddesses, united as the Eye-Uraeus. It is thus hardly surprising that these goddesses came to be worshiped in temples built directly below the pinnacle on its west side (B 200 and 300). It is from just this angle that the rock appears so convincingly as the "Eye of Re," wearing a spherical or sun-disk crown on its "head."

In a well-known myth cycle the Eye of Re was said to have quarreled with her father, the Creator, and to have left him in order to dwell in faraway Nubia. The story of how the anger of this goddess was appeased, how she transformed from one goddess form to another, and how she was brought back to Egypt to become her father's uraeus is one of the mainstays of Egyptian mythology (see Junker 1911; 1917; Smith 1984; Desroches Noblecourt 1995). From this, it is obvious that Gebel Barkal must have been identified as the place where the "Distant Goddess" dwelt in all of her manifestations.³¹ Taharqa's temples B 200 and 300

rk....O *Nt*-Crown, O *In*-Crown, O Weret-Hekau, O fiery Serpent..." (Faulkner 1994, I 36).
ekau, O fiery Serpent..." (Faulkner 1994, I 36).

²⁹ (29) See discussion below, Section XI.

³⁰ Walker 1991, 143. Note also PT 2206: "This king ...is the uraeus (*irt*) which came forth from the Eye of Re (*i'rt R*')."

6: "This king ...is the uraeus (*irt*) which came forth from the Eye of Re (*i'rt R*')."

³¹ Note FHN I 159, in which Taharqa calls himself "beloved of Bastet, who dwells in *Bwgm*." "*Bwgm*" was the name of the place in Nubia where the Eye of Re was supposed to dwell. Gebel

preserve reliefs showing her transformations from leonine form (south=Gebel Barkal) to human form (north=Egypt). Whether the Barkal pinnacle inspired this myth of her Nubian sojourn, or whether it merely confirmed it, remains to be seen.

In a relief of Ramses II at Abu Simbel, the pinnacle is pictured as a uraeus wearing the White Crown (**fig. 17**). Here the rock suddenly becomes Nekhbet, goddess of Upper Egypt and one of the two royal uraeus goddesses. As I will discuss below (Sections VIII-IX), there were also two other temples built directly in front of the pinnacle that are now almost totally destroyed (B 1100 and 1150). These were almost certainly dedicated to both of the royal uraei, Nekhbet and Wadjet. Both of these goddesses, too, were imagined to exist within the rock, although to be sure Nekhbet's profile is by far the more obvious. Although there is no direct evidence for it, the form of Wadjet, goddess of Lower Egypt, was probably imagined in the pinnacle wearing the Red Crown. A Red Crown can vaguely be discerned in the pinnacle summit when the rock is viewed from the west ("north") side (**fig. 16**). When these twin royal uraeus goddesses merged into one uraeus (as they usually did on the pharaoh's crown) they became the goddess of the crown, Weret-Hekau ("Great of Magic").³² This single royal uraeus was also known as the "Eye of Horus," just as the god's uraeus was called the "Eye of Re" (Westendorf 1977, 49-50).³³ Together, as we have noted above, these formed the two "Eyes (=Uraei) of God."³⁴

Barkal has never been called by this name explicitly, but the iconography of B 300 leaves little reason to doubt that Gebel Barkal was the imagined place of her residency. Certainly all of her forms were thought to reside within the pinnacle.

residency. Certainly all of her forms were thought to reside within the pinnacle.

³² Weret-Hekau is the name of the royal crown personified as a goddess. (For example PT 194-195, 196: "He has come to you, O Red Crown, ...O fiery Serpent, ...O Great One, ...O Weret-Hekau" [and cf. CT I 185]). Her name was written with the determinatives of the Red and White Crowns over dual *nb*-signs, or with the Double Crown over a single *nb* sign (Faulkner 1962, 64). Like all goddesses, she assumed many forms. She could appear simply as a woman, as, for example, in the Taharqa coronation relief at Kawa (Macadam 1955, 95, pl. 22), or she could appear as Hathor, wearing the horned disk, as in the Heb-Sed scenes of Amenhotep III at Soleb (M. Schiff Giorgini et al. 1998, pl. 50). She could appear with the head of a lioness, as at Medinet Habu, where she was simultaneously identified as Sekhmet and Bastet (Walker 1991, p. 111). She could also appear as a rearing cobra with a woman's head, crowned with the *swty* crown of two tall plumes, which is customarily worn by queens and god's wives. The most famous example of this iconography is found on a gold plaque from the tomb of Tutankhamun, where the human-headed serpent goddess appears (with the face of Queen Tiye) nursing the king (Troy 1986, 72, fig. 46). An unnamed statue of the goddess in this guise is in the University of Pennsylvania Museum (Capel and Markoe 1996, cat. 71.) We may also recognize a relief on the north wall of the tomb chapel of Arkamani at Meroe (Beg. N. 7) as a picture of Gebel Barkal with Weret-Hekau (Dunham and Chapman 1952, pl. 4, E). Here the mountain appears as a bench on which sit the gods Amun (as Re), Weret-hekau (wearing the *swty*), Hathor (wearing disk and horns), and the pinnacle itself as a uraeus. See also Nebe 1986.

Weret-hekau (wearing the *swty*), Hathor (wearing disk and horns), and the pinnacle itself as a uraeus. See also Nebe 1986.

If the pinnacle, as uraeus, represented all the different goddesses, its dual-sexed nature meant that it could also be masculine. Among ancient graffiti on the west side of Gebel Barkal, there is a crude representation of a ram-headed Amun sitting inside the mountain, which takes the form of a sort of box with a bent top. In front of this is a ram-headed uraeus with upraised human arm supporting a flail (**fig. 22**). This obviously is the pinnacle in the form of the ithyphallic Amun Kamutef in transformation to or from the metaphoric phallic form of a rearing serpent. A variant of this unusual figure appears again in a bronze ram-headed uraeus, found in B 700 (Wildung 1997, 199-200) (**fig. 23**). And as if to confirm the close cultic relationship between Luxor and Gebel Barkal, a granite statue of a rearing uraeus, set up at Luxor Temple by Taharqa, is identified on one side as "Amun-Kamutef" and on the other, as Amun, "Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands" (El-Saghir 1991, 52-54) (**fig. 24**).

In Meroitic art, rulers often wear crowns having uraei that are male rather than female. These exhibit ram or lion heads (Török 1987, figs. 22, 24, 26, 64-65, 85, 150) (**fig. 25**). The reason for the male uraei is obvious. If the pinnacle was thought to represent all forms of the royal and divine uraei, and if these uraei were proven, through phallic association, to be male as well as female, then the uraei must be dual-sexed, like the pinnacle and like the Creator god himself.

In mythology, the familiar female uraei, the "Eye of Re" and the "Eye of Horus," were personified as the sun and the moon respectively (Rundle-Clark

³³ Eg. PT 900-901: "O King, the dread of you is in the intact Eye of Horus, (namely) the White Crown, the serpent-goddess who is in Nekheb....I provide you with the Eye of Horus, the Red Crown, rich in power and many-natured, that it may protect you, O King, just as it protects Horus..." (Faulkner 1969, 157). Sometimes the two royal uraei are called the two eyes of Horus, as in PT 33: "Take the two eyes of Horus, the black and the white; take them to your forehead that they may illumine your face." (Faulkner 1969, 9, and see also PT 40+1, 71. The association of Weret-Hekau, Nekhbet and the Eye of Horus is made clear in PT 2285: "O Osiris the King, take the Eye of Horus ... for its magic is great on me. O Osiris the King, take the Eye of Horus, great of magic - a Great of Magic (i.e. Weret-Hekau) vulture" (Faulkner 1969, 318). eat of magic - a Great of Magic (i.e. Weret-Hekau) vulture" (Faulkner 1969, 318).

³⁴ A great many Egyptian religious texts make it evident that there were really no distinctions between the "Eye of Re" and "Eye of Horus." Both these two uraei and the goddesses implied in each all eventually overlapped, merged and shared identities, so that the uraei of the divine and royal crowns really became the same thing in the minds of the ancients. Because the king was seen as an incarnation and youthful manifestation of the god, his uraeus was often said to be the same as the god's, and *vice versa* (Walker 1991, 141-143). The "Eye of Horus," for example, was sometimes said to be on the brow of the Sun God (Ibid, 143). It was also said to protect Atum (Faulkner 1994, I 238-239; CT IV: 98-109). Weret-Hekau was also called Ma'at, the "Eye of Re" (Walker 1991, 119). Mut is called the Weret-Hekau of Thebes (Ibid, 188). And Weret-Hekau is sometimes identified as both "Eyes" (Ibid, 142). We see therefore that all the goddesses merged and converged within each uraeus and both uraei, just as they merged and converged within the pinnacle, which must have been seen as a colossal statue (*ka*) of each goddess and all of them combined.

1991, 218-230). From this we realize that the pinnacle must also have had solar and lunar associations. The “Eye of Re,” of course, was the eye of the Sun, personified as his daughter, who fled in anger from him and later returned to protect him. The “Eye of Horus,” on the other hand, was the eye of the Sun's child and youthful counterpart. This eye was plucked out of its socket when Horus and Seth engaged in their violent quarrel over the kingship, and it broke into pieces. Thoth reassembled the pieces, and this Eye became the waxing and waning moon.

Among the amulets found at el-Kurru, there is a notable pair of large faience *wd3t* eyes that reveal the fusion of the concepts “eye” (*wd3t*), “uraeus” (*w3dyt*), “green” (*w3d*), “sun” and “moon”.³⁵ In each amulet, which is blue-green faience, the space between the upper lid of the eye and brow is filled with a pair of winged uraei (“Wadjty”), which face a small eye (*wd3t*). Under the lower lid, within the falcon-like eye markings, are images of a winged scarab (Khepri=“Sun”) and a squatting baboon with lunar crown (Thoth=“Moon”) (Dunham 1950, pl. 53A) (**fig. 26**).³⁶

If the uraei of god and king were conceptualized as sun and moon, perhaps this begins to explain why the uraei sometimes have ram and lion heads. The lion god Apedemak, famously depicted as both a lion-headed man and a serpent (Zabkar 1975, pls. 8, 25), is often represented with lunar imagery (Wenig 1978, 68, 274). His “fiery blast” aimed at enemies, described in a text from Musawwarat es-Sufra, is a familiar trait of female uraei (FHN II 583; cf. Rundle-Clark 1991, 221-223). Apedemak thus would be the masculine form of the “Eye of Horus,” as Amun would be the masculine form of the “Eye of Re.”³⁷

ve been seen as a colossal statue (*ka*) of each goddess and all of them combined.

³⁵ The punning on the first three concepts is explicit in the following: PT 96: “the green (*w3d*) eye of Horus (*wd3t*)”; PT 1459: “I am he who grasps the White Crown, Master of the Curl of the Green Crown (*W3d*=Red Crown of Wadjet); I am the uraeus which went forth from Seth...I am he who takes care of (?) the Red One which came out of...I am the Eye of Horus...” (Faulkner 1969, 31, 225). See also Walker 1991, 142: The Eye of Horus belongs to Re-Horakhty, which adorns him “in its name of Wadjty”.

The Eye of Horus belongs to Re-Horakhty, which adorns him “in its name of Wadjty”.

³⁶ Three other amulets from the same group are identical on the obverse and portray the head of Bat (=Hathor) surmounted by an eye. The tresses of her hair are a pair of uraei. Each amulet thus represents Hathor as “eye” and “uraeus pair”. The reverse of these amulets are each inscribed differently. The first is incised with an eye surmounted by the crown of Amun-Re, indicating its identity as Re/Eye of Re. The second bears the image of an eye, beside which Horus stands on a uraeus. This eye would be Horus/Eye of Horus. The other is incised with an image of the Double Crown on a *nb* base, which is the spelling of the name of Weret-Hekau (Dunham 1950, pl. 53A, B).

b base, which is the spelling of the name of Weret-Hekau (Dunham 1950, pl. 53A, B).

³⁷ Note that the wife and female counterpart of Apedemak, Amesemi, wears a headdress crested by a figure of a falcon (Horus), or a falcon standing on a crescent moon. Thus she herself must be

Given the merging beings of Amun and Apedemak in the royal uraei, we can see that the pinnacle-uraeus must also have represented both of these gods simultaneously (a fact which will be proved below, Section V). Since even the king is identified as the "Eye of Horus" in the Pyramid texts,³⁸ we see that the pinnacle must represent not only the sun god in all his forms, but also the moon god, his child, in all of his. The pinnacle thus would represent the god and king - in all their conceivable forms - merged into a single being, which is the very essence of Kamutef (see below, Section VI).³⁹

V. Chapters 162-167 of the Book of the Dead.

Many of the above interpretations of the Barkal pinnacle will seem highly suspect to the "uninitiate." However the rules of this strange association game are confirmed by Chapters 162-165 and 167 of the Book of the Dead - the so-called "Nubian chapters."⁴⁰ Chapter 163 actually makes reference to "the *ipt* (or *Npt*= 'Napata'), headland of Nubia," and the others employ unknown words which are specifically designated as "of the Nubian speech" (Allen 1974, 157-162). The texts all seem to be describing, by means of puns and divine associations, the same sort of infinitely layered theology as that which I have traced above. The earliest known versions of these texts belong to Dynasty 21, but they are obviously older. They must have been composed in the New Kingdom. They obviously continued in use in Egypt through Ptolemaic times, so they reveal an Egyptian awareness of and interest in the mysteries of Gebel Barkal even centuries after it ceased to be under their political control.

A straight translation of these texts results in a series of nonsensical passages. Yet if one knows the "secrets" of the pinnacle, as traced above, the texts make

a peculiarly Meroitic female personification of the "Eye of Horus," which is the Moon (see *Orientalia* 69, fasc. 3 [2000], pl. 32, fig. 29).

of Horus," which is the Moon (see *Orientalia* 69, fasc. 3 [2000], pl. 32, fig. 29).

³⁸ For example, PT 976: "O men, a serpent is bound for the sky, but I (i.e. the king) am the Eye of Horus...I take my departure as the Eye of Horus; PT 1147: "I am a snake multitudinous of coils; I am the scribe of the god's book, who says what is and brings about what is not...I (i.e. the king) am this Eye of Horus, which is stronger than men and mightier than the gods"; PT 1916-1920: "O King...cleanse yourself with (waters of the Canal of the God) as a god and go forth thence as the Eye of Re..." (Faulkner 1969, 166, 186, 277.

d) as a god and go forth thence as the Eye of Re..." (Faulkner 1969, 166, 186, 277.

³⁹ The lunar aspect of the king is well illustrated in the mirror of Nastasen, where the disk into which the king looked is supported by a lunar crescent, held by a handle bearing figures of Amun and Re and Mut and Hathor. When the king looked into the mirror, he saw his face reflected as the moon god Khonsu-Horus, the son of Mut-Hathor and Amun-Re (Wildung 1997, 238-239).. moon god Khonsu-Horus, the son of Mut-Hathor and Amun-Re (Wildung 1997, 238-239)..

⁴⁰ Dr. Leonard Lesko recognized these chapters as "Nubian" and discussed them in his paper at the Ninth International Conference of Egyptology in Cairo (March 28-April 3, 2000). When I heard his very important presentation I realized at once these chapters must be referring to the "hidden" meanings of the Gebel Barkal pinnacle.

perfect sense. Four of the texts (162-3, 165 and 167) are addressed variously to Amun, Osiris, and a "Great Lion", while the other (164) is addressed to Sekhmet-Bastet "Eye of Re," who is also called Weret-Hekau and Mut.

In these texts Amun and the lion, called "Heq", seem to be forms of each other, perhaps directional reflections, or perhaps pacified and unpacified aspects of each other. In Spell 162, for example, this dual being is called "Lord of the White Crown (*wrrt*)." He is said to be "equipped with the flail," and he is "Lord...of the phallus," indicating his association with Kamutef and the Pinnacle-Phallus-White Crown. He is also called "Lion of Might" (*rw shm*), which recalls by pun that in Spell 164 the leonine goddess Sekhmet-Bastet, "Eye of Re," is called his "royal wife." *Shm* is simply the masculine form of *shmt*, again suggesting that the pinnacle combined male and female principles. Since Sekhmet was the "unpacified" form of the "Eye of Re," the lion was probably the unpacified form of Amun. Later in the text the lion is called "Embracer of the Great Goddess," suggesting again that they were two beings, male and female, united as one in the pinnacle. Finally, he is described as "Lord of Forms, numerous of beings, who conceals himself in the Eye (*wd3t=W3dyt*) from his children." In other words, the many forms of the lion are "hidden" (*Imn*) in the form of the Eye-Uraeus-Phallus-Pinnacle, while he is nonetheless visible as a figure wearing the White Crown. Spell 162 concludes by applying the lion's epithets to the deceased, who is Osiris. This reveals that the Lion and Osiris are also one being. One of his epithets is "Tail of the Ram-Lion," showing that he is also Amun in a state of transformation to or from a ram.

Amun and Osiris here are clearly forms of each other, but they are personifications of different time. Amun represents day, life and present time; Osiris represents night, death, and past time, or transition to new life. They converge and separate as Khepri at dawn and reconverge as Atum in the evening. In Spell 163, the deceased, as Osiris, is described as one who is "hidden (*imn*) within the Pupil of the Eye (*wd3t*)." This Pupil is called "Creator of the *ka* (*ir k3*)." Later in the text, Amun is addressed in the same way: "O Amun, you bull (*k3*), Khepri, lord of the Two Eyes (*wd3ty=W3dty*), Fierce of Pupil is your name. Osiris is the image (*tit*) of your two Eyes. Enchainers (*srsr*) is the name of one; Crusher (*sp*), who creates the *ka*, is the name of the other." Here we learn that "Osiris is hidden (*imn*)" within the Eye-Uraeus-Pinnacle. This phrase can as well be translated "Osiris is Amun within the Eye-Uraeus-Pinnacle". We must conclude therefore that the pinnacle contains a "hidden" figure that is both Osiris and Amun. The text then states cryptically: "He it is who sets northwest of the *ipt* (or *Npt*: 'Napata'), headland of Nubia, without journeying to the east."

This text makes no sense unless we stand on the southeast side of Gebel Barkal at sunset and gaze to the northwest at the profile of the pinnacle, which assumes the exact form of a standing figure of Osiris wearing the White Crown. The phrase "without journeying to the east" can only be understood with reference to the local Nile, which here flows from northeast to southwest, making true "east" the same as "river west". When the sun rises in the east, in other words, it is

again "west" in terms of the "upside-down" river. The implication is that Osiris can live eternally here, for there is really no "east". At Gebel Barkal, the upper world and the underworld have become the same, or perhaps they have simply merged with primeval time, before there was a difference.

Ironically Spell 162 Variant contradicts this while reminding us of the pinnacle's lunar associations. Speaking of Osiris; the text states: "You dawn in the eastern horizon of the sky.... you dawn as the moon...You have seen the aging of Thoth; You come as the inundation..." Then it concludes: "Your *ka* is enduring, and your phallus is within the maidens. You resume your form as yesterday...You are lord of the Uraeus (*i'rt*)."

VI. Gebel Barkal as Residence of Kamutef and Source of the Royal *Ka*.

In Spell 163 one of the Eyes-Uraei is named "Creator of the *ka*." A few lines later, Amun himself is called *Ka* ("Bull"), which is an abbreviation of his full name Kamutef ("Bull of his Mother"). The goddess within the Eyes-Uraei is thus his "mother". After combining all the male and female deities mentioned in the text into a single entity (i.e. the Gebel Barkal pinnacle), the spell informs us that "Atum...is his real true name."

Since the living king was a manifestation of Atum when he wore the Double Crown, and since he was a manifestation of Amun as *Ka* ("Bull"), and since he was a manifestation of Osiris, we see that the pinnacle was conceptualized simultaneously as an image of the primeval god, the primeval king, the living god and the living king. In other words, it was at Gebel Barkal, rather than at Luxor, where all aspects of god and royal being converged physically in the natural rock to fulfill the meaning of "Kamutef" (cf. Bell 1985, 258-259; Traunecker 2001, 221-222).

The name of Kamutef can be translated in different ways that reveal the mysterious and complex nature of the god, as traced above. These meanings are derived from the various interpretations of the word "*ka*". When written with the "bull" hieroglyph, as it was in the normal spelling of the god's name, it meant literally "bull." But this word also concealed the meaning "phallus" and suggested the bull's procreative act and power. This spelling, however, was also a pun on an identical word, written with the "open arms hieroglyph". This word, for want of a more precise English equivalent, is usually translated "divine double" (cf. Faulkner 1964, 283; Bolshakov 2001, 215-217).

The name of Kamutef ("Bull of his Mother") is usually taken to mean that Amun (as "Bull/phallus") impregnated his wife-consort, the goddess Mut ("Mother"), who gave birth to him as "Bull" and thus became his "mother". Since the kings in their titularies are always called "Bull," the name Kamutef also refers to Amun's manifestation of himself as his own son, the king (Kessler

2001, 211).⁴¹ In this way the god was simultaneously father and son, and the living king was the god's filial aspect of himself. In biological terms, of course, this makes no sense, but in Egyptian solar terms it was completely logical. The sun (Amun-Re) was one being, but he had separately personified aspects. Atum (the old sun at sunset), Re (the strong sun of midday), and Khepri/Horakhty (the child sun of dawn).⁴² As each god daily transformed from one to the other, each became parent or son of himself through the one being of Amun-Re. Since the living king was likened to the sun god in all these phases, he was always an integral part of this strange genealogy.

The mythological concept of the *ka* ("Bull"=Procreator) becoming the *ka* ("Bull"= the king) played out in reality through the medium of the *ka* ("divine double"). Although the king was a mortal man, he was thought to be born with an exact duplicate of himself that was also shared by Amun, his father. During the king's coronation and each year thereafter in the Opet ceremony, as well as during the king's Heb-Sed or Jubilee, the king ritually united with his *ka*. When this happened the king was thought to share a common essence with the Creator, and the Creator was thought to be manifest in the living king. Each of these ceremonies was thought to set the clock back to the *sp-tpy*, so that each new reign and each New Year became a replay of the moment of Creation, when all royal and divine power were combined in the one great god. This was why, upon his coronation, the king was given a special "throne name" that described his own unique *ka*-aspect of the god. "Kamutef," when translated "Ka of his Mother" also meant that the child of Mut was that mysterious being ("divine double") in which the king and god were joined as one.

If we take the name Kamutef in another way, we see that the god actually becomes his own mother. As stated in Spell 163, it is she, within him, who is the "creator of the *ka*." If he is the "'Divine Double' of his Mother" then he must also be her exact reflection, and thus must be female. If, on the other hand, we translate the name as "Phallus of his Mother," Mut becomes an exact reflection of him, and thus must be male. These intellectual imponderables are given form in the vignettes accompanying the "Nubian Spells" of the Book of the Dead.

The vignette accompanying Spell 163 includes a pair of winged eyes with legs, symbolizing the two "Eyes" in the texts – the "Eyes of Re and Horus" or, in other words, the divine and royal uraei, which symbolize all the goddesses manifested in the Barkal pinnacle. The same vignette also includes a pair of dwarf beings (Ptah?) sharing the posture and attributes of Kamutef - one with double falcon head and *swty* crown, symbolizing Re.⁴³ These figures are said to

e chapters must be referring to the "hidden" meanings of the Gebel Barkal pinnacle.

⁴² (41) See also FHN I 42, 86, 107, 128; FHN II 440, 464, 474 etc.

⁴³ For eloquent expression of these concepts see Horemheb's Hymn to Atum-Re-Harakhty in Murnane 1995, 228-230.

of these concepts see Horemheb's Hymn to Atum-Re-Harakhty in Murnane 1995, 228-230.

be “what is in the pupils” of the Eyes. They are, in other words, the hidden forms of the god within the Pinnacle-Phallus-Uraei (Allen 1974, 159-160). These figures flank another, which is described in the text as “(an image of) Mut having three faces - one like the face of *Ph3t* (“Revealed One”=a lioness [i.e. Sekhmet, Tefnut, Weret-Hekau, Wadjet]) wearing twin plumes (*swty*), another like a human face wearing the White Crown and Red Crown, another like a vulture’s face (i.e. Nekhbet) wearing twin plumes. She possesses a phallus, wings, and lion’s claws” (fig. 27) (Faulkner 1972, 163; Allen 1974, 160-161). Amun Kamutef, therefore, is revealed as the god who combines father, mother, and child, and all of their infinite forms, within himself. He is all forms of creation yet unborn. An amulet from Ku. 54 (Boston MFA 24.645) takes the form of a ram-headed pregnant winged goddess, which apparently depicts the god at the moment of his giving birth (Dunham 1950, pl. 51A, 1380)!

One royal ritual that took place at Luxor Temple during the later Eighteenth Dynasty was the coronation of the king. In Section III above, I quoted a text of Hatshepsut, in which her father Thutmose I supposedly announced her kingship from "Southern Sanctuary." Horemheb, too, has left us an account of his coronation at "Southern Sanctuary" (Gardiner 1953; Murnane 1995, 230-233). These rites took place generally on New Year's Day, which was the annual symbolic repeat of the *sp-tpy*, when the Nile, at its lowest and weakest in mid-summer, suddenly began its miraculous rise. At this time, the king was united with his divine parent and reborn as the sun on earth. The close relationship of the king and kingship to the Creator is revealed in the forms of the word *h'* ("to rise, appear in glory"). The coronation ceremony was called *h'i* ("the Rising"), which was a word also used for the "rising" of the sun. The Primeval Hill of Creation was called *h'* ("Riser"), and this hill was the source of the *h'w* ("Risers"= "Crown") (Faulkner 1964, 185-186). The crown itself was also said to have been created by Re at the *sp-tpy* (FHN I 55, 236, 237). The origin of kingship and the crowning of the king, thus, was linked symbolically to the primeval moment and the primeval place. By the Eighteenth Dynasty this place was thought to be Luxor Temple, which we now know was merely a symbolic substitute for Gebel Barkal. These two sites were perhaps understood to be *kas* ("divine doubles") of each other in the name "Southern Sanctuary". We are forced to conclude, therefore, that in the New Kingdom, kingship, like Creation itself, was imagined to come from Napata, the remotest town in the Egyptian Nubian empire.

VII. Gebel Barkal as Mythical Source of Upper Egyptian Kingship

It is well known that in Napatan times the kings of Kush believed Gebel Barkal was the source of their kingship and crown and that these things had been

⁴³ These figures are also evoked by numerous amulets of pantheistic dwarf beings found in the royal tombs at el-Kurru (Dunham 1950, pls. 50-51)

handed down to them by the god of Gebel Barkal "since the time of Re" (FHN I 55, 236, 237). While such statements imply a long historical memory, Taharqa's knowledge of, or interest in, his own family seems to have extended no further back than his grandmother's generation and to his great-uncle Alara, the first Napatan king known to us by name. Later Napatan kings also spoke of Alara, but knew or said nothing of any earlier king (Török 1997, 123-126). Beyond this there seems to have been no dynastic memory other than Egyptian mythological history or that Napata and Nubia had once been occupied by the pharaohs of the New Kingdom. Through their priestly advisors, however, the early Napatan kings realized that when they embraced the Amun cult, and the god declared them to be his own sons, they became a part of the great continuum of this history, which in their conviction had begun at Napata (cf. FHN II 644-646). The "kings of Kush since the time of Re," it seems, were the pharaohs of the New Kingdom as well as all the "White Crown wearers" who had preceded them to the beginning of time, even to Osiris. All of them appeared in the colossal royal figure wearing the White Crown who was manifested in the Gebel Barkal pinnacle. As sons of Amun, the new Napatan kings saw themselves as heirs of this primeval kingship, which meant that all previous Egyptian kings were their "ancestors" (FHN I 132, 172, 220, 221; Griffith 1922, 102-103). The tradition is exactly that related by Diodorus Siculus (FHN II 644-645), who states that the "Aithiopians" were the first men created on earth because they were "closest to the sun", that they were the first men to honor God, that they colonized Egypt, that the Egyptians were their descendants, that Osiris was their leader, and that their kings "use tall pointed felt hats ending in a knob" (See also Burstein 1999, 122-123).

Gebel Barkal was the site of the primary coronation during Napatan times. When the Kushite kings of Dynasty 25 were crowned at Memphis (FHN I 153-155), the ritual was surely coordinated with Napata (cf. Herodotus ii. 139). Nearly every Egyptian language text preserved from the post-Dynasty 25 era refers to the Barkal sanctuary as that to which the Napatan king went first to be selected or confirmed for rule by Amun of the mountain; it was also there that the god gave the king his crowns. We know that a preliminary crowning ceremony took place soon after the death of the old king (FHN II 401-403), but a formal ceremony seems to have taken place again on New Year's Day (FHN I 55, 77, 205-206, FHN II 404-406, 409).⁴⁴ This day, as previously noted, coincided with the start of the Nile inundation, which was the annual anniversary of the *sp-tpy* (Zabkar 1988, 121-123; Kemp 1993, 200; Kendall 1997a, 330-331 and refs.)

Symbolically this was of the utmost significance. If Gebel Barkal was the home of the god who sponsored Creation, it must also have been the place where the king went at every seasonal and cyclical reenactment of Creation: New Year's

heistic dwarf beings found in the royal tombs at el-Kurru (Dunham 1950, pls. 50-51)

⁴⁴ For a thorough discussion of the Napatan coronation, with full references, see Török 1997, 221-234.

Day, Coronation, and Heb-Sed. At these times the king, in the form of his *ka*, was merged with the Creator, which meant that he himself assumed responsibility for renewing the life of the land by personally presiding over the Nile flood. This is why the king was repeatedly likened to the gods of the Primeval Hill, Atum and/or Tatanen (FHN I 137, 147-148, 195, 254).

Immediately following his coronation at Gebel Barkal, the king undertook a journey downstream, in which he stopped at each of the other Amun sanctuaries to celebrate duplicate coronations there (Török 1997, 224-234). On this journey the king acted as the sponsor of the rising Nile. His visitations to the various towns and sanctuaries symbolically renewed their prosperity for the coming year. In the Kawa stele of Irike-amanote, the king's secondary coronation ceremonies at Kawa and Pnubs are described in some detail (FHN II 408-411). In a torchlight procession at each place, the king is said to have made the local Amun go around each city, carried in his bark, while the king himself accompanied it "holding up his arms," as the text states (FHN II 413). By this gesture he was surely making the sign of the hieroglyph "*ka*," which symbolized what the multitudes were actually said to have cheered: "The son is united with his father." At each of the Amun sanctuaries, therefore, the king united with its god, thereby assuming that god's powers. The description seems identical to that of the Egyptian Opet festival at Luxor (Bell 1997, 157-176). The Napatan kings, starting at Gebel Barkal, seem to have traveled no further downstream than Pnubs (Kerma) to perform these rituals, but one wonders if during the New Kingdom, at those times when the pharaohs themselves visited Gebel Barkal, they may have begun the same journey at "Pure Mountain" at New Year's Day and completed it at Luxor in time for the Opet, two months later, when the Nile was in full flood. This is certainly what Piye did before commencing his Egyptian campaign of Year 20 (FHN I 77, 79; cf also FHN I 118-119).

It is Piye's Year 3 Stele that preserves the earliest Napatan record of the kingship tradition of Gebel Barkal. Here he declares that "Amun of Napata granted me to be ruler of every foreign country," and "Amun in Thebes granted me to be ruler of the Black Land (*Kmt*)" (FHN I 57; Reisner 1931, 89). The twin Amuns of Barkal and Karnak are presented here as mutually supportive aspects of each other, each giving the king a vital portion of his kingship. Only one Amun, however, is shown in the lunette. This is the ram-headed god of Napata, whom the text says gave the king "every foreign country." Yet we see that he is the one handing the king two royal crowns and thus also giving him the kingship of "the Black Land." One crown is the Red Crown of Lower Egypt, and the other is the cap crown, which obviously had some meaning analogous to, but not quite identical with, the White Crown. Here Amun of Napata seems to be granting the gift ascribed to Amun of Thebes. We wonder if there is an inconsistency here, or if we are to understand that the two gods are really exactly the same and perform the same tasks. We also wonder what the king really means here by the terms "foreign countries" and "the Black Land." Does the Red Crown of Lower Egypt symbolize "foreign countries"? Does the cap crown symbolize "Kemet"?

"Kemet", in this case, would have to be understood here as a united Nubia and Upper Egypt. By the time of Harsiotef, "Kemet" had come to mean Kush (FHN II 446).

The stele informs us that although there were other kings (in Egypt), Piye's kingship was superior to theirs because it was granted to him by Amun. The idea that Piye was the "bodily" son of Amun, created through a union between the god and the king's own mother, is pure royal dogma of the New Kingdom (Bell 1985, 280 and refs.). His titularies were also derived from those of Thutmose III and Ramses II (Reisner 1931, 93-97; Török in FHN I, 51-52). It is quite evident, therefore, that the Kushite ruler is presenting himself as the first of a new breed of "authentic" kings the likes of which the world had not seen since the great pharaohs of centuries past.⁴⁵ While the text is surprising for its political assertiveness - all the more so since nothing like it (and hardly even a written text!) had preceded it in the Nubian tradition - we find that Piye's ideas about Gebel Barkal were exactly those expressed seven centuries earlier by the Egyptian kings. Piye and the other Napatan royals, in other words, were not inventing a kingship tradition; they were simply reviving an old one from the New Kingdom that they knew gave them unassailable legitimacy and full authority to rule Egypt.

The idea that the pharaohs of the New Kingdom may have viewed Gebel Barkal as the source of their own kingship, or more particularly Upper Egyptian kingship, may seem unthinkable. But there is a growing body of evidence to suggest that they did. The Barkal Stele of Thutmose III, for example, had two images of Amun in its lunette; to each the king appeared making offerings (Reisner and Reisner 1933a, pl. 3). Although both gods were erased by the followers of Akhenaten, the god on the right ("south") can still be identified by his partly preserved epithet "[Amun who is] in Pure Mountain." This god is made to say to the king "I give you the kingship of the Two Lands." The figure and name of the god on the left ("north") are completely destroyed, but it was certainly Amun of Karnak, who is made to say "I give you all foreign lands." We see from this the surprising fact that the Egyptians, even in early Dynasty 18, considered the god of Gebel Barkal to be the one who granted the "kingship of the Two Lands (i.e. Egypt)." The text even seems to echo Hatshepsut's in her Red Chapel at Karnak, who states that Amun of "Southern Sanctuary" (Gebel Barkal) told her father Thutmose I in an oracle that she would be ruler "of the Two Lands" and "all foreign lands" (see above, Section III).

discussion of the Napatan coronation, with full references, see Török 1997, 221-234.

⁴⁵ Török (1997, 134, and FHN I 51) believes that Piye early took the name *Wsr-M3't-R'*, not so much to imitate Ramses II, but to "regard himself as the legitimate successor of the Theban Twenty-Third Dynasty Kings Pedubast I, Osorkon III, and Takeloth III." The name was certainly *de rigueur* for any ruler of this period, all of whom sought to link themselves with Ramses II, and was even assumed by Alara ("Ary-mi-Amun"). See note 57.

Why would the Egyptians attribute their kingship to a remote mountain in Nubia? The reason is evident in Ramses' relief at Abu Simbel, which shows the anthropomorphic Amun of Karnak ("Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, who is in *Ipt-swt*") seated inside Gebel Barkal, from which rises an enormous uraeus, crowned with the White Crown (**fig. 17**). From this, it appears that the pharaohs believed this mountain - an extension of Karnak - was the home of the most important manifestation of Nekhbet (of Nekheb/Nekhen) and thus was the true source of the Upper Egyptian uraeus and kingship. This idea is given further support by the texts of Amenhotep Huy, Viceroy of Kush under Tutankhamun, who informs us variously that his authority extended from "Nekhen to *Nswt-t3wy* ('Karnak'=Gebel Barkal)" or from "Nekhen to Karoy". These texts also state that "Khenethennefer was entrusted to him, and Upper Egypt was bound together under his supervision" (Davies and Gardiner 1926, 10-11). From this we conclude that by Dynasty 18 the Thebaid and all of Nubia, with a "Karnak" at each pole, had become the united province of Upper Egypt and the White Crown.

Nekhbet was the chief deity of Nekheb (el-Kab) and was the patron deity of Upper Egyptian royal power. Nekhen (Hieraconpolis), across the river, was also the home of the god of primeval kingship, Horus of Nekhen, whose Soleb statue, incidentally, Piye erected in B 500 at Barkal, as if to proclaim the mountain a kind of "divine double" of Nekhen (cf. Kemp 1991, 37-42, Simpson 1971; Dunham 1970, 25, 27, pl. 25). The Egyptians were surely aware that the earliest wearers of the White Crown resided at Nekhen, but on encountering Gebel Barkal and its statue-like pinnacle "wearing the White Crown," they must have revised their history to assume that this place was the true origin of the White Crown and the ancestors who had worn it. In his Barkal Stele, Thutmose III remarks: "My Majesty fought a herd of 120 (elephants in Niy). Never had the like been done by any king since (the time of) the God, (by any of) those who formerly received the White Crown" (Reisner and Reisner 1933a, 31).

The idea that the king's uraeus dwelt at Gebel Barkal, even in the Eighteenth Dynasty, finds further proof in Thutmose's Barkal Stele. After recording the founding of the first Egyptian settlement at Barkal, he describes a "miracle" by which Amun revealed himself to the Egyptians as the mountain's occupant. He said this miracle occurred at night after a spectacular meteor lit up the sky from south to north. It was witnessed only by the night watchmen. At a crucial point, the text becomes fragmentary, but there follows the description of a surprise attack by an unidentified enemy host, which was suddenly annihilated by fire while the Egyptians and locals slept. Although the words describing the cause of the fire have been lost, an earlier passage in the text provides a clue to what it was. Here the king describes himself in battle as "(rushing) like a falling star between the two bows (of heaven) when it crosses the sky...It is his uraeus diadem which overthrows (his enemies) for him; (it is) his flame-goddess which overcomes his enemies" (Reisner and Reisner 1933a, 27-28, 35-36). Since the Egyptians believed that a uraeus could destroy any and all enemies of the king

or god by means of its fiery breath or searing gaze, they must have circulated the story that the pinnacle came to life one night as the king's fire-spitting uraeus and was their salvation. The tale would have been contrived to confirm that the irresistible power of each pharaoh was lodged in the pinnacle, which was his royal uraeus in Upper Nubia. The rock, incidentally, faced almost due south, across the river, and would surely have been thought, like the uraeus on the king's crown, to be the guardian of the border of the empire.

:

If the ancients conceived the Gebel Barkal pinnacle simultaneously as the "Eye of Re" and the "Eye of Horus" - the respective divine and royal uraei - one must naturally assume that they also conceived the mountain as the crown of the god or the king, or both of them merged. In fact there is explicit proof of this from Napatan times. In the stele of Nastasen, the city of Napata is named several times. In the usual spelling, the city name is followed by hieroglyphic determinatives indicating "water," "mountain," and "city." But the spelling varies. Sometimes the mountain determinative is the normal sign for "mountain;" sometimes it is a rectangular "block of stone" (Gardiner 1969, sign-list N 26 and O 39). In several instances, these determinatives are replaced by a third: a dome-shaped hieroglyph with rearing uraeus (**fig. 28**). This obviously denotes the specific mountain of Napata: Gebel Barkal, the mountain with the "uraeus" (Priese 1977, 361, n. 52). This hieroglyph, it will be seen, also appears at the top of the stele in an inscription over the head of Nastasen's mother, Pelka (**fig. 29**). The text is uncharacteristically revealing, for the words say plainly: "She gave the crown in Napata because her father [i.e. Amun] established [there] the *ka* of the crown of Re-Harakhty" (*di.n.s p3 sh m Npy dd smn.n it.s k3 n p3 h3 Hr-3hty*).⁴⁶ The Gebel Barkal hieroglyph is the determinative of the word *ka* ("divine double"), which indicates absolutely that the "divine double" of the primeval crown ("the crown of Re-Harakhty") is the mountain itself. The meaning of this statement is at once obvious when we view the mountain at sunset from the east, when it exhibits the perfect silhouette of the Kushite cap crown (**fig. 30**). Even the wide coils of the twin serpents on the crown front can be seen to simulate the natural curve of the front of the cliff (**fig. 31**).

Much has been written about the Kushite cap crown (Russmann 1974, 27-44; Török 1987; 1997, 284-287; Leahy 1992, 223-240). The solution of its origin, however, seems really quite simple. The crown simulated the shape of Gebel Barkal, which, as the Primeval Hill of Re/Amun-Re, was also believed to be the *ka* and source of the primeval crown. Those who wore this crown believed they were the direct heirs of the most ancient kingship, which was only granted to through Gebel Barkal. The crown thus became the unique badge of the Kushite dynasty and reminded all that the Napatan kings were the god's chosen, who had sprung from the True Source. As the Year 3 Stele of Piye suggests, the cap crown with one uraeus implied royal authority over "Upper Egypt" (as redefined in the New Kingdom), which included the Thebaid and Nubia and the union of the "two Karnaks". The crown probably did not acquire its second uraeus until

selves with Ramses II, and was even assumed by Alara ("Ary-mi-Amun"). See note 57.

the time of Shabaqo, who officially annexed Lower Egypt and the authority of the Red Crown. The cap crown of Dynasty 25, then, was really a sort of "Triple Crown" that incorporated Nubia, Upper Egypt and Lower Egypt, while simultaneously declaring that the origin of kingship came from Gebel Barkal.

But were the Kushites the first to see a crown in the natural outline of Gebel Barkal? Surely not, for as we know they revived ideas and rebuilt temples here that had already existed during the New Kingdom. As we have seen, it was Thutmose III who first described the uraeus on the mountain, and both he and Hatshepsut attributed their kingships to Amun of Gebel Barkal. The idea of a crown in the mountain would have been implied by its "uraeus" right from the beginning. The Egyptians, determining that Gebel Barkal was the original source of (Upper Egyptian) kingship, would surely have begun to ponder its relationship to their own historical crowns. Initially, they would have seen the obvious "White Crown" in the pinnacle summit as "proof" that its earliest wearers came from here and that Nekhbet in her uraeus form dwelt here. They might also have remarked the similarity of the mountain's silhouette to the profiles of common images of Old Kingdom kings, in which the royal subjects wore a uraeus on their natural heads or over tightly fitting head-covers (Russmann 1974, 29-31). Probably the first Egyptian royal crowns to acknowledge the primacy of Gebel Barkal were those featuring rams' horns, which identified the ruler as united with the ram god of Luxor/Gebel Barkal and Nubia in general (Bell 1985, 268-270). The increasing development of the cap crown during and after the Amarna period, however, especially between the reigns of Seti I and Herihor (Russmann 1974, 31-33; Leahy 1992, 232-239), may have been a result of continuing active speculation on the nature of Gebel Barkal and the relationship of Nubia to the Thebaid through the Amun cult. Cap crowns evoked both the shaven heads of priests and the smooth pate of Ptah, and the crown may thus have symbolized a kingship with a particular priestly function in connection with the gods of the Primeval Hill. Cap crowns in use by Egyptian kings during the Third Intermediate Period would probably only have been imitative artifacts of the Ramesside Period, but with Dynasty 25, the cap crown was naturally revitalized and became dominant. The power of this symbol as a sign of legitimacy and connection to Kamutef and the source of the *ka* even ensured its continuance into Dynasty 26. Following the war of Psammetichus II against Kush in 593 BC, however, the Saites shunned it in favor of the old Blue Crown (Leahy 1992, 228-229), doubtless as a political statement that they and not the Kushites were the true heirs of the New Kingdom pharaohs and that the Barkal cult was invalid or at least no longer relevant in Egypt. The post-war Saite tendency to erase one of the uraei on the crowns in images of Kushite kings seemed to say: "We accept your rule of the south, but you have no authority - and never had any authority - in the north" (cf. Yoyotte 1951; Török 1997, 371-374)

VIII. The Coronation Complex at Gebel Barkal: A Napatan Revival of a New Kingdom Original.

The most complete account of the Napatan coronation at Barkal derives from the highly propagandistic Coronation Stele of Aspelta (FHN I 232-244). Here the king states that after the unexpected death of Anlamani, his predecessor (and brother), the army and all the great officials gathered at Gebel Barkal to ask the priests to solicit the god to signify his choice for successor. The priests, army commanders and officials then went into the temple and, prostrating themselves before the god, asked him to select the new king, who, it is clear, had been serving in the army with many of the other brothers of the former king. When these men were paraded before Amun, he declined to choose any of them initially and then selected Aspelta. When the god said to the officials, "This is your king," they immediately fell down "on their bellies" and worshiped him, "giving praise to this god because of the mighty thing he (Amun) did to his son whom he loves" (FHN I 241). The new king had suddenly been transformed from familiar comrade to "god", and he had obviously united with Amun to become his *ka*. At this point, we are told, Aspelta entered the sanctuary. There he found the crowns and scepters of the former kings of Kush. And after conversing with the god, he put on the crown of Anlamani and stepped forth into the open again, where he appeared to the assembled throngs "as Re shines in heaven."

A few more details about the choreography of the coronation are supplied by Irike-amanote, who informs us that his selection to the throne was finalized at Meroe upon the death of his predecessor Talakhamani. As the time of the New Year ceremony approached, he proceeded to Napata so that his arrival coincided with it (FHN II 406-407). Once at Napata he made his way to the "king's residence" - "so that he might be given the crown of Nubia" (FHN II 406). He next went to the temple and conversed with his father Amun "who is in Pure Mountain." Perhaps, as I will explain below, he went "inside the mountain".

If these documents keep the details of the Napatan coronation somewhat obscure, we gain a better picture of a coronation from the accounts of Horemheb's ceremony at Thebes (Gardiner 1953; Murnane 1995, 230-234). According to these documents, the king-to-be first went to Karnak "in the embrace of Horus," so that the latter could bequeath to him his throne in the presence the great god. Next Horus took Horemheb to Luxor, where the king-to-be greeted the Luxor Amun in the temple. After the king took leave of this god, he went to his nearby palace, where the Luxor god then visited him and escorted him to a shrine called *Pr-wr* ("Great House"). There the king met the crown goddess Weret-Hekau, who put the crown on his head. Once crowned, the king was ushered to another temple called *Pr-nsr* ("House of Flame"), where he received formal approval in his office by "Neith, Nekhbet, Wadjet, Isis, Nephthys, Horus and Seth, and the Great Ennead." We know that "*Pr-wr*" and "*Pr-nsr*" were the names of the main temples of the royal uraeus goddesses,

Nekhbet at El-Kab and Wadjet at Buto respectively (Arnold 1981; Redford 1984, 124-130). From texts like Horemheb's we also know that smaller versions of these temples existed at Luxor and elsewhere and played significant roles in coronations and Heb-Sed festivals (Ibid, 125-126; cf. also Schiff Giorgini et al. 1998, pls. 74, 75, 78, 79).

Since 1996, our team at Gebel Barkal has been probing the large unexcavated area, about 90 m square, southwest ("north") of B 500 and 800, between the Napatan Palace B 1200 and the Barkal cliff. Here we have identified remains of a Napatan and Meroitic coronation complex not only identical to that described by Horemheb, but also built directly on top of a New Kingdom original probably built by Horemheb. We found a block there inscribed with his name (**fig. 40**). This confirms, what the texts already imply, that, long before the Napatans, the Egyptians considered Gebel Barkal an important source of kingship and built coronation temples there that had exact parallels at Thebes. This also indicates that the pharaohs occasionally visited Gebel Barkal - how often we cannot say - to celebrate or re-enact coronation rituals and possibly Heb-Seds like those held at Thebes and/or Memphis. Three or four centuries after the complex ceased to be used at Barkal, the Napatan kings restored all the same buildings and revived the same ceremonies, believing that they had had their origins there. These buildings and rituals continued to be used well into the Meroitic period - as if the kingship of the pharaohs was and had always been uniquely Kushite!

The mud brick palace B 1200 was partially investigated by Reisner in 1919 and 1920; it was then again partly re-excavated by our team in 1996. In previous reports, I suggested that it had at least four superimposed Napatan levels (Kendall 1991, 303-309; 1997b, 322-323). Under these, Reisner recovered loose blocks (still unpublished) inscribed for Ramses II (Reisner Photo Register, neg. C 8587). Since B 1200 was situated to the left of and perpendicular to Ramses' original entrance to B 500 (through the second pylon fronting B 502), it appears that Napatan B 1200 ("Level I") must have been built directly on top of an original palace of Ramses II.

I have noted above (Section II) that Egyptian palaces were always built on the "starboard side" of the entrances of Amun temples. When one of these temples was enlarged and its entrance moved forward, the related palace was torn down and a new one built in the correct relationship to its entrance. During the Napatan Period, however, B 1200 remained stationary, despite the enlargement of B 500 with court B 501, perhaps because the building was so sanctified by Ramesside tradition. On the other hand we should note that it always remained in the correct relationship to the entrance of the "northern" Amun temple B 800/900. Only when B 1200 was finally replaced in the early Meroitic Period was the new palace (B 100) built in the correct relationship to the entrance of B 500.

Of the levels of B 1200 excavated thus far, the second Napatan level, has proven to be the best preserved, for it was heavily burned, and the builders of Level III (mid-sixth century BC) simply filled in its rooms with earth and built over them. Among the most interesting features of Level II are numerous stone architectural elements bearing inscriptions of Anlamani and Aspelta. One large room (under the Level III rooms B 1213-15, 1221-22) contained four inscribed fallen columns, whose texts reveal that the ruler used this chamber to perform rituals connected with the New Year ceremony and to ensure the pacification of Sekhmet and the other goddesses embodied in the pinnacle (Kendall 1997a, 324-334). The ritual was probably a regular part of the coronation ceremony and its annual re-enactment. Another room (B 1233) seems to have been the throne room (Dunham 1970, pl. 60B). This room connected with a larger room (B 1234), which in turn connected with a corridor (B 1237-39) that led out of the palace through a rear door. If one stands today where this corridor was, he will see that it and probably the rear door (now disappeared) were aimed directly at the Gebel Barkal pinnacle (**fig. 32**).

Between the throne room and the corridor there was a doorway with inscribed stone jambs (Ibid, pl. 62). One of the jambs preserves the words: *wd3wt.tw r pr wr sw(?) thns.tw pr nsr* (".... One goes out to the *Pr-wr*... one enters the *Pr-nsr*") (**fig. 33**). It is clear from this text that these two shrines - the same coronation temples mentioned by Horemheb - must have existed there also in Napatan times beyond the rear door of the palace in the direction of the pinnacle. The throne room, thus, was doubtless the place where the Napatan king sat in his palace, like Horemheb, to await the arrival of the god before proceeding with him to the two named shrines, where he received his crown and confirmation. Irike-amanote, it will be remembered, claimed to have gone "to the palace" at Barkal to receive his crowns (FHN II 406).

If one wanders the rolling rubble field behind B 1200, he will observe the remains of at least two unexcavated temples there (**Map, fig. 2**). One, which we designated B 1100, is easier to see than the other; it is located directly under the Barkal pinnacle at the cliff's edge. The other, designated B 1150, is more indistinct. It lies in front of B 1100 and was probably built on the same axis. Both temples have been so badly plundered by stone scavengers as to have nearly disappeared. We naturally hypothesized that these structures were the *Pr-wr* and *Pr-nsr*, the temples of the royal uraeus goddesses

Preliminary excavations undertaken in B 1150 in February 2002 yielded little information about that structure. (48)¹ Although the site is a vast rolling rubble heap of Meroitic baked bricks, cut stones and column drums, this building was so destroyed that a week's work on the site was unable to produce a single intact

lara ("Ary-mi-Amun"). See note 57.

⁴⁷ (46) Note that in FHN II 473 the word *ka* has been incorrectly translated "shrine"t

vestige of it. A geophysical survey conducted by us in 2000 ("48"=49)¹ suggests the building may have been roughly 40 x 40 m square, large enough certainly to have housed shrines for the thirteen(?) gods stated by Horemheb to have occupied the *Pr-nsr* (49)⁵⁰

B 1100, on the other hand, was better preserved. Its ruins emerge from the rubble directly in front of the pinnacle. The temple appears to have been a *hemispeos*, partly rock cut into the base of the pinnacle, with a forward part built of sandstone masonry, just like B 200 and 300. It appeared to penetrate the mountain in the same stratum and at the same level as B 300, which lies about 30 m to the left of it. The original form of B 1100, however, is hard to determine, for its forward part has been so stripped of stone that its plan has disappeared, and its rear part is buried under a pile of gigantic boulders. These are the obvious remains of a catastrophic ancient rock fall caused by the collapse of the front face of the pinnacle, which dropped a number of huge stones directly on top of the temple. These stones are still lying exactly where they fell (**fig. 34**). They seem to have crushed and sealed the temple's inner chambers, and probably also destroyed its outer structure with their forward momentum. Today not enough of B 1100 survives to permit us to visualize it, but it is clear, based on the position of its surviving foundation stones, that its axis was perpendicular to the cliff, just like all the other Barkal temples (**fig. 35**). It is also clear that it had at least three building phases: Egyptian, Napatan, and Meroitic.

The best preserved fragments of B 1100 are from its Meroitic phase; it is these that provide the only clues to its cult, but the clues are decisive. In our excavations of 1997, we recovered about 30 fragmentary carved sandstone blocks, which could be dated by the presence, on some, of the cartouches of Natakamani and Amanitore (**fig. 36**). Most of these blocks had been part a small vaulted chamber, and nearly all were carved with raised relief depicting flying vultures in a starry sky (**fig. 37**). Where the vault had joined the vertical side walls, pairs of standing vultures appeared in horizontal registers of relief. Here the vultures could be identified as Nekhbet and Wadjet by their special crowns. In repeating patterns, they were pictured facing each other, framing pairs of royal cartouches, pairs of small squatting figures of Amun, and a unique Hathoric fetish wearing the

⁴⁸ From Feb. 16 and Feb. 21, 2002, I was joined at Gebel Barkal by Pawel Wolf, Ulricke Nowotnik, Annett Dittrich, and Diana Nickel. During these days we made exploratory trenches in B 1150.

⁴⁸ Between Dec. 3 and 12, 2000, a magnetometry survey was conducted in several areas at Gebel Barkal by Geophysicist Margaret Watters. We were assisted also by Hassan Ahmed Mohammed (for NCAM), with help from Ahmed Moussa and Faiz Hassan Osman. The area of B 115⁴⁹0 was surveyed Dec. 6; the results, not yet published, were less than satisfactory.

⁴⁹0 was surveyed Dec. 6; the results, not yet published, were less than satisfactory.

⁴⁹ The Horemheb text states that the deities occupying the *Pr-nsr* were "Neith, Nekhbet, Wadjet, Isis, Nephthys, Horus, Seth, and the entire Ennead." The Ennead would have included Atum, Shu, Tefnut, Geb, Nut, Osiris, Seth, Isis and Nephthys. Since the latter three were previously named, we have six deities remaining to add to the original named seven, yielding thirteen. have six deities remaining to add to the original named seven, yielding thirteen.

Double Crown (**fig. 38**). This strange motif combined the characteristics of Hathor-Bat and Mut while emphasizing the feature of the Double Crown. Since this fetish is the evident focus of the uraeus-vultures, we can only assume that it was intended to personify the crown goddess Weret-Hekau, mistress of the *Pr-wr*. In the Kawa reliefs we see Taharqa being led by Horus and Thoth to a *Pr-wr*, before which stands Weret-Hekau to greet him. Once inside the temple, the king is crowned by the two gods (Macadam 1955, 95, pl. 22).

Egyptian religious texts, as we have seen, reveal that all the goddesses were thought to combine within the being of Weret-Hekau - as they did within the pinnacle - to symbolize either the great god's uraeus (the "Eye of Re") or the king's uraeus (the "Eye of Horus"), or both together, or both Nekhbet and Wadjet together, or both the crowns together (see notes 32-36). Since B 1100 lay directly beneath the pinnacle, and since the pinnacle was anciently identified as a uraeus, there seems little doubt that B 1100 was indeed the *Pr-wr*, the temple of Weret-Hekau, into which the king went to get his crown. By its name, however, the *Pr-wr* was especially identified with the uraeus goddess Nekhbet (Arnold 1981). This probably explains why both royal uraei are depicted inside B 1100 as vultures. Wadjet is taking on the attributes of Nekhbet, and both, as we shall see, merge with Mut - all symbolized by vultures.⁽⁵¹⁾¹ The pinnacle was undoubtedly conceived as both royal uraei combined. The god of Gebel Barkal, thus, rendered to the king a complete kingship; yet the *de facto* meaning of the site seems to have been as a source of Upper Egyptian kingship.

Beneath the Meroitic blocks of B 1100 we found many disturbed Napatan blocks, and these lay upon the remains of an even older foundation wall, made with *talatat* (**fig. 39**). Incredibly, not more than 10 m from this wall we recovered a red sandstone block preserving the cartouche of Horemheb ("*nb t3wy Dsr-h[prw]-r*") (**fig. 40**). Obviously Horemheb, and probably Seti I and Ramses II after him, had all used (or at least prepared for their possible use) this temple for coronation ceremonies, mirroring those held at Luxor.

IX. B 1100: The *Pr-wr* or Coronation Temple at Gebel Barkal; its Destruction by Cliff Collapse in the Late New Kingdom; its Restoration in the Napatan Period.

During February 2002, our main objective was to try to confirm whether B 1100 had indeed been a *hemispeos* and to determine the relative date of the temple's destruction. ⁽⁵²⁾¹ Since huge fallen stones, piled on top of one another, lay over

⁵¹ Cf. PT 910-913: "I know my mother (*Mwt*), I have not forgotten my mother the White Crown, ...dwelling in Nekheb, Lady of the *Pr-wr*...O Ruddy One, O Red Crown, O Lady of the lands of Dep, O my mother, say I, give me your breast that I may suck from it...and live, and be little again" (Faulkner 1969, 159).

⁵² The work was carried out between Feb. 6 and 14, 2002. Apart from our workmen, the team consisted of myself, Cynthia Shartzter and Shadia Abu Rabu for NCAM.

the supposed rock-cut rear of the temple, we needed to find an area for exploratory excavation that would not undermine them. We saw that one large stone was resting alone on the slope and that it could be removed without affecting the others, so we had our men break it up with sledgehammers. This cleared an area about 3 x 4 m that we could safely dig. Here we expected to find more buried architectural fragments, but, to our surprise, none appeared. Instead, we found, down to natural bedrock, only loose rubble, layered with hundreds of sherds of broken pottery vessels, broken bread molds, charcoal, cracked and charred animal bones and cattle teeth. A preliminary analysis of the pottery indicated that these layers were not earlier than the early Napatan Period. Since no such refuse layers could have accumulated if a temple had stood here, we had to conclude - against our visual judgement - that B 1100 had not been rock-cut after all and had stood entirely in front of the mountain.

Within days, however, we gained a rather different impression when we began working several meters to the right. As we made shallow excavations around the edges of some of the largest boulders resting over the supposed temple axis, we found that some seemed to be resting directly on natural *gebel*. This meant that, unlike the stone we had removed, the others had fallen when the *gebel* surface was relatively clear of debris and before the Napatan trash layers had accumulated. This also indicated that the large stone we had broken up and removed had fallen later than the main pile. We soon discovered that one of the largest stones rested directly upon a horizontal row of six *talatat* blocks, bonded with cement (**fig. 41**). This revealed that the Eighteenth Dynasty temple had indeed continued under the rocks and had almost certainly penetrated the mountain. We could now conclude that it was the New Kingdom temple - and not the later versions - that had been destroyed by the pinnacle collapse. The Napatan and Meroitic versions of B 1100, while restorations of the first, were not rock-cut. These had been free-standing structures built in front of the cliff.

Since Egyptian B 1100 was built of *talatat* blocks, and since a block inscribed for Horemheb was recovered nearby, we could assume that this temple had built (or restored) by Horemheb. Since Ramses II built heavily at the site, and since in reliefs at Abu Simbel he actually depicts himself performing ceremonies at Gebel Barkal before the "uraeus" (**fig.17**), we can safely assume that B 1100 was still intact at the time of his visit(s) in the early or mid-thirteenth century BC. The rock fall that destroyed the temple, therefore, must have taken place after Ramses' reign but before the advent of the Napatan Period.

When the Napatan rulers began to restore the site in the early eighth century BC, they would have found B 1100 in ruins and the mountain so fractured here that they could not rebuild the temple as a rock cut shrine. They had no choice but to rebuild it as a free-standing shrine. Prior to this construction, while leaving the fallen rocks *in situ*, they must have cleaned the site and removed all visible remains of the old temple - except for the *talatat* trapped under the largest fallen rock. Only after the new Napatan temple was erected and went into service,

probably in early Dynasty 25, did rubbish begin to pile up behind it. This temple must have continued in use until the first century AD, when Natakamani and Amanitore undertook its final restoration. Since the large fallen rock that we removed lay over Napatan remains, it is apparent that there were rock falls later than the first that may have damaged or destroyed the Napatan temple and probably prompted its renewal.

All evidence suggests that the inner chambers of the New Kingdom *Pr-wr* were cut into the base of the pinnacle so that the kings, during their coronations here, could physically enter the mountain. Here symbolically they would have "united with the god" (i.e. the mountain) and received from Weret-Hekau their crowns, which, after all, were supposed to have originated from the mountain, the "*ka*-crown." This, I believe, was the idea behind the temple during the New Kingdom. If the Napatan kings found the temple destroyed and sealed and the mountain no longer accessible, we must wonder how they managed to revive the authentic New Kingdom coronation. Fortunately other observations we made this year made the answer quite clear.

Today, the only true rock-cut temple at Barkal is the Mut temple (B 300), about 30 m west of B 1100. Taharqa built this temple over a New Kingdom original (FHN I 132), whose remains are still plainly visible within the later forecourt (B 301) (**fig. 5**). These remains, we see, are composed entirely of *talatat* blocks and reveal that the New Kingdom temple had been a free-standing structure with triple sanctuary, much like B 200 (which was sacred to three goddesses or three separate aspects of Hathor in three parallel sanctuaries). If the Egyptians originally built B 1100 as a rock-cut shrine and B 300 as a free-standing shrine, we see that Taharqa (?) rebuilt B 1100 as a free-standing shrine and converted B 300 into a rock-cut shrine (**fig. 42**). The Kushites would now have used the latter as their means of accessing the mountain.

To these observations, I can add another fascinating detail. At the base of the hillside, about halfway between B 1100 and B 300, one can see a rock outcrop that has anciently been cut vertically across its back side (**fig. 43**). It also appears to have been cut to support fitted masonry blocks. The line formed by the vertical cut is perpendicular to the axes of both B 300 and B 1100. This suggests that there was once a partly rock-cut, partly masonry-built corridor connecting the two temples from their respective side doors: one on the southwest ("N") side of B 1100, which led to a door on the northeast ("S") side of B 300 (court B 301). Both of these doors were independent of the main entrances of the temples. This allows us to suppose that in Napatan times and later, the king during his coronation first went into B 1100, just as he had done in the New Kingdom, and there received his crown. Instead of entering the mountain there, however, he passed through the special passage to B 300, and, through it, into the mountain, as

the goddess Nekhbet-Weret-Hekau transformed into Mut.⁽⁵³⁾¹ Once inside the temple of Mut, the king could commune with his "Mother" and finally exit the temple as her child, "Ka-mut-ef", the *ka* (the "Bull") reborn.

X. Kingship Lost and Regained: The Historical Implications of the *Pr-wr* at Gebel Barkal.

In his stele, Harsiotef reports that he became "afraid" when he received news at Meroë that the temple of Amun of Napata had "collapsed in the court of the north" (FHN II 442). His fear, he says, was allayed only after being assured by a seer that the god had no ill regard for him and that Amun had simply given him an opportunity to restore the temple. Archaeological evidence recovered at Barkal by our team this year suggests that B 1100, the New Kingdom *Pr-wr* - the temple into which the king went to receive his crown - was destroyed by a rock fall when

⁵³ Who really was this goddess Weret-Hekau, in whom all the goddesses and all the uraei could unite and who was said physically to have put the crown of the king's head? The Nastasen stele informs us that it was really the king's mother who "gave the crown in Napata..." (FHN I 472). We know that the king's mother was understood to be a daughter and wife of the god, just as she was considered to be the mother of the god in his earthly manifestation as king. Since, in these roles, she was identical to all the great goddesses, as well as being their sister, and since all these divine ladies were thought to be able to assume the forms and identities of each other at will (just as the king could assume the identities of so many gods), we must understand that the king's mother impersonated the goddesses when she entered their temples during religious ceremonies. This allowed her to act in their behalf as "Great of Magic." During the coronation, she became Weret-Hekau and crowned her son. When she and her son passed into the Mut temple, she became the goddess "Mother," and the king was ritually born again as "Ka-mut-ef". I have described above an inscription, datable to the reign of Anlamani, that appears on an interior doorway in B 1200 (**fig. 33**). The text on the left jamb mentions the king's departure through this door for the coronation temples *Pr-wr* (B 1100) and *Pr-nsr* (B 1150), which were officially the temples of the royal uraeus goddesses ("Eye of Horus"). On the right jamb, there is another important text, but written in the second person feminine singular. It reads: *m htp sp sn(?) ...tn wd3.t wd3/irt R' ts.phr wd3 wd3t/irt Hr ts.pr* ("In peace, in peace...Your wholeness is the wholeness of the Eye of Re, and *vice versa*; your wholeness is the wholeness of the Eye of Horus, and *vice versa*"). The text obviously is addressed to a woman who accompanies the king as he exits the palace and goes to the coronation temples. She is also obviously making magical transformations and is becoming each and every goddess of the royal and divine uraei, just as they are becoming her. As she enters into B 200 and B 300 she becomes the goddesses Mut, Hathor, Isis, Tefnut, Sekhmet, Bastet, Maat, etc, who are the goddesses of the "Eye of Re" and the uraeus of the crown of Amun-Re. When she enters into B 1100 and B 1150, she becomes the goddesses Nekhbet, Wadjet, and Weret-Hekau, who are the goddesses of the "Eye of Horus" and the king's crown. When she puts the crown(s) on the head of her son, she becomes the personification of the eternal divine crown, which is the mountain itself. Everywhere the king went, thus, he needed to be accompanied by one or more of the royal women, who would impersonate one or more of the goddess and perform for him such important ritual roles. W.V. Davies, in his lecture "New Fieldwork at Kurgus: The Pharaonic Inscriptions" at the Ninth International Conference of Nubian Studies in Boston, August 21-26, 1998, reported finding inscriptions at Kurgus of both Ramses II and some of the ranking women of his family. See Lohwasser 2001 and references.

the front face of the pinnacle collapsed and fell on it. Since the pinnacle was thought to be a living statue of the god in all his forms as well as that of the royal uraeus in all of hers, the sudden destruction of the temple by the "gods" must have filled those on the scene with terror and anxiety - that is, if the site was still operational at the time. It is difficult to imagine the priesthood interpreting this event in any other way than as a sign that Amun was angry at the reigning king or dynasty and that he wished to revoke indefinitely the king's authority to rule his (Amun's) southern domains.⁽⁵⁴⁾¹

Since the destruction of B 1100 seems to have occurred sometime after the reign of Ramses II but before the beginning of the Napatan Period, one might suspect that it actually occurred near the end of Dynasty 20. This was the moment when history records the unprecedented crisis in the Egyptian kingship that marked the beginning of the Third Intermediate Period. At that time, for reasons never understood, the High Priests of Amun at Karnak usurped the king's authority in Upper Egypt and Nubia, even while respecting and honoring his northern authority. Although for three centuries the kings of the Third Intermediate Period made a show of maintaining royal traditions and even wearing the White Crown (eg. Mysliwiec 1988, pls. 16, 20b, 23d, 24a), a full southern kingship was not established again until early Dynasty 25, when it was restored by the Kushites. Is it a coincidence that the Nubian kings were also the first since the New Kingdom to restore Gebel Barkal and to lavish attentions on Luxor Temple? Could it be that the natural destruction of the "coronation temple" at Barkal was one of the events leading to the Egyptian withdrawal from Upper Nubia near the end of Dynasty 20? ⁽⁵⁵⁾¹ Although our excavation results are still very preliminary and although much remains to be proved, there are tempting reasons to consider that there might be a linkage between the natural destruction of this temple and the contemporary diminution and loss of Upper Egyptian kingship. Not only does it explain the strange politics of the Third Intermediate Period, when multiple kings emerged simultaneously without universal recognition, it also offers for the first time a convincing explanation for the sudden emergence and success of an Egyptianized Nubian dynasty in the Sudan that advertised itself as a direct successor to the kings of the New Kingdom.

reported finding inscriptions at Kurgus of both Ramses II and some of the ranking women of his family. See Lohwasser 2001 and references.

⁵⁴ These domains would have included all the territory between Napata and the northern border of the Thebaid at El-Hiba, about 35 km upstream from Herakleopolis. El-Hiba marked the northern limit of Upper Egypt and the authority of the White Crown (Baines and Malek 1984, 129; Aufrère and Golvin 1997, 221-223).

t of Upper Egypt and the authority of the White Crown (Baines and Malek 1984, 129; Aufrère and Golvin 1997, 221-223).

⁵⁵ This hypothetical scenario finds a parallel in the Herodotean fable of the withdrawal of the Kushites from Egypt. Here Sabacos, the last Kushite king, is said to have had a vision that he should kill all the priests in Egypt. Since he imagined that this dream was sent by God to encourage him to commit a sacrilege, he decided to depart from Egypt and to return to Kush, since the fifty years had passed that the oracles of Kush had foretold he should rule Egypt.

It should be clear from the data presented above that by early Dynasty 18 the pharaohs recognized and accepted Gebel Barkal the source of Upper Egyptian kingship. As long as Gebel Barkal and its "uraeus" in the form of Nekhbet remained under their political control, they would probably have believed that the kingship of the South and the domain of the White Crown were comfortably theirs. Since in their worldview Gebel Barkal and Luxor were simply southern and northern aspects of each other, they must have assumed that coronations celebrated at one site were automatically validated at the other. A coronation at either site would have confirmed a king's rule over an Upper Egypt that combined the Thebaid and Nubia and their respective religious poles, Thebes and Napata. On the other hand, when the *Pr-wr* at Barkal was destroyed by the rock fall, the priesthood may have concluded that an opposite effect took place. Since the coronation temple at Barkal was suddenly and violently closed to the king, they may have concluded that a coronation ritual could no longer take place at Luxor. The king, unable to unite with his *ka* or to receive his crown at Gebel Barkal or Luxor, could not be considered divine. His kingship, thus, could have no standing with the god at Thebes and would not be recognized by the priesthood. If this were the case, we would imagine the Amun clergy moving very quickly to usurp the king's authority in all areas over which "the god" had jurisdiction. In the absence of a legitimate king, the "god's domains", in their view, would have to be ruled in Amun's behalf by his High Priest - until the "true" kingship of the South could be re-established. The High Priesthood then became a "virtual kingship", for it became hereditary. Meanwhile the king, dwelling in the north, retained his full Red Crown authority there, even while continuing to use all the age-old royal trappings and dignities, including the now fictive White Crown. The sentiments of the Theban establishment of the time were probably exactly those uttered so many years later by Piye. To paraphrase his words: gods and men can make a king (in the North) but only Amun (of Thebes and Gebel Barkal) can make a true king (FHN I 57-58).

The events at the end of Dynasty 20 have never been fully explained, since their causes are nowhere expressed. There are only allusions to ambiguous events. Initially a High Priest of Amun at Karnak had to be "suppressed" and at least some faction of the priesthood rose in revolt against the authority of the reigning king, doubtless Ramses XI (ca. 1100-1070 BC), who was resident at Memphis (Kitchen 1973, 247-254; Wente 1966, 73-87). This king's alienation from Amun is suggested by his unprecedented throne name "Setep-en-Ptah." A later text refers to this tumultuous episode as the "war of the High Priest," which implies that it was no small affair. The troubles also involved Nubia, for the Viceroy of Kush Panehsy apparently came to the aid of the king by invading the Thebaid with his Nubian troops and warring against the priestly establishment, which was heavily armed (Kitchen 1973, 247; Wente 1966, 84-85). Neither side prevailed, although the struggle went on intermittently for years.

By Year 19 of Ramses XI (ca. 1080 BC), Herihor, the supreme military commander of the Theban forces, declared himself High Priest of Amun and Viceroy of Kush in opposition to Panehsy, who still retained control of Nubia and who must still have been loyal to the king (Kitchen 1973, 248). Herihor's move indicates a Theban attempt to wrest control of Kush from a royal official and to bring it squarely under the rule of "the god". At this same time, Herihor announced the dawn of a new dating era, called the *whm mswt* ("Repeating Births"="Renaissance"), which was to be used for dating in the South while the regnal years of the king were used concurrently for dating in the North (Ibid, 248).

Why would a "Renaissance" be declared? In the Egyptian mind, this would only have been a recognition that Creation - and kingship - must begin again. From the looks of Herihor's seizure of power, it appears that he aspired to reunite Nubia and the Thebaid and to re-establish the lost kingship under his persona as High Priest. Besides calling himself High Priest, Viceroy of Kush, and Generalissimo, Herihor, in the reliefs in the temple of Khonsu at Karnak, calls himself King and adopts royal titles, although his throne name is nothing more than his title "First Prophet of Amun." Herihor's kingship, in other words, was only tentative and ceremonial, used only within the sacred precinct of Karnak to perform the vital rituals traditionally performed by the king, who was no longer active or present (Kitchen 1974, 248-252). In the reliefs he normally appears wearing only a cap crown with uraeus (**fig. 44**). This crown, it will be seen, is practically indistinguishable from that later worn by Piye (**fig. 45**). The meaning of the latter, as suggested above, apparently signified the royal authority granted by the primeval Amun over his united domains of Nubia and the Thebaid through Gebel Barkal, whose shape the crown imitated. We must wonder if Herihor's crown signified the same thing.

Herihor predeceased Ramses XI, but his place was filled by his son Paiankh/Piankh, who assumed all of his father's titles except that of King (Kitchen 1974, 252-253). By Year 10 of the "Renaissance" (ca. 1070 BC), the year that Ramses died, Paiankh was still fighting Panehsy for control of Nubia, probably to regain the "crown of Amun" that his father had fought for and aspired to. If the Theban priest-commanders managed to wrest control of the Thebaid from Ramses XI, they met only reversals in Nubia. There the Viceroy Panehsy retained control and blocked further Theban access to the south. It would be an attractive theory to suppose that it was Panehsy's prolonged conflict with the Amun priesthood that caused the demise of the Amun cult in Nubia and brought about the neglect and abandonment of the god's temples. These establishments, which had always been managed by the Theban priesthood, would probably have been identified by Panehsy as strongholds of the enemy. The temples, in this scenario, would have been forcibly closed by the Viceroy's troops, and their priests, either expelled or executed. The hoped-for "Renaissance" did not come about, and this dating system was soon abandoned.

For the next three centuries, Egypt was divided into two semi-independent polities: Lower Egypt, which was the restricted realm of the king, and Upper Egypt, the better part of the country, which was controlled by the Amun theocracy. Nubia, the contested battleground of the king and clergy, was now totally beyond the control of either, now in the hands of Panehsy's successors and/or one or more small rising Nubian chiefdoms. Karnak of the north was now cut off from "Karnak of the south." The glorious kingship of the imperial age was now only a memory. Gebel Barkal, the once powerfully symbolic source of southern kingship, was inaccessible - but not forgotten, as the contemporary "Nubian Chapters" of the Book of the Dead reveal.

It is not my intention here to analyze the history of the Third Intermediate Period in detail but merely to point out that when it is considered in light of the hypothesis outlined above, a seductive pattern of circumstantial evidence emerges that may allow us to make better sense of this confused period.

The kings that arose at Tanis in Dynasty 21 were duly honored at Thebes, even though they had no authority there. What we notice at once about Smendes I, the founder of the dynasty, is his unusual throne name Hedjkheperre ("The manifestation of Re is the White Crown") (Kitchen 1974, 255). This suggests that the king identified his *ka* as the personification of the southern crown, the very thing that neither he nor his dynasty would ever possess in reality! Despite the intermarriage and apparent mutually supportive relationship of the Tanite and Theban ruling houses in Dynasty 21, the institution of the kingship of Upper Egypt seemed to be accepted as a polite fiction by both sides, even though it is clear that some unspoken thing was terribly wrong. Even after High Priest Pinudjem, son of Paiankh, assumed kingship late in his tenure, none of his own three sons who succeeded him as High Priest followed him in the practice (Ibid, 258-261). There seemed to be a recognition that the title of "King", as understood in the New Kingdom, carried with it meaning that no politician in this period, either royal or priestly, could entirely fulfill, justify or bequeath.

The title "Viceroy of Kush" had lapsed under under Paiankh, but was revived in a curious way under High Priest Pinudjem II (ca. 990-969 BC). One of his two wives, Nesikhons, held a remarkable series of titles, revealing that her official duties involved almost exclusive devotion to Amun of Western Thebes,¹ the goddesses who were involved with his sexual appeasement, and Khnum of Elephantine. She was also called "Superintendent of Southern Foreign Lands and Viceroy of Kush" (Ibid, 275-276; Török 1997, 108, n.190, 127). One suspects that her responsibilities as Viceroy in Nubia were no longer political or military but purely magical (Kendall 1999, 62-63). Perhaps her duties involved ritually stimulating a phallic image of the god in the Theban area, whose "pacification" was then thought to be magically transferred to the deity in Nubia. Such activities

⁵⁶ Since Dynasty 18, Amun of Western Thebes had been associated with the Amun of Luxor (and Gebel Barkal) (Pamminger 1992, 99-105)

on the part of a "royal" woman, herself the alter-ego of Hathor "Mistress of the Vulva" and perhaps, too, the "pacified Eye of Re," might have been thought to satisfy the god at the Source, not only to ensure the inundation but perhaps even to provide magical protection to any would-be Egyptian king or prelate seeking to regain the White Crown. The Semna inscription of Karimala/Katimala, a probable daughter of Osochor (ca. 984-978 BC) and probable wife of Siamun (978-959 BC) (Bennet 1999), also fits into this period and seems to be the record of a futile Dynasty 21 Nubian campaign in Year 14 of Siamun, possibly to reconnect the two Karnaks (FHN I, 35-39; Kendall 1999a, 59-63).

Dynasty 22 was founded by the energetic Libyan king Sheshonq I (ca. 945-924 BC), who, like Smendes, chose as his throne name "Hedjkheperre", as though his major aim, too, was to regain and embody the White Crown. By his Year 5, he had established complete domination over Thebes by taking away the four highest clerical sinecures from the old Theban families and giving them to members of his own family (Kitchen 1974, 288-289). As if in recognition that the way to recovery of full Upper Egyptian kingship lay in reconquering Nubia, Sheshonq mounted a major Nubian campaign, which ultimately returned rich offerings to Amun of Karnak (Ibid, 293, 295; Zibelius-Chen 1989, 335-337), even though it failed to reach Gebel Barkal.

As the ninth century wore on, there was increased friction between Thebes and Tanis. Osorkon II (ca. 874-850 BC) appointed one Harsiese, not his own son, to the High Priestship of Amun at Karnak (Kitchen 1974, 314-316). This man soon claimed kingship for himself, and chose again the throne name "Hedjkheperre", as if to announce his own aspirations to the White Crown. After Harsiese's death and burial (directly beside the temple of Amun Kamutef at Medinet Habu: Hölscher 1939, 52-53), Osorkon replaced him with his own son Nimlot. Nimlot's real residence as High Priest of Amun, however, was nowhere near Thebes but at Herakleopolis in Middle Egypt, the northern frontier of the Thebaid (Kitchen, 328-329, 331; O'Connor 1982, 884).

Whether Takelot II (also "Hedjkheperre") was the son of the Tanite king Osorkon II or king of a new "Theban 23rd Dynasty" (surely based at Herakleopolis) remains unclear (cf. Kitchen 1974; Aston 1989). In any case the High Priest Nimlot, the new king's brother or brother-in-law, died in Takelot's Year 11 (ca. 839 BC, according to Kitchen, or ca. 827/822 BC according to Aston). This resulted in Takelot's appointing his own son Osorkon to the High Priestship, an act that was extremely unpopular and triggered an armed uprising in Thebes (Camino 1958). With the arrival at Thebes of Osorkon and his forces from Herakleopolis, the revolt was put down, but it flared up again in Year 15, resulting in a brutal suppression of the rebels, in which the ringleaders were tried, executed, and their bodies burnt, thus preventing them an afterlife (Ibid., 161, no. 261; Kitchen 1974, 330-331). Further troubles continued intermittently for nine more years, until Takelot's year 24 (ca. 823 BC according to Kitchen, 803/ 798 BC, according to Aston).

Although these disturbances at Thebes have no obvious relationship to Nubia, we note with considerable interest that they occurred at virtually the same time that the ancestral graves of the Napatan rulers at el-Kurru began to exhibit a surge in Egyptian cultural influences (Kendall 1999a, 1999b). We also note that among Osorkon's gifts to Amun are two separate amounts of gold "from Henethennefer," revealing contemporary Theban ties with the region of Napata (Caminos 1958, 274; Goedicke 1965).

Of the chiefs buried at el-Kurru, probably none ever set foot in Egypt. Nor is it likely that they were influenced in their habits and beliefs by any old Egyptian community or priestly group still surviving in Nubia from the New Kingdom. There seems no way to account for their rapid "Egyptianization" than to assume that in the last quarter of the ninth century BC they received at their court one or more waves of influential Egyptian visitors who probably came to stay. Since the Kurru chiefs ultimately adopted the Amun cult with an unusual devotion, it must be assumed that their Egyptian visitors were Theban and belonged to the priestly class. Who they were and why they came we can only guess. They could have been high-level political refugees, members of the old disenfranchised priestly families and their followers, who came, fleeing persecution by the Takelot faction, to establish a base in exile - remaining fiercely devoted to Amun of Karnak but bitterly opposed to the king and his family. The senior members of the group were no doubt highly learned in religious matters, and, putting themselves in the service of the Kurru chiefs and gaining their confidence, they would soon have exercised considerable influence over them in both religious and political matters. On the other hand, the visitors could have been members of repeated official delegations from Thebes seeking to establish closer ties and regular communication with the Kurru chiefs in order to re-establish the Amun cult in Nubia. This, too, would probably have resulted in the dispatch of numerous resident missionaries and other support personnel, who would have settled there. In either case, these contacts would probably have been prompted by acute Theban unhappiness with the political situation in Egypt.

It is clear from the historical record that the Amun priesthood at this point was in a very weakened position in Egypt and had little or no influence over any of the several kings claiming the title. The old symbiotic and mutually supportive relationship between the king and "the god" no longer existed in any meaningful way and certainly did not translate into power for either. By the late ninth and early eighth century BC, the relationship between the priesthood and the Tanite or Herakleopolitan kingship had become openly hostile. By opening communications with the Kurru chiefs, the Thebans - at least some faction - made a decisive move to re-establish the Amun cult at remote Napata, to restore the ancient kingship of Upper Egypt at its source, and to unite the god's domain from "Karnak to Karnak" just as it had been centuries before. Theban interest in Gebel Barkal was almost certainly the primary reason that these groups came to el-Kurru in the first place. The proximity of this Nubian court to Napata may have been

the reason why its chiefs, among all others in Nubia, became the ultimate beneficiaries of "the god's" patronage and support.

To begin restoration of the Barkal sanctuary and cult, the new priesthood in Kush would have needed to enlist the aid of the local rulers in the project and to spark their political ambitions. They would have had to school them in the meaning and history of the site, to show them its visible "archaeological" record, and to read and translate for them the texts still exposed there. They would have recounted for them the god's great "miracles" done for the kings of centuries past, and would have convinced them that the same favors awaited them, if they dedicated themselves wholly to Amun's service, rebuilt and furnished his temples, implemented his cult and ancient rituals, served and supplied the needs of his priests, waged war in his name and dedicated to him the spoils. Only then would the god instruct the rulers in his "secrets" and grant his kingship to them and their descendants.

This, of course, the above is mere speculation, but the archaeological and historical record strongly suggests that some very similar scenario actually took place. In my recent reappraisal of Reisner's records from el-Kurru, I suggested that the sequence of the ancestral tombs probably began sometime within the period ca. 885-835 BC (Kendall 1999a; 1999b). Because of the probability that the Kurru chiefs were buried next to their wives, and because of the tendency of the historical succession for the throne to pass from brother to brother, I supposed that the earliest ten tombs belonged to five royal couples, which may have belonged to no more than three generations. During this period, the tombs passed from simple tumuli of traditional Nubian type, in which the dead were laid flexed on beds in pits, to square tombs, probably surmounted by small pyramids, in which the dead were laid on their backs and eventually mummified and coffined in the Egyptian manner. Chapels on the sides of the tombs suggested an emerging cult of Osiris. Egyptian trade goods and luxury stone and faience vessels appear in the tomb furnishings from the very beginning. Also early in the sequence we even find the earliest evidence for the use of stone masonry, a skill, too, that seems to have been imported from Egypt (Kendall 1999a, 20).

The apparent sixth ruler, belonging perhaps to the fourth generation, was Alara, the first known by name, whose accession I placed at approximately 785 BC. According to Aston, the Theben revolt in the reign of Takelot II took place within the period 827-798 BC, so the rise of a pro-Theban, anti-Tanite or Herakleopolitan Napatan dynasty seems very likely to have been a direct result of this civil war. Connected history of the Napatan dynasty begins with Alara, who is the first of his line known by name and the first reported to have "put his trust in Amun" (Vinogradov 1999). He is almost certainly the author of the "Ary-mi-Amun" stele from Kawa, which means that he was also the first to use Egyptian writing for his own inscriptions and the first to use pharaonic titles (Macadam

1949, pls. 32-33; FHN II 521-528; Kendall 1999a, 58-65).(57)¹ Almost certainly it was he who began restoration of the Amun temples at Kawa and Gebel Barkal (see Section II). His grand-nephew Taharqa, in the latter's Year 8-10 Stele from Kawa, reveals that Alara's succession to the throne was disputed, possibly by an anti-Egyptian, anti-Amun faction (FHN I, 174). This "evil-plotter" was said to have been defeated with Amun's help, which resulted in the supremacy of Alara, who then put himself completely under the authority of "the god". At this point the myth of divine conception was revived so that Alara and his sisters were identified as having the god's paternity. They and their descendants now joined the ranks of the kings going back "to the time of Re."

The new Nubian priesthood, working with their allies at Thebes, would have groomed the new rulers for full pharaonic kingship and would have planned with them the reunification of the Thebaid and Nubia, which was surely the agenda of the united priesthood. If the official state-sponsored Amun cult of Kush was founded at "southern Karnak" by Alara, the reunification of the "two Karnaks" began with Kashta, who traveled at least as far as Elephantine and probably to Thebes to claim full pharaonic titles. His assumption of power in the Thebaid, superseding the authority of the "Theban" rulers, who probably actually resided at Herakleopolis, seems to have been completely peaceful (Török 1997, 144-153).

With the accession of Piye, we have our first clear image of this new southern order, and we can measure just how far the conversion and the acculturation of the Kushites had come in just a few decades. Perhaps a consciously reconstructed "rebirth" of history can be traced in the king's own public persona, with the clock now set back to the "Renaissance". We notice, for example, that he shares all the important characteristics with the early independent High Priests of Amun of Dynasty 21. In a relief in B 502, for example, he appears as High Priest of Amun (Kendall 1999a, 116, fig. 19). This makes us suddenly cognizant of the fact that the position of High Priest had disappeared at Thebes one or two generations before, having given way to a "God's Wife of Amun" in the person of a king's virgin daughter (Doxey 2001, 72-73). By this time, the High Priesthood of Amun seems to have migrated south to Gebel Barkal! The king is also the virtual Viceroy of Kush, although he would never have used this title officially because he was no "King's Son". Likewise, as revealed in his Victory Stele (FHN I 62-112), he was supreme commander of the army of the South, who gave orders to

⁵⁷ Török's discussion of "Ary's" titles (FHN II 521) places the king squarely in the early eighth century BC. That his name is rendered *Iry-mi-Imn* ("Ary-mi-Amun") rather than the usual *Ir/Irr* ("Alara") is easily explained by the common late Egyptian tendency of names and words to drop their final "r's" in spelling and pronunciation when elided with others (Cerny and Groll 1975, 6; Kendall 1999a, 64). "Ary", therefore, must be Alara. Notice that the king's crown, otherwise similar to that of Herihor and Piye (figs. 44, 45, 46), lacks a uraeus, as though he had not quite achieved full royal status. Nevertheless, over his head flies Nekhbet, revealing that he is under her protection. He was perhaps ruler primarily in priestly mode, like the Theban prelates of Dynasty 21, although he writes his name in cartouches, calls himself "son of Amun" and "Lord of the Two Lands," and uses the throne name of Ramses II.

his generals from Napata before taking the field himself. His army and navy, at the opening of his famous chronicle, were deployed just south of Herakleopolis defending the northern border of the Thebaid ("Hen-Nekhen": FHN I 68).

The king's crown, appearing faintly in a photograph of a relief (destroyed after 1906) (60)¹ on the "S" wall of court B 501 (**fig. 46**) is strikingly similar to that worn by Herihor in his reliefs in the Khonsu Temple (The Epigraphic Survey 1979, *passim*) (**fig. 44**). The same crown is clearly pictured in Piye's Year 3 Stele and is held out to him by Amun of Gebel Barkal (Reisner 1931, pl. 6) (**fig. 45**). In both cases the crown has only one uraeus. Obviously in the stele the cap crown doubles for the White Crown in symbolizing royal authority over Upper Egypt, which now means the united Thebaid and Nubia, which was the very same territory to which Herihor and Piankh aspired. Although the White Crown was believed now to come from Gebel Barkal, the cap crown was an explicit expression that it derived from the crown-shaped mountain.

Even the king's name: "Piye/Pi(ankh)y" is spelled nearly identically to that of Piankh/Piankh, the son of Herihor, almost as if it were chosen to present the Kushite king as that man's reincarnation or vindication. While the High Priest Piankh, in his wars with Panehsy, failed to recapture Kush and Gebel Barkal, Piye's early reign may have been seen as the belated successful replay of those events, which resulted in the Theban priesthood's ultimate victory in Nubia, which had eluded them for three centuries. Once having united Gebel Barkal and Karnak, Piye could "reincarnate" as king - but no ordinary king. His royal names reflect the "rebirth" of both Thutmose III and Ramses II within himself. He was now "Pa/Pi-ankh," the "Living One," which was the name of the Eternal King, within whom were all kings. (60-2)¹ As such, he was the new child of Amun, bodily son of the god, heir to the kingship "of Re", "Strong Bull (*ka*) Arising (i.e. "crowned") in both Thebes and Napata" (FHN I 48-49). He was perhaps the first king in centuries to celebrate coronations and Opet Festivals in Thebes (FHN I 79). Diodorus' tradition of "priests" choosing from among themselves who should be "king of the Aithiopians" may have had a basis in historical fact (FHN II 646).

The Kushite restoration of the Barkal sanctuary and the Kushite "recovery" therein of the uraeus and the royal *ka* seems to have resulted in the full restoration, by Piye's reign, of the old-style kingship of the New Kingdom, the reunification of Thebes and Napata, and the reactivation of Luxor Temple. It is not surprising that the king also made offerings at Hermopolis and Heliopolis, for he would have considered both of these sites northern manifestations of Gebel Barkal. Hermopolis, after all, was the ancient city of Thoth and the Primeval

"son of Amun" and "Lord of the Two Lands," and uses the throne name of Ramses II. and "Lord of the Two Lands," and uses the throne name of Ramses II. of the Two Lands," and uses the throne name of Ramses II.

⁶⁰ See note 63.

⁶⁰ Texts in the lunette of the Barkal Stele of Thutmose III record that the king will "exist as "foremost of the *kas* of all the Living Ones who arise upon the throne of Horus like Re" or as

Ogdoad, one member of whom was Amun in his most ancient aspect (Rundle-Clark 1991, 55-58).(60-3)¹ Heliopolis was the ancient northern site of the sun cult, and had been identified with Karnak and Gebel Barkal since the early New Kingdom.

If the majority of the reliefs in the newly restored B 500 illustrate Piye's military conquests in Egypt (Kendall 1986, 7-20), his ritual scenes are just as interesting for what they show of his knowledge of ancient royal traditions. These scenes appear on the two halves of the "south" wall of B 501, while the surrender of Lower Egypt appears on the "north" wall (Wildung 1997, 164, fig. 28). This means that the ritual scenes portray events that occurred in Napata.

The "east" section of the wall, left of the central doorway, pictures the king's construction projects at Barkal (**fig. 46**). Although the walls are poorly preserved, we discern (from right) a figure of the king accompanied by an *Iwn.mut.ef* priest, and a text that refers to "his *ka*". The king appears again beside his *serekh* "[Strong Bull arising] in Thebes" and another figure, who is perhaps "stretching

"foremost of the *kas* of all the Living Ones who arise as King of Upper and Lower Egypt, south and north, like Re." The term "Living One", therefore, refers to all kings, past, present and future, whom the present king embodies as "foremost of (their) *kas*." The name Pi-ankh or Pa-ankh also means "the Living One," suggesting that the name of the great Nubian conqueror was chosen to identify himself with all the ancient kings that had supposedly "arisen" at Gebel Barkal since the beginning of time. The name later became a title and epithet of royalty: In the Sanam Stele of Madiken, for example, the lady is called "king's sister and king's wife of the Living One (i.e. Aspelta)" (FHN I, 262, 263, 260). In his stele, Nastasen calls the dynastic founder "Piankh-Alara" (FHN II 477) (Török 1997, 124). The "Living One" was also a frequent epithet of the high god (Rundle Clark 1991, 59).

⁶⁰ This Ogdoad as well as Kamutef were also represented in the Small Temple at Medinet Habu in Western Thebes, which had been founded in Dynasty 11 and was later restored by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. The temple was connected with the Primeval Hill of Thebes (Djeme), as well as the cult of Luxor (and Gebel Barkal), and the cult of a great serpent, an aspect of Amun, called Kematef. Like the Kamutef temple near the Mut Complex at Karnak (also built by Hatshepsut), it was restored by the Kushites (Morkot 2000, 246-247; Arnold 1999, 47).

esented in the Small Temple at Medinet Habu in Western Thebes, which had been founded in Dynasty 11 and was later restored by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. The temple was connected with the Primeval Hill of Thebes (Djeme), as well as the cult of Luxor (and Gebel Barkal), and the cult of a great serpent, an aspect of Amun, called Kematef. Like the Kamutef temple near the Mut Complex at Karnak (also built by Hatshepsut), it was restored by the Kushites (Morkot 2000, 246-247; Arnold 1999, 47).

n the Small Temple at Medinet Habu in Western Thebes, which had been founded in Dynasty 11 and was later restored by Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. The temple was connected with the Primeval Hill of Thebes (Djeme), as well as the cult of Luxor (and Gebel Barkal), and the cult of a great serpent, an aspect of Amun, called Kematef. Like the Kamutef temple near the Mut Complex at Karnak (also built by Hatshepsut), it was restored by the Kushites (Morkot 2000, 246-247; Arnold 1999, 47).

⁶² The scene, of course, is of great antiquity, first appearing on the macehead of King Scorpion (Millet 1990, 55, fig. 2). Cf. also the construction scenes of Thutmose III at Karnak (Schwaller de Lubicz 1977, pl. 174).

the cord" (Isler 1989, 203-204). The next tableau shows king grasping a huge hoe and preparing to dig the first earth (cf. FHN II 412). (62)¹ The accompanying text speaks about some action to be conducted "four times". Next he runs with a young bull, symbolizing his *ka*, before a Meret goddess, who twice says "Come and bring!" Finally the king, followed by his *ka* in human form, stands with a wand before five completed temples shown as Lower Egyptian tent shrines. The fragmentary text identifies the architectural ensemble as *hnm.f* ("his abode"), followed by its double name, only one of which is partially legible: *Dw-w'b n nhh* ("Pure Mountain of Eternity").(63)¹

On the "western" half of the wall, to the right of the door, Piye has represented himself celebrating his Heb-Sed and coronation (**fig. 47**). At the extreme right, he enters the temple followed by his *ka*, and he is led by Montu (Cf. Schwaller de Lubicz 1977, 317-318). He wears the ancient Heb-Sed robes that can be traced back to archaic times. The king and god encounter a vertical row of southern shrines, which probably lay below a row of northern shrines, now lost. These were the shrines set up to house the statues of the gods brought from the south and north to witness the ceremony (cf. Naville 1892, pls. 7, 8, 12). Further to the left the king appears seated in his kiosk, where a servant brings food offerings. The scene is of a very ancient type (Cf. Schwaller de Lubicz 1977, fig. 77; Bisson de la Rocque 1931, pls. 8, 10; Naville 1892, 19-21, 23). Next the king is led forward hand in hand by Montu and Atum (Schwaller de Lubicz 1977, 146, fig. 20), while an *Iunmutef* priest stands by a *serekh* reading "[Strong Bull arising in?] Napata." The king, now wearing a royal kilt, stands close beside a god. The preserved sign "*wr*" may suggest that this is a scene of Piye being led into the "[*Pr*]-*wr*" to receive his crowns. The remainder of the original wall surface, some 5-6 meters, is concealed by later masonry.

Piye was interested in celebrating a Heb-Sed, as can be understood from a reference in his Victory Stele (FHN I 84). The fact that he moved so many divine statues from Soleb to Gebel Barkal suggests that these were among the "convocation of gods" brought to the capital for the ceremony. This may imply that he really did rule at least thirty years (but cf. Redford 1985; Morkot 2000, 170). Piye, in any case, was probably not the first to celebrate a Heb-Sed at Napata, although he may have been the first in over three centuries. Some sort of a Heb-Sed was probably celebrated here throughout the New Kingdom, even if it may only have been a magical substitute, performed simultaneously to the real

course, is of great antiquity, first appearing on the macehead of King Scorpion (Millet 1990, 55, fig. 2). Cf. also the construction scenes of Thutmose III at Karnak (Schwaller de Lubicz 1977, pl. 174).

⁶³ The upper part of the king's figure, in which the king wears a cap crown, has been restored from a photograph in the Breasted archive in which his preserved head can still be faintly seen. See the on-line archive of the 1905-1907 Breasted Expeditions to Egypt and the Sudan: <http://www.oi.uchicago.edu/OI/MUS/PA/YPT/BEES/BEES.html> (Orinst P 2984: Gebel Barkal (Napata), Great Temple of Amun). YPT/BEES/BEES.html (Orinst P 2984: Gebel Barkal (Napata), Great Temple of Amun).

one at Thebes, with the king physically absent. The statue of Thutmose III found at Barkal, for example, depicts the king in his Heb-Sed robes (Dunham 1970, 17, pl. 3). Akhenaten also may have developed a Heb-Sed complex at Barkal that mirrored the one built for his Year 3 Heb-Sed at East Karnak in the complex called the *Gm-p3-Itn* (Redford 1984, 122-130; see above, Section III)..

If B 1100 remained closed at the dawn of the Napatan era, it is not clear exactly how Piye managed to recover the "lost" kingship. His Year 3 Stele, however, invokes the crown goddess Weret-Hekau in a most interesting way (FHN I 58), suggesting that the problem had been solved. Weret-Hekau, as I have shown, was the crown goddess resident in both the *Pr-wr* (B 1100) and the pinnacle. The broken text is interesting because the context suggests a threat: "Whoever of these princes (in Egypt) does not pay tribute to me, Weret-Hekau [i.e. 'will do something terrible']". He is obviously referring to his deified crown and uraeus, derived from Gebel Barkal and the pinnacle.

XI. Kingship Regained, Lost, and Reconceived - with Comments on the Nubian Campaign of Psammeticus II.

During the New Kingdom, the Egyptians had seen Gebel Barkal only as a manifestation of Karnak, but now the Kushites and their priestly backers made a conscious, if subtle, effort to distinguish the two places. They now began calling the mountain *Nst-t3wy* ("Throne of the Two Lands") in the singular, while Karnak remained *Nswt-t3wy* ("Thrones of the Two Lands") in the plural (Robisek 1989, 92, Amn. 22; Pamminger 1992, 106; eg. Dunham 1970, 23, fig. 13). Exactly what was intended by this distinction is not entirely clear, but it seems likely to have been a move to give precedence to Gebel Barkal as the real center of the kingship (i.e. "throne").

With his massive constructions at Napata, his epic literary chronicles, and his exquisite bas-reliefs, Piye set a high standard for his successors to follow. Although Shabaqo and Shebitqo were too preoccupied with events in Egypt to expend their energies in their homeland, Piye was even outdone by his son Taharqa, who put the ultimate stamp on the Gebel Barkal site. Exhibiting a rich knowledge of mythology and a bold imagination, he erected monuments here that complemented one another as well as the natural setting in ingenious ways and seemed to create a vivid fusion of the real world and the mythological. Under Taharqa's care the Barkal site became an elaborate stage set for the celebration of past, present, and eternal monarchy, and the perpetual recreation of the world.

In its most basic form, as we have seen, the Barkal pinnacle was understood to be the living ithyphallic god with whom the king united to become the *ka*, which made him eligible to receive the crown. In another form the pinnacle was a gigantic statue of the king's uraeus, whose divine double perched on his crown. The pinnacle, standing 74.5 m high, rose nearly parallel to the mountain's cliff. At its summit, it was 5 m lower than the cliff edge and 11 m distant from it. The

pinnacle peak was completely inaccessible to man by normal means. Taharqa, however, conceived the idea to scale it and to adorn it.

By mounting a pair of shadufs on the cliff edge, Taharqa's engineers were able to raise a number of wooden beams into the ravine between the cliff and pinnacle and to set them into sockets, cut for the purpose. Ultimately they were able to construct a series of fifteen stages that allowed men to climb to the top of the pinnacle's "White Crown" (**fig. 48**). There, on the precipitous face overlooking the temples, they carved a panel of inscription, about 1 1/2 x 3 m in area. Although the texts were too high to be read from the ground, they recorded, at least in part, Taharqa's conquests over Tjemehu (southern Libyans) and Mentiu-Setet (Asiatic Bedouin). Today they are almost completely weathered away. Bronze nails still embedded in the stone, however, reveal that the masons had also covered the panel entirely with gold sheet, which would have made it the most conspicuous feature of the mountain. The gold sheeting perhaps linked the pinnacle symbolically with an obelisk (Van Siclen 2001, II 562).

Under the gilded panel, Taharqa's masons cut a shallow alcove, about 1 m high, with niche, suggesting the place where a small statue once stood. This statue, now lost, had almost certainly represented the king. On either side this figure had been sheltered from the wind by walls built of rough masonry and mortar. Both the statue, as well as the stones and mortar, had evidently been lifted from the ground with ropes and pulley mounted on the end of a stationary crane arm that had been set in a diagonal channel cut on the west side of the pinnacle peak. Since no more than three or four men could have worked safely on the pinnacle top at once, the crane and its ropes must have been operated by gangs of men standing on the cliff.

Close observation of the rough face of the pinnacle revealed that it had also been extensively filled with crude masonry and mortar, all of which, too, had been hoisted up by means of this crane. The purpose of these fills was evidently to conceal cracks and cavities in the rock and perhaps to enhance the shape of the pinnacle. The construction was an almost unbelievable feat of engineering and daring (Kendall 1994), and one hates to think how many of the workmen may have lost their lives while trying to fulfill the king's wishes. It seems to have been an elaborate effort on Taharqa's part to ensure that he, in the form of his statue, would be forever united with the pinnacle, which, as Kamutef, was really both his father and mother. His union with Kamutef ensured that he would always be united with his *ka*. His union with his uraeus ensured that he would always be king.

Taharqa seems to have felt that the mountain, which was inhabited by all the great goddesses, required more explicit female expression, so he undertook the construction or complete renewal of the temples of the goddesses Hathor and

Mut, B 200 and 300. He was probably also the sponsor of the temples of the royal uraeus goddesses Nekhbet and Wadjet, *Pr-wr* and *Pr-nsr* (B 1100 and 1150), which appear to have been part of the same series. Today the only well-preserved temple among these is B 300, which was built just west (left) of the base of the pinnacle. In the New Kingdom, this temple had been free-standing, but in his reign Taharqa rebuilt it as a deep rock cut shrine with a built outer structure and pylon. The columns along its axis took the form of sistra and colossal Bes images. These were apotropaic and obviously had the purpose of pacifying the goddess in her form as the leonine "Eye of Re" before she emerged from the sanctuary (Robisek 1989, 77-78). On the unpublished rear wall the goddess is shown lion-headed on the right ("south") together with the ram-headed Amun of Napata, while on the left ("north") she is human-headed as she stands with the anthropomorphic Amun of Karnak. The Bes columns, however, can also be understood as the amuletic symbols of childbirth (Malaise 2001, I 180).

In his building inscription, Taharqa says that he found the temple built by the "ancestors" in "humble work" (*k3t nds*), and that he rebuilt it as "splendid work" (*k3t mnh*). Here again there seems to be a word-play, for *k3t* also means "vagina, birth passage" (the feminine of *k3=ka="phallus"*) (Faulkner 1964, 283). Taharqa, in other words, rebuilt this temple "for his mother Mut ...as a splendid birth passage". Built beside the phallic pinnacle, the temple would have had the effect of rendering the mountain female so that it became a symbolic womb. As we have seen above (Section IX), in the Napatan Period the king was crowned in B 1100, which was then a free-standing temple in front of the pinnacle. He then crossed from it into B 300 through a private passage and from there into the mountain via B 300. Once inside, he united with his "Mother", the goddess Mut, who then symbolically gave birth to him as her child, the living *ka*, which fulfilled the meaning of Kamutef. At this point the king became the new-born god. The temple was perhaps the prototype of the *mammisi* or "birth houses" of later Egyptian temples (Arnold 1999, 285-288). Mut's wearing of the Double Crown suggested her role as "Mother of Kingship." In later Meroitic times, Gebel Barkal was actually represented anthropomorphically as a goddess with head in the form of a dome-shaped mountain with rearing uraeus (Dunham and Chapman 1952, pl. 7 A).

Dazzling as are the meanings of these constructions, they pale against the meanings designed into Taharqa's funerary monument. 10 km northeast of Gebel Barkal on the opposite side of the river, Taharqa founded a new royal cemetery at Nuri. The location was far from the old ancestral cemetery at el-Kurru, and the tomb was unlike anything that had been built before in the Sudan or would be built in the future (Dunham 1955, 6-16, pls. 3-4). The tomb underground was a near duplicate of the Osireion at Abydos (Leclant 1984, 1115; Aufrère, Golvin, and Goyon 1994, 43-44). Its huge columned chamber was rock cut and planned so that the deceased king within his coffins rested on a built platform in the middle of a grand gallery. The floor of this gallery was below the water table, so that the king's mummy on its bier would be surrounded by water, just like the Creator on

the Primeval Hill emerging from the *Nun* at the beginning of time. The enormous pyramid constructed over the tomb - in two or three separate enlargement phases - was probably also associated with the Primeval Hill and the *benben* stone of Heliopolis, as pyramids had been since earliest times (Lehner 1997, 29, 34-35). The extraordinary thing about the pyramid is that it was placed at exactly the point on the horizon where the sun rose at New Year's Day when the sunrise was observed from the summit of Gebel Barkal. The pyramid was situated so that when observed from Gebel Barkal at sunrise on that day, the sun would rise from the horizon directly over its point. The ancient Egyptian New Year's Day occurred about a month after the summer solstice and coincided with the start of the inundation (Daumas 1980, 466-467). The tomb thus became a symbol of the eternal annual rebirth of the deceased king, who had become the Eternal king Osiris, buried within. This god, awakened each year on the anniversary of his earthly coronation, personified the rising river and became the bearer of fertility each New Year. By a peculiarity of the local geography, the pyramid, when viewed from Gebel Barkal, was within a few degrees of the vanishing point of the river on the horizon, from which the inundation emanated.

Spells 162 and 163 of the Book of the Dead reveal that the pinnacle on Gebel Barkal was conceived as a standing statue of Osiris, wearing the White Crown (see above, Section V). When one stands on the summit of Taharqa's pyramid and looks toward Gebel Barkal, he will see that the pinnacle has a particularly strong resemblance to the god in profile. Some four months after New Year's Day and after the official start of the Nile inundation was the festival of Khoiak, which symbolized the official end of the inundation and the death of Osiris (about mid-November) (Spalinger 2001, 521). Just as New Year's Day was approximately one month after the summer solstice, the Khoiak festival was approximately one month before the winter solstice. Therefore on the date of the Khoiak festival, if one were to stand on the summit of Taharqa's pyramid, he would see the sun set directly behind the figure of Osiris on Gebel Barkal, symbolizing the god's "death". Five days later was the festival of the primeval Amun-serpent Nehebkau, which symbolized a kind of return to primordial time and a second New Year, which was associated again with the birth of the king as the living Horus (Spalinger 2001, 531). During this period the sun would have moved several degrees to the right, setting over Gebel Barkal so as now as to highlight the "crown" in the mountain.

Due to the reverse direction of the Nile here, Taharqa's tomb, still on the "west" bank, paradoxically lay to the east, the place of sunrise and rebirth. Gebel Barkal, on the "east" bank, lay paradoxically to the west, the place of sunset and death. The tomb and the mountain, thus, symbolized Creation, death and rebirth simultaneously. They were opposites, yet they were also the same. All of the opposites, in fact, were perceived to be united in Gebel Barkal and its pinnacle and became synonyms: present and past, upperworld and underworld, living and

dead, east and west, north and south, male and female, god and goddess, father and mother, parent and child, god and king, etc. It was the spectacular realization of Egyptian theological speculation. It also created a perfect convergence of another pair of opposites (at least to our way of thinking): mythology and reality.

Gebel Barkal, under Taharqa, was designed - with obvious optimism - to be the ultimate and permanent center of kingship in the Nile Valley. It was to be the eternal link between the Creator god and mankind, and between the eternal king and the living king. Assyria's invasions of Egypt in the latter decade of Taharqa's reign, and his disastrous defeats at their hands, however, seemed to signal the god's sudden and unexplainable withdrawal of support (FHN I 181-190). At this point theologians would have attempted to rationalize the horror and chaos in Egypt by drawing parallels from mythology. The current period must be the end of one time and the beginning of another. Taharqa's defeat and death at Napata must be a repeat of Osiris' murder at the hands of Seth. Osiris' death was not an end but a beginning, for like Osiris at the beginning of time, Taharqa, too, would be avenged by a son or successor, a living Horus, who would drive out the evils and restore *ma'at* in the land once again. These were possibly the underlying motives behind the design of his tomb, which may have remained under construction for some time after his death.

The expected redemption of the Dynasty under Tanwetamani would not be realized. The Assyrians invaded the Thebaid and sacked Thebes. Soon Upper Egypt and Thebes fell under the sway of the Saïtes, who had been Assyrian collaborators (Elgood 1951, 74-75). The Kushites would have considered them usurpers. These events must have been perplexing for the Amun priests and galling for the rulers, who were now exiled in Napata and militarily exhausted. The volatility of the situation was somewhat defused by the Saïtes, who allowed the old Kushite theocracy to retain their priestly offices at Thebes well into Dynasty 26, but the certainty of their control over Upper Egypt would have been an obvious sore point with Kush, even sixty years after the unofficial transfer of power in Egypt (Ibid, 93). The Amun cult, at least as it was understood by the Nubian priesthood, demanded of its royal champions that they control "the two Karnaks." The unresolved issue of control over Thebes would doubtless have been at the root of the conflict between Egypt and Kush in 593 BC. Another cause would have been the continuing pretensions of the Kushite kings to the Egyptian crown through the authority of the god of Gebel Barkal. On the bark stand of Atlanersa, for example, Amun of Gebel Barkal promises the king "Upper and Lower Egypt as recompense for this monument" (Reisner 1918, 105). In Anlamani's stele from Kawa, the king speaks of himself as the living descendent of "the Kings of Upper Egypt and the Kings of Lower Egypt" (FHN I 221).

The direct causes of the war between Kush and Egypt in 593 are unknown but not hard to imagine. As Psammetichus' Tanis Stele relates, a messenger came to him

and reported that "The Nubians are planning to fight with you." Why would they plan to do this, after nearly seventy years of relative calm? Early in his reign Psammetichus made a ceremonial visit to the Amun temple at Byblos (Elgood 1951, 93-94). Knowing the Egyptian king was occupied elsewhere, the reigning Kushite monarch may have seen this as his chance to retake the Thebaid. His plans obviously were not kept secret enough to prevent their discovery by Egyptian spies. Hearing the news, Psammetichus quickly returned, marshalled his transport ships, troops and all their necessary supplies and horses, and sent them southward into Nubia on a preemptive strike. The army, as we know from a graffito at Abu Simbel consisted of two divisions: one comprised of native troops and the other of foreign mercenaries. Judging by the 4200 prisoners that this army later took at Pnubs, we can probably reasonably estimate its own number at between 4000 and 7000 men.

Lazslo Török has recently discussed at length the textual evidence for Psammetichus' invasion of Kush and has come to the conclusion that the Egyptian army never reached Napata and that the evidence linking the campaign with Aspetia is "not compelling" (Török 1997, 366, 371, and in FHN II 279-290). Given the archaeological evidence published since Török's publications, as well as some new data I will present here, I believe Török's conclusions are far off the mark, and that the army did indeed attack Napata. Not only do I believe the army attacked Napata but also that Gebel Barkal was the primary objective of the campaign (Kendall 1991, 308).

The evidence for violent destruction at Gebel Barkal, both during the reign of Aspetia and contemporary with Psammetichus' campaign, is considerable and difficult to attribute to any other factor than enemy action. Since Gebel Barkal lies on the right bank of the Nile, beyond which there were no predatory desert tribes, makes it difficult to conceive what enemy could have inflicted such damage, if not the invading Egyptians. The Barkal palace (B 1200, Level II), which contains inscriptions of both Anlamani and Aspetia, was completely gutted by fire during Aspetia's reign (Reisner Diary, Jan. 31, 1919). In 1996, while excavating in the same level, my team found dramatic deposits of charcoal and remains of charred palm logs from the fallen roof beams lying on the floors and against the walls inside the rooms (Kendall 1997, 322-323, 323-333). The neighboring temples B 500 and B 800/900 were also damaged by fire, and Aspetia's statue was the last in a group of ten royal statues that had originally stood inside B 500 and had been toppled and broken. Some of the pieces of these statues were later dumped together with burned debris into the space of room B 904, which was then charred and roofless from the same fire (Kendall 1996, 468-470). Even on the other side of the river, we find the same pattern of evidence. At Sanam, shortly after the completion of the Aspetia chapel, the Taharqa temple was burnt and left unrestored (Griffith 1922, 85). The Treasury at Sanam was also destroyed by fire, and the latest name found in its ashes was that of Anlamani (Griffith 1923, 82, 86-87, 89). All these buildings appear to have been deliberately set on fire at about the same time.

Both the Karnak and Shellal Stelae of Psammeticus describe a decisive Egyptian victory in the region of Pnubs (FHN I 279-286), but, contrary to Török's opinion that these were reports of his army's "final victory" and of "the southernmost point reached by the Egyptians" (Török 1997, 371), the texts, to my mind, seem a record only of the first news the king received. A graffito at Abu Simbel (FHN I 288) speaks of a fleet going upstream to Kerkis, "as far as the river allowed," which may refer only to the Second Cataract region. Zurawski (1998, 80-81), however, has credibly linked "Kerkis" to Terkis (Soniyat), the place where the Nile, as one sails upstream from the Third Cataract, suddenly turns to the northeast, forcing the sailor against the current and the prevailing wind. It is the place beyond which sailing ships can proceed no further. It lies about 112 km downstream from Napata. Zurawski, while imagining that the army with its transport ships passed some 200 km beyond Pnubs, concludes, like Török, that it did not reach Napata. This scenario, however, would seem to require some telltale signs of damage at Kawa, but none has yet been reported.

The Tanis Stele tells a quite different story than the other texts (Manuelian 1984, 365-371). It states that Psammeticus sent an army to "the land of Shas", from which, by the next line, it had reached "[...]r-[g?]-ba", where the "capital" (*hnw*) of the "king" (*kw3r*) was, "along with the town called 'The Cliff' (*T3-Dhn[t]*)" The text then speaks of a "great carnage" being made there, of the "burning/roasting of the king" and of trees being cut down. The text abruptly ends with the phrase "Psametik, living forever, given life like Re forever."

Török takes "Shas" here to be Sai Island, south of the Second Cataract, and concludes that the text describes an action on or near Sai where the king was then residing. The Shellal/Karnak versions, on the other hand, record a victory at Pnubs south of the Third Cataract, in which the Egyptian army took 4200 prisoners. Neither one of these texts mentions Napata by name, so Török, unimpressed with the archaeological evidence at Barkal and Sanam, concludes that army never reached Napata and did not pass beyond Pnubs (FHN I 286). The key geographical name in the Tanis Stele is, of course, *T3-Dhn(t)* ("The Cliff"), which Török equates with a hill on Sai. Earlier scholars equated it with locations at Korti and Dongola (Török 1997, 372-373). Yet the obvious equation would be *T3-Dhn(t)* = Gebel Barkal, especially given the references to a royal residence, and a "burning".

I have shown in this paper that Karnak and Gebel Barkal were called by the same name: *Nswt-T3wy* ("Thrones of the Two Lands") and "southern Heliopolis" because they were conceived as northern and southern manifestations of the same place. I have also shown that the mountain at the northern border of the Thebaid was called *T3-Dhnt*, and like Gebel Barkal, it was associated with Amun (as Sobek), with the Primeval Hill and with a stone serpent (Aufrere and Golvin 1997, 221-223; Brovarski 1984, 2002; Allen 1974, 85, Spell 108). It stands to reason then that the mountain at the southern border of the Thebaid would also be

known by the same name, since the two were obviously manifestations of the same place. Török has doubted that *T3-Dhn(t)* in the Tanis Stele is Gebel Barkal because Napata is not specifically named, yet we need only recall the Coronation Stele of Aspetla to see that when the army gathered at Gebel Barkal for the selection of the king it was said to be, not at Napata, but at *hnw dmi Dw-w'b rn.f* ("the residence-town called Pure Mountain") (FHN I 234), which is an almost identical construction to that in the Tanis Stele: *hnw pw n kw3r nty im hn'dmi T3-Dhn rn.s* (the residence of the king was located there together with the town called 'The Cliff') (Manuelian 1984, 367). Normally Amun of Gebel Barkal is called *nb Nswt T3wy hry-ib Dw W'b* ("Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands, who is in Pure Mountain"), but in the Year 3 Stele of Piye, he is uniquely called *nb Nswt T3wy Dhn W'b* ("Lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands of Pure Cliff"). The editors of FHN have translated *dhn w'b*, as did Reisner, as (Amun...) "who appoints and is pure," but the context surely requires a parallel with *Dw W'b*. Perhaps even double meanings are intended. The word *dhn*, however, is an interesting one, in view of what we know of Gebel Barkal, for it not only means "cliff" but also "forehead" and "diadem with uraeus" (Erman and Grapow 1931, Bd. 5, 478-479).

Török expresses surprise that the place name Pnubs occurs in the Shellal/Karnak stelae, which were put on display for local audiences in the south, who knew where Pnubs was situated, while the Tanis version contained "obscure" place names that would have been virtually unknown to people in the north (Török 1997, 373). I think, in fact, we can look at this another way. The accounts of the Battle of Pnubs would have been erected at Shellal and Karnak to inform the southerners of Psammeticus' victory in Nubia. Given the pro-Kushite sentiment of Upper Egypt, he would not have wished to disclose his army's depredations at "southern Karnak." His Tanis audience, on the other hand, completely familiar with the term "*T3-Dhn(t)*" would have been highly receptive to the news of Psammeticus' destruction of the Kushite sanctuary, which had authorized Kushite tyranny over them for the entire previous century.

There is not enough information in the texts to reveal Psammeticus' battle plans, but we can be sure that he divided his forces and made a two-pronged attack. One army marched very conspicuously over the Third Cataract and upriver to Pnubs to draw attention to itself and to form the focus of Kushite resistance. Another smaller force probably left the main army shortly after Sai and struck out across the Nubian desert with their pack animals, marching by night. After a journey of some 225 km they would have attacked Gebel Barkal suddenly from the rear, done their damage, and departed as quickly as possible. We may only speculate on how Sanam was damaged. Did these troops leave via the desert, or did they proceed downriver in commandeered river craft? Did they meet Theocles' fleet at Kerkis, near Old Dongola?

Gebel Barkal must surely have been the planned objective of Psammeticus' campaign because it was the center of a cult that gave the Napatan rulers a claim

to Upper Egypt, if not all of Egypt. The ceremonies held there, and the colossal pyramids being built there, allowed the Kushites to trumpet their claims to the Saite throne and to advertise their connection with the greatest pharaohs of the past, who were thought to have come from Gebel Barkal since the beginning of time. The primeval crown, the royal uraeus and kingship they claimed were theirs by authority of the mountain's god, who was also the god of Karnak, and as long as they could maintain this tradition with impunity, Psammeticus' legitimacy and that of his dynasty could always be questioned. By ravaging and looting the Barkal sanctuary and the royal palace there, by slaughtering the priests and residents, and by damaging or destroying the other towns and temples downstream, Psammeticus could be released from doubts about his own legitimacy and force the Kushites once and for all away from his borders and into inner Africa. This disaster was surely the event that forced the Kushites to look southward and to give up their dream of reuniting Nubia and the Thebaid. It would have led them to re-conceive the very nature of Amun's domain as well as the definition of their own kingship. Now "the Two Lands" and "Kemet" would be names they would apply to Nubia (FHN II 406, 446). Perhaps they reconceived their Nubian empire now as a "mirror image" of their former Egyptian, in which the great bend of the Nile acted as the reflector that reversed the shape of the world. The "northern Karnak" and royal capital (i.e. Meroe) now lay at the south, while the "southern Karnak" became, more than ever, the center - the center of Creation and of the world, and the center and birthplace kingship.

Bibliography

Abdel Hamid et al. 1975

F. Abdel Hamid avec la collab. de S.Donadoni, Ch.Lebanc. *Le Grand Temple d'Abou Simbel* - II. Cairo. .

Adams 1977

W.Y. Adams. *Nubia: Corridor to Africa*. Princeton: 1977.

Allen 1988

J. Allen. *Genesis in Egypt: The Philosophy of Ancient Egyptian Creation Accounts*. *Yale Egyptological Studies* , vol. 2. New Haven: Yale University.

Allen 1974

T.G. Allen, ed. *The Book of the Dead or Going Forth by Day*. Chicago.

Anderson and Ahmed 2000

J. Anderson and S. el-D. M. Ahmed. "Prospections archéologiques et fouilles de sauvetage dans la région de Berber-Abidiya (1997 et 1999)." *Cahier de Recherches de l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Egyptologie de Lille* 21: 17-37.

Anderson and Ahmed in press.

J. Anderson, J. and S. el-D. M. Ahmed. "The Berber-Abidiya Archaeological Project 1997-2001." *Sudan Archaeological Research Society Anniversary Issue*. The British Museum. 5pp.

Anthes 1961

R. Anthes. "Das Sonnenauge in den Pyramidentexten." *ZÄS* 86: 1-21.

Arkell 1940

A. J. Arkell. *Report for the Year 1939 of the Antiquities Service and Museums in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan*. Khartoum: 1940.

Arkell 1944

A.J. Arkell. *Report for the Years 1940-1943 of the Antiquities Service and Museums in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan*. Khartoum: 1944.

Arkell 1947

A.J. Arkell. "Discoveries which suggest the Existence of a Hidden Rock Temple: Colossal Statues Identified in the Sudan. A Sudanese Abu Simbel: Colossal Statues created by a Kushite King to emulate the Memorial of Ramses II," *Illustrated London News* Feb. 15, 1947: 214-215.

Arkell 1955

A.J. Arkell. *A History of the Sudan from the Earliest Times to 1821*. London: 1955.

Arnold 1981

D. Arnold. "Per-wer II." In W. Helck and W. Westendorf, eds. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* IV. Wiesbaden: 934-935.

Arnold 1991

D. Arnold. *Building in Egypt: Pharaonic Stone Masonry*. Oxford.

Arnold 1999

D. Arnold. *Temples of the Last Pharaohs*. New York.

Aston 1989

D.A. Aston. "Takeloth II - A King of the 'Theban Twenty-third Dynasty'?" *JEA* 75: 139-153.

Aufrère and Golvin 1997

S. Aufrère and J.-C. Golvin. *L'Égypte Restituée, tome 3: Sites, temples et pyramides de Moyenne et Basse Égypte de la naissance de la civilisation pharaonique à l'époque greco-romaine*. Paris.

Aufrère, Golvin, and Goyon 1994

S. Aufrère and J.-C. Golvin. *L'Égypte Restituée, tome 1: Sites, et temples de Haute Égypte de l'apogée de la civilisation pharaonique à l'époque greco-romaine*. Paris.

Baines 1970

John Baines. "Bnbn: Mythological and Linguistic Notes," *Orientalia* 25 , 389-xxxx

Baines and Malek 1984

J. Baines and J. Malek. *Atlas of Ancient Egypt*. Oxford.

Bell 1936

G. Bell. "Notes: Nuba Fertility Stones," *Sudan Notes and Records* 19: 314-316.

Bell 1985

Lanny Bell. "Luxor Temple and the Cult of the Royal Ka," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 44:251-294.

Bell 1997

Lanny Bell. "The New Kingdom 'Divine' Temple; The Example of Luxor." In B.E.Shafer, ed. *Temples of Ancient Egypt*. Ithaca: 127-184

Bennet 1999

C. Bennet. "Karimala, Daughter of Osochor?." *Göttinger Miscellen* 173: 7-8.

Bickel 1991

S.Bickel. "L'iconographie du dieu Khnoum," *BIFAO* 91: 55- 67

Bisson de la Rocque 1931

M.F. Bisson de la Rocque. *Rapport sur les Fouilles de Médamoud (1930)*. Cairo.

Blackman 1937

A. Blackman. "Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Sesebi, Northern Province, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1936-37." *JEA* 23: 145-51, pls. 12-19.

Bolton 1936

A.R.C. Bolton. "The Dubab and Nuba of Jebel Daier," *Sudan Notes and Records* 19: 92-108

Bolshakov 2001

A. O. Bolshakov. "Ka," in D.B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt II*. Oxford: 215-217.

Bongioanni and Croce. eds. 2001

A. Bongioanni and M. S. Croce, eds. *The Illustrated Guide to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo*. Cairo.

Bonheme 1987

M.-A. Bonheme. *Les noms royaux dans l'Égypte de la troisième période intermédiaire*. Cairo

Bonnet 1990

C. Bonnet. *Kerma: Royaume de Nubie*. Geneva.

Bonnet, Honegger, and Valbelle 1998-1999

C. Bonnet, M. Honegger, and D. Valbelle. "Kerma: Rapport préliminaire sur les campagnes de 1997-1998 et 1998-1999." In *Genava*. Geneva: Musée d'art et d'histoire, November, 1999.

Bonnet, Valbelle and Ahmed 2000

C. Bonnet, D. Valbelle, and S. E.-D. M. Ahmed. "Les sanctuaires de Kerma du Nouvel Empire à l'époque méroïtique." *Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Année 2000, juillet-octobre*. Paris: Académie des inscriptions & belles-lettres.

Bosticco 1988

S. Bosticco. "Il tempio B 200 al Gebel Barkal," *Vicino Oriente* 7: 217-221.

.

Breasted 1906

J.H. Breasted. *Ancient Records of Egypt*, 5 vols. Chicago.

Brunner 1977

Helmut Brunner. *Die südliche Räume des Tempels von Luxor*. Mainz.

Budge 1907

E.A. Wallis Budge. *The Egyptian Sudan: Its History and Monuments*, vol. I. London.

Burstein 1999

S. M. Burstein. "The Origins of the Napatan State in Classical Sources." In S. Wenig, ed. *Studien zum antiken Sudan: Akten der 7. Internationalen Tagung für meroitische Forschungen vom 14. Bis 19, September 1992 in Gosen/bei Berlin. Meroitica 15*. Wiesbaden.: 118-126.

Cailliaud 1826

F. Cailliaud, *Voyage a Méroé, au Fleuve Blanc, au-delà de Fazoql...* vol. iii . Paris.

Camino 1958

R. Camino. *The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon*. Rome.

Capel and Markoe 1996

A.K. Capel and G. Markoe, eds., *Mistress of the House, Mistress of Heaven: Women in Ancient Egypt*. Cincinnati.

Chittick 1957

H. N. Chittick. "An Inscription on Gebel Barkal," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 43: 42-44.

Curtis and Reade 1995

J.E. Curtis and J.E. Reade. *Art and Empire: Treasures from Assyria in the British Museum*. New York.

Daumas 1980

F. Daumas. "Neujahr." In W. Helck and E. Otto, eds. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie IV*: 466-467.

Davies 1982

W. V. Davies. "The Origin of the Blue Crown," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 68: 69-76.

Davies 1998

Vivian Davies. "New Fieldwork at Kurgus: The Pharaonic Inscriptions," *Sudan & Nubia* 2: 26-30

Davies and Gardiner 1926

N. de G. Davies and A. H. Gardiner. *The Tomb of Huy, Viceroy of Nubia in the Reign of Tut'ankhamun (no. 40). Theban Tomb Series, Fourth Memoire*. London.

Desroches Noblecourt 1995

C. Desroches-Noblecourt. *Amours et fureurs de La Lointaine; Clés por la compréhension de symboles égyptiens*. France.

Desroches Noblecourt 1999

C. Desroches-Noblecourt. *Le secret des temples de la Nubie*. France.

Dodson 1991

A. Dodson. "Third Intermediate Period." In D. B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, vol. 3. Oxford.: 388-394.

Dorman 1988

P.F. Dorman. *The Monuments of Senenmut: Problems in Historical Methodology*. London/New York.

Doxey 2001

D. Doxey. "'Priesthood.'" In D.B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, t 3. Oxford: 68-73.

Dunham 1950

D. Dunham. *The Royal Cemeteries of Kush, I: El-Kurru*. Cambridge, MA.

Dunham 1955

D. Dunham. *The Royal Cemeteries of Kush, II: Nuri*. Boston.

Dunham 1970

D. Dunham. *The Barkal Temples*. Boston.

Dunham and Chapman 1952

D. Dunham and S.E. Chapman. *Royal Cemeteries of Kush, vol. III: Decorated Tomb Chapels of the Meroitic Pyramids at Meroe and Barkal*. Boston.

Elgood 1951

P. G. Elgood. *Later Dynasties of Egypt*. Oxford.

El-Saghir 1991

M. El-Saghir. *The Discovery of the Statuary Cachette of Luxor Temple*. Mainz.

Epigraphic Survey 1979

The Epigraphic Survey. *The Temple of Khonsu, vol. 1. Scenes of King Herihor in the Court. (OIP 100)*. Chicago.

Epigraphic Survey 1981

The Epigraphic Survey. *The Temple of Khonsu, vol. 2. Scenes and Inscriptions in the Court and the First Hypostyle Hall (OIP 103)*. Chicago.

Emery 1967

W. B. Emery. *Lost Land Emerging*. New York.

FHN I (1994)

T. Eide, T. Hägg, R.H. Pierce, and L. Török, eds. *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum. Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD. I. From the Eighth to the Mid-Fifth Century BC.* Bergen.

FHN II (1996)

T. Eide, T. Hägg, R.H. Pierce, and L. Török, eds. *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum. Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD. II. From the Mid-Fifth to the First Century BC.* Bergen.

Fairman 1938

H. W. Fairman. "Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Sesebi (Sudla) and 'Amara West, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1937-38." *JEA* 24: 151-56, pls. 8-10.

Fazzini 1988

R. A. Fazzini. *Egypt: Dynasty XXII-XXV (Iconography of Religions XVI/10).* Leiden.

Faulkner 1964

R.O. Faulkner. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian.* Oxford.

Faulkner 1969

R.O.Faulkner. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts.* Oxford.

Faulkner 1972

R.O. Faulkner, trans. C. Andrews, ed. *The Ancient Egyptian Book of the Dead.* New York.

Faulkner 1994

R.O. Faulkner. *The Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*, 3 vols. Warminster.

Gabolde 1998

L. Gabolde, "Le 'grand chateau d'Amon' de Sésostris Ier à Karnak." *MAIBL* 17:

Gabolde 1999

L. Gabolde. "Brèves Communications: Canope et les orientations nord-duf de Karnak établis par Thoutmosis III," *RdE* 50: 278-282.

Gamer-Wallert 1983

Ingrid Gamer-Wallert. *Der Löwentempel von Naqa'a in der Butana (Sudan) III. Die Wandreliefs 2. Tafeln.* Wiesbaden.

Gardiner 1906

A. H. Gardiner. "Mesore as first month of the Egyptian Year." *ZÄS* 49: 131

Gardiner 1944

A. Gardiner. "Horus the Behdetite." *JEA* 30: 23-60.

Gardiner 1953

A. Gardiner. "The Coronation of King Haremhab," *JEA* 39: 13-31;

Gardiner 1969

A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*. Oxford.

Goelet 2001

O. Goelet. "Herihor." In D. B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, vol. 2. Oxford. 93

Goedicke 1965

H. Goedicke. "The Location of *Hnt hn nfr*," *Kush* 13: 102-111.

Gohary 1992

J. Gohary. *Akhenaten's Sed-Festival at Karnak*. London/New York.

Griffith 1900

F.Ll. Griffith. *Stories of the High Priest of Memphis. The Sethon of Herodotus and the Demotic Tales of Khamuas*. Oxford.

Griffith 1922

F. Ll. Griffith. "Oxford Excavations in Nubia," *LAAA* IX: 67-124.

Griffith 1923

F. Ll. Griffith. "Oxford Excavations in Nubia," *LAAA* X: 73-171.

Grimal 1981

N.-C.Grimal. *Quatre stèles Napatéennes au Musée du Caire*, *JE* 48863-48866. Cairo.

Hein 1991

I.Hein. *Die Ramessidische Bautätigkeit in Nubien*. Wiesbaden 1991

Hintze 1971

F. Hintze. *Musawwarat es Sufra, Band I, 2: Der Löwentempel*. Berlin.

Hölscher 1939

U. Hölscher. *The Excavation of Medinet Habu, vol. II. The Temples of the Eighteenth Dynasty (OIP 41)*. Chicago.

Isler 1989

M. Isler. "An Ancient Method of Finding and Extending Direction," *JARCE* 26: 191-206.

Isler 1991

M. Isler. "The Gnomon in Egyptian Antiquity." *JARCE* 28: 155-185.

Jacquet, Bonnet, and Jacquet 1969

H. Jacquet, C. Bonnet, and J. Jacquet. "Pnubs and the Temple of Tabo on Argo Island," *JEA* 55: 103-111.

Junker 1911

H. Junker. *Der Auszug der Hathor-Tefnut aus Nubien*. Berlin.

Junker 1917

H. Junker. *Die Onurislegende*. Berlin.

Kemp 1991

Barry Kemp. *Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a Civilization*. London.

Kendall 1986

T. Kendall. "Gebel Barkal Epigraphic Survey: 1986. Preliminary Report of the First Season's Activity. Report to the Visiting Committee of the Department of Egyptian Art, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston." Boston.

Kendall 1990

T. Kendall. *Kerma and the Kingdom of Kush*. Washington

Kendall 1991

T. Kendall. "The Napatan Palace at Gebel Barkal: A First Look at B 1200." In W.V. Davies, ed. *Egypt and Africa: Nubia from Prehistory to Islam*. London. 302-313,

Kendall 1994

T. Kendall. "Le Djebel Barkal: Le Karnak de Koush." In *La Nubie (=Les Dossiers d'archéologie* 196, Sept. 1994): 46-53

Kendall 1996

T. Kendall. "Fragments Lost and Found: Two Kushite Objects Augmented." In P.D. Manuelian, ed, *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson*, vol. 2. Boston: 468-476.

Kendall 1997a

T. Kendall. "Excavations at Gebel Barkal, 1996. Report of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Sudan Mission," *Kush* 17: 320-354.

Kendall 1997b

T. Kendall. "Kings of the Sacred Mountain: Napata and the Kushite Twenty-fifth Dynasty of Egypt." In D. Wildung, ed, *Sudan: Ancient Kingdoms of the Nile*. Paris/New York: 161-171.

Kendall 1999a

T. Kendall. "The Origin of the Napatan State: El Kurru and the Evidence for the Royal Ancestors." In S. Wenig, ed. *Studien zum antiken Sudan: Akten der 7. Internationalen*

Tagung für meroitische Forschungen vom 14. Bis 19, September 1992 in Gosen/bei Berlin. Meroitica 15. Wiesbaden.: 3-117.

Kendall 1999b

T. Kendall. "A Respinse to Laszlo Török's 'Long Chronology' of El Kurru." In S. Wenig, ed. *Studien zum antiken Sudan: Akten der 7. Internationalen Tagung für meroitische Forschungen vom 14. Bis 19, September 1992 in Gosen/bei Berlin. Meroitica 15. Wiesbaden: 164-176*

Kendall 2001

T. Kendall. *Archaeological Explorations in the Bayuda Desert: 1999-2000 Seasons, Preliminary Report I, Part I: Al-Meragh and the Wadi Muqaddam between Tamtam and Korti.* (Khartoum): The NCAM Bayuda Expedition: National Corporation of Antiquities and Museums, Sudan.

Kessler 2001

D. Kessler. "Bull Gods." In D.B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt I.* Oxford: 209-213.

Kitchen 1973

K.A. Kitchen. *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 BC).* Warminster.

Kormysheva 1994

E.Kormysheva. Le nom d'Amun sur les monuments royaux de Koush. Études lexicographiques. *Hommages à Jean Leclant, Vol.II, Nubie, Soudan, Ethiopia.* IFAO. Cairo: 251-261.

Kormysheva 1996

E.Kormysheva. "Kulte der ägyptische Götter des Neuen Reiches in Kusch." *Wege öffnen. Festschrift für Rolf Gundlach. AA.:133-148*

Kormysheva 2002

E. Kormysheva. "On the Origin and Evolution of the Amun Cult in Nubia." In T..Kendall, ed., *Nubian Studies 1998: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference of Nubian Studies, Boston. August 21-16, 1998.* Boston.

Kozloff and Bryan 1992

A. P. Kozloff and B. M. Bryan, with L.M. Berman. *Egypt's Dazzling Sun: Amenhotep III and his World.* Cleveland.

Lacau 1969

P. Lacau. *Une Chapelle de Sesostris Ier à Karnak.* Plates. Paris.

Lacau and Chevrier 1977-79

P. Lacau and H. Chevrier. *Une chapelle d'Hatshepsout à Karnak.* Cairo.

Leahy 1990

A. Leahy, ed. *Libya and Egypt, c. 1300-750 BC*. London.

Leahy 1992

A. Leahy. "Royal Iconography and Dynastic Change, 750-525 B.C.; The Blue and Cap Crowns," *JEA* 78: 223-240

Lehner 1997

M. Lehner. *The Complete Pyramids*. London.

Lepsius 1842-45

C. R. Lepsius. *Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien...Abt. III*. Berlin.

Lichtheim 1976

M. Lichtheim. *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings*. Berkeley: U. of California Press.

Lohwasser 2001

A. Lohwasser. "Queenship in Kush: Status, Role, and Ideology of Royal Women," *JARCE* 38: 61-76.

Macadam 1949

M.F.L. Macadam. *The temples of Kawa I: The Inscriptions*. Oxford.

Macadam 1955

M.F.L. Macadam. *The Temples of Kawa II: History and Archaeology of the Site*. Oxford.

Malaise 2001

M. Malaise. "Bes." In D.B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt I*. Oxford: 179-181.

Manuelian 1987

P. D. Manuelian, *Studies in the Reign of Amenophis II*. *Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge* 26. Hildesheim.

Manuelian 1984

P.D. Manuelian. *Living in the Past: Studies in Archaism in the Egyptian Twenty-Sixth Dynasty*. London.

Morkot 2000

R.G. Morkot. *The Black Pharaohs: Egypt's Nubian Rulers*. London.

Munro 1983

I. Munro. *Das Zeit-Heiligtum des Min*. *Münchener Ägyptologische Studien* 41. Berlin.

Murnane 1995

W. J. Murnane. *Texts from the Amarna Period in Egypt*. Atlanta.

Mysliwiec 1978

K. Mysliwiec. *Studien zum Gott Atum, Band I. Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge 5*. Hildesheim.

Mysliwiec 2001

Karol Mysliwiec. "Atum." In D.B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt I*. Oxford: 158-160.

Naville 1892

E. Naville. *The Festival Hall of Osorkon II in the Great Temple of Bubastis (1887-1889)*. London.

Nebe 1986

I. Nebe. "Werethekau." In W. Helck and E. Otto, eds. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie VI*. Wiesbaden: 1221-1224.

O'Connor 1982

D. O'Connor. "Egypt, 1552-664 BC." In J.D. Clark, ed. *The Cambridge History of Africa, vol. I. From the Earliest Times to 500 BC*. Cambridge.

O'Connor 1983

D. O'Connor. "The Third Intermediate Period." In *Ancient Egypt: A Social History*. Cambridge: 232-249.

O'Connor 1989

D. O'Connor. "City and Palace in New Kingdom Egypt." In *Sociétés urbaines en Égypte et au Soudan (CRIPEL 11)*. Lille: 73-87.

Ogdon 1985-86

J. R. Ogdon. "Some Notes on the Iconography of Min." *Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar* 7: 27-41.

Pamminger 1992

P. Pamminger. "Amun und Luxor - Der Widder und das Kultbild," *Beiträge zur Sudanforschung* 5: 93-140.

Parker, Leclant, and Goyon 1979

R.A. Parker, J. Leclant, and J.-C. Goyon. *The Edifice of Taharqa by the Sacred Lake of Karnak*. Providence.

Piankoff 1954

A. Piankoff. *The Tomb of Ramsesses VI. Texts. Bollingen Series XL.I*. New York.

Piankoff 1957

A. Painkoff. *Egyptian Religious Texts and Representations, vol. 3: Mythological Papyri. Bollingen Series XL.* New York.

Piccione 1990

P.A. Piccione. "Mehen, Mysteries, and Resurrections from the Coiled Serpent," *JARCE* 27: 43-52..

Porter and Moss 1951

B. Porter and R.L.B. Moss, with E.W. Burney. *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings, VII. Nubia, the Deserts, and Outside Egypt.* Oxford.

Porter and Moss 1972

B. Porter and R.L.B. Moss, with E.W. Burney. *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings, II. Theban Temples (Second Edition).* Oxford

Priese 1977

K.-H. Priese. "Eine verschollene Bauinschrift des frühmeroitischen Königs Aktisanes (?) vom Gebel Barkal," in E. Endesfelder et al., eds *Ägypten und Kusch.* Berlin.

Priese 1993

K.-H. Priese, *The Gold Of Meroe.* New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Redford 1999

D. Redford. "The Beginning of the Heresy." In R. Freed, Y. J. Markowitz, and S. D'Auria, eds. *Pharaohs of the Sun: Akhenaten, Nefertiti, Tutankhamen.* Boston: 50-59

Reisner 1917

G.A. Reisner. "The Barkal Temples in 1916 (Part I)." *JEA* 4: 213-227

Reisner 1918

G.A.Reisner. "The Barkal Temples in 1916 (Part II)." *JEA* 5: 99-112

Reisner 1920

G.A. Reisner. "The Barkal Temples in 1916 (Part III)." *JEA* 6: 247-264

Reisner 1931

G.A. Reisner. "Inscribed Monuments from Gebel Barkal." *ZÄS* 66: 76-100.

Reisner and Resiner 1933a

G. A, Reisner and M.B. Reisner. "Inscribed Monuments from Gebel Barkal, Part 2: The Granite Stela of Thutmose III," *ZÄS* 69: 35, l. 33.

Reisner and Reisner 1933b

G.A. Reisner and M. B. Reisner, "Inscribed Monuments from Gebel Barkal, Part 3: The Stela of Sety I," *ZÄS* 69: 73-78,

Robisek 1989

C. Robisek. *Das Bildprogramm des Mut-Tempels am Gebel Barkal. Beiträge zur Ägyptologie, Bd. 8.* Wien.

Rundle-Clark 1991

R.T. Rundle-Clark, *Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt.* London.

Russmann 1974

E.R. Russmann. *The Representation of the King in the XXVth Dynasty.* Brussels/Brooklyn.

Schiff Giorgini et al. 1998

M. Schiff Giorgini et al., *Soleb V: Le temple. Bas-reliefs et inscriptions.* Cairo.

Schwaller de Lubicz 1982

R.A. Schwaller de Lubicz, with G. and V. de Mire. *Les Temples de Karnak: contribution à l'étude de la pensée pharaonique.* Paris.

Simpson 1971

W. K. Simpson. "A Horus-of-Nekhen Statue of Amunhotpe III from Soleb." *Boston Museum Bulletin* 69: 152-164.

Spalinger 2001

A. Spalinger. "Festivals." In D.B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt I.* Oxford: 521-525.

Tobin 2001

V.A. Tobin. "Amun and Amun-Re." In D.B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt I.* Oxford: 82-85.

Török 1987

L. Török. *The Royal Crowns of Kush: A Study in Middle Nile Valley Regalia and Iconography in the 1st millennium BC and AD.* Cambridge.

Török 1997

L. Török. *The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization.* Leiden.

Traunecker 2001

C. Traunecker. "Kamutef." In D.B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt II.* Oxford: 221-222.

Troy 1986

L. Troy. *Patterns of Queenship in Ancient Egyptian Myth and History*. Uppsala.

Van Siclen 2001

C. C. Van Siclen. "Obelisk." In D.B. Redford, Ed. in Chief. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt II*. Oxford: 561-564.

Van Voss 1982

H. van Voss. *Ägypten, die 21. Dynastie (Iconography of Religions XVI/9)*. Leiden.

Vergniew 1999

R. Vergniew. "Recherches sur les monuments thébains d'Amenhotep IV à l'aide d'outils informatiques." *Cahiers de la Société d'Égyptologie*, 4/1. Geneva. 4 ff.

Vinogradov 1999

A. K.. Vinogradov. "[...] their brother, the Chieftan, the son of Re', Alara [...]"? *CRIPEL 20: Sociétés urbaines en Égypte et au Soudan*. Lille: 81-94.

Waddington and Hanbury 1822

G. Waddington and B. Hanbury. *Journal of a Visit to some parts of Ethiopia*. London.

Walker 1991

Edward J. Walker. *Aspects of the Primal Nature of Egyptian Kingship: Pharaoh as Atum* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, U. of Chicago). Ann Arbor.

Wenig 1976

S. Wenig. "Gebel Barkal." In W. Helck and E. Otto *Lexikon der Ägyptologie II*, 3 (Wiesbaden: 1976)

Wenig 1978

S. Wenig. *Africa in Antiquity: The Arts of Ancient Nubia and the Sudan II*. Brooklyn.

Wente 1966

E. F. Wente. "The Suppression of the High Priest Amenhotep." *JNES* 25, 73-87

Westendorf 1977

W. Westendorf. "Horusäuge." In W. Helck and E. Otto. *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 17, Band III, Lieferung I. Mainz: pp. 49-50.

Wildung 1997

D. Wildung, Ed. *Sudan: Ancient Kingdoms of the Nile*. Paris/New York.

Yoyotte 1951

J. Yoyotte. "Le martelage des noms royaux Éthiopiens par Psammétique II." *RdE* 8: 215-239.

Yoyotte 1968

J. Yoyotte. "La date suppose du couronnement d'Hatshepsout." *Kemi* 18: 85-91.

Zabkar 1975

L.V. Zabkar. *Apedemak, Lion God of Meroe*. Warminster.

Zabkar 1988

L.V. Zabkar. *Hymns to Isis in her Temple at Philae*. Hanover.

Zibelius-Chen 1989

K. Zibelius-Chen, "Überlegungen zur ägyptischen Nubienpolitik in der Dritten Zwischenzeit." *SAK* 16: 329-345.

Zibelius-Chen 1995

K.Zibelius-Chen. "Das nachkoloniale Nubien." In *Der Sudan in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*. Hrsg. R.Gundlach

Zurawski 1998

B. Zurawski. "Pliny's 'Tergedum' discovered." *Sudan & Nubia* 2 (1998): 74-81.

Zurawski 2001

B. Zurawski. "The Southern Dongola Reach Survey: Report on Fieldwork in 2000." *Polish Archaeology in the Mediterranean* 13: 283-287.