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Tombos and the Viceroy Inebny/Amenemnekh\textit{u}

\textit{W. Vivian Davies}

As part of a wider investigation of Egyptian inscriptions in the Northern Sudan, the British Museum has begun a project of epigraphic survey at Tombos near the Third Cataract,\textsuperscript{1} well known as the site of major pharaonic stelae documenting Egypt's conquest and occupation of Kush in the early Eighteenth Dynasty. I published here the first results of the project: a new record of an important viceregal inscription located on Tombos Island (Back Cover, Colour plates V-VIII, Figures 1-2).\textsuperscript{2} I also consider related material from the collection of the British Museum and from the temples of Semna and Kumma (now housed in the garden of the Sudan National Museum, Khartoum).

\textit{Island of Tombos, Inscription of Year 20 of Thutmose III}

Cut into the northern face of a low, granite boulder, located not far from the river-bank in the south-east of the island (Colour plates V (91/17) and VI),\textsuperscript{3} the inscription, now incomplete owing to lamination of parts of the surface, is arranged in eight horizontal lines, the hieroglyphs reading right to left (Colour plate VIII; Figure 1). Only the final line, damaged in parts, is preserved along its entire length.\textsuperscript{4} There is no trace of paint within the hieroglyphs. Marking the successful outcome of a punitive expedition carried out in Year 20 of King Thutmose III, the text invokes benefits for the viceroy responsible (name deliberately damaged), boasting of his effectiveness in delivering southern goods

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure1.png}
\caption{New copy of inscription of Thutmose III.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{1} PM VII, 174-5.
\textsuperscript{2} The basic record was made in November 2006.
\textsuperscript{3} PM VII, 175 (Island); Edwards and Salih 1992, 24-5, pl. vii (ref. 91/17). The choice of this particular boulder was probably influenced by practical concerns. Its relatively smooth, vertical northern side offered an ideal surface for such an inscription and is set at a convenient height (Back cover). It is one of a large outcrop of such boulders (Colour plate VI) a group of which, further to the north, is decorated with native rock-art (Edwards and Salih 1992, 24, ref. 91/16). Beyond, near the northern tip of the island, is another Egyptian inscription (Edwards and Salih 1992, 26-7, pl. viii, ref. 91/13),

\textsuperscript{4} The length of the final line is approx. 1.16m. The maximum surviving height of the inscription is 630mm.

\textsuperscript{5} Breasted 1908, 47-8.

\textsuperscript{6} Säve-Söderbergh 1941, 175-6 and 207-9, with fig. 16 (publishing Breasted's photograph with transcription). Cf. the more recent photograph in Edwards and Salih 1992, 25, pl. vii, and Edwards 2004, 103-4, fig. 411, and the transcription (based on the Säve-Söderbergh publication) in U/rk. iv, 1373, 3-19.

\textsuperscript{7} On the military campaign, see, for example, Redford 1967, 60-1;
In dispute from the beginning has been the reading of the damaged name of the viceroy, ‘the king’s son, overseer of southern foreign lands’, an issue which has bearing on the question of the number and identity of the viceroys who served during the co-regency of Thutmose III and Hatshepsut. To date, only one viceroy is attested with certainty for the period of the co-regency, namely Amenemnexit (I-n-n-m-n-hw). He is known from several rock-inscriptions at different sites in Nubia (see further below), one of which (at Shaffak) is dated to Year 18. In a number of cases (twice in the same context at Shaffak and once at Sheh), his name has been officially effaced. Of the other attested viceroys of the first half of the Eighteenth Dynasty, only Usertaset (temp. Amenhotep II) appears to have certainly suffered similar persecution. There must therefore be a high probability that Amenemnexit is the viceroy named in the Tombs Island inscription. As will be seen below, this inference is well founded, though there is an unexpected twist to the tale.

The viceroy of the Tombs Island inscription is named twice, at the end of lines 5 and 8 respectively. In the interpretation of the traces remaining in the first case, scholarly opinion has been largely divided between the reading Iny (Any) and Inebny; the latter reading supported by

---

7 Reinecke, 1977, 372-3; Zibelius-Chen 1988, 195, with n. 356, and 222, with n. 168; Säve-Söderbergh and Troy 1991, 3; Pedén 2001, 90; Redford 2003, 190, with n. 28; Redford 2004, 38, with n. 8; Bryan 2006, 79; Spalinger 2006, 354; Popko 2006, 134.
9 Hintze and Reinecke 1989, i, 90, nos. 365, II, 122, no. 365.
10 Hintze and Reinecke 1989, i, 90, nos. 365-6, II, 122, nos. 365-6; Gasse and Rondot 2003, 43, fig. 4; Gasse and Rondot 2007, 136 and 481 (SEH 241).
11 Schulten 1969-70, 36, n. 68; Dewachter 1978, I, 534-5; Müller 1979, 173-6, no. 8; Habachi 1980, 632, no. 10; Gasse and Rondot 2003, 43-4, pl. 4; Gasse and Rondot 2007, 147-154. There is no clear evidence that the name of the viceroy Senti was ever deliberately effaced (Dewachter 1978, I, 534-5). The identity of the king and viceroy figured on the stela from Sai Island, S. 63 (see most recently

---

Plates 1 and 2. Detail of the inscription, showing the viceroy’s first name.

Plate 1. Detail of the inscription, showing the viceroy’s second name.
the fact that a ‘king’s son’ named Inebny is known from a
contemporary source, the famous painted limestone statue,
British Museum EA 1131 (Colour plates IX-X).14 There
appears to have been a general assumption that the second
example of the name, in line 8, was a repetition of that in line
5, though it has also been argued that ‘Tam-m-nwfr’ might be
read in line 8 and a shortened or diminutive form in line 5.15

Our new record of the inscription, with details enlarged,
is reproduced in photograph and facsimile in Colour plates
VII-VIII, Plates 1-2, and Figures 1-2, respectively. It can be
seen that, despite the ancient attempts to obliterate the names
by deliberately lowering the surface of the stone at the ap-
propriate points, the outlines of the individual hieroglyphs are
still for the most part preserved (Plates 1-2; Figure 2). There
is little doubt that the first name is Tabny (written as
in the horizontal line 12 of the British Museum statue,
Colour plate XI), while the second name is certainly ‘Tam-m-
nwfr’.16 In the case of the former, only the n-sign underneath
the ū-sign is not entirely clear. In the latter, the name-deter-
minative, once located under the arm-holding-stick-
hieroglyph, is lost.

With these names included (Figure 1), the inscription may
be read as follows:17

1. [Ye]jar 20. The good god, who overthrew the one who
attacked him […]
2. house (ê) (a) of his father (b), who gave strength (ê) (c)
and […] (d)
3. […] (e) Menkheperre (f) [beloved of] A[mon] […] (g)
4. A gift that [the king gives] and Amun, [to]rd of the
thrones of the two lands and the Ennead which is in Ta-
Sery, that they may give valour, vigilance and […] (h)
5. [in] front of the king (ê) and life, health, prosperity and
alertness in the favour of the king, and every[ly] good and
pure thing for the spirit of the king’s son, overseer of south-
ern (ê) foreign lands, Inebny,
6. [he says: I am an] effective [servant] of his lord, who
filled his house with [gold] (kâ), jasper, ivory, ebony, and
tishespe-wood,
7. [with] [skin] (m) of panthers, khesayet-spice and
incense of the Medjau,

8. with the riches of vile Kush (n); one who was caused
to ascend to the palace of the lord of the two lands (o),
who entered favoured and left beloved (p), king’s son,
Amenemekhu.

a. The ‘house’-hieroglyph here is taken (not impossibly)
as the substantive ‘house’, ‘temple’ by Säve-Söderbergh 1941,
208, fig. line 2, and Urk. iv, 1375, 4, with êf ‘build’ restored
before it. However, since it lacks the stroke-determinative,
which is present in the example of the word in line 6, it
could possibly itself be a determinative, of a word like ∫n-wu,
‘storeroom’, ‘labour establishment’, ‘∫n-∫n Betriebe’, which is
commonly attested in the context of military victory by the
king with prisoners taken to ‘fill the ∫n’ of his father (Amon)
or similar; cf. Wh 4, 507, 12; Polz 1990, 47, n. 28; Eichler
2000, 97-8, with n. 451; Morris 2005, 182; Hallmann 2006,
42, n. 288, 226, n. 1532, 233 and 299.

b. There is a natural hole in the surface above the ē, which
the sculptors avoided and worked around.

c. With Säve-Söderbergh 1941, 208, Urk. iv, 1375, 5, and
Helck 1961, 67, no. 416, taking ēf here as a writing of nh/ or
nâfr or nub, ‘Stärke’ or ‘Sieg’, an attribute or outcome
granted by Amun to the king (cf. Wh 2, 316, 13; Galán
1995, 52-3 (IV) and 54-5 (VI)).

d. The remains of a sign or possibly two signs are dis-
cernible above the cartouche in line 3.

e. Of the first half of the line there survives a tiny rem-
nant only, located immediately above the third test-sign (of
nâfr nsw t3w) in line 4.

f. Despite the partial loss of the end of the name, the
reading Menkheperre, the prenomen of Thutmose III (as
opposed to Menkheprure, the prenomen of Thutmose IV),
is assured (cf. Bryan 1991, 6-9).

g. Reading the remnant following the cartouche as the
bottom of the i of ‘Tamb; cf. Urk. iv, 1375, 7; Helck 1961,
67, no. 416, n. 3.

h. I take the vertical sign following the š (of r(aw)-š) as
its stroke determinative. The identity of the fragmentary
sign following remains uncertain. On the attributes com-
monly included in this version of the offering formula, see
Barta 1968, 97 and 122 (Bitte 122).

i. Reading [n]-hãḥ nsw. For the expression in such
formulæ, see Barta 1968, 97, Bitte 122, h with n. 3; cf. Urk. iv,
1614, 13. For the seated king hieroglyph as a writing of
nsw, cf., for example, Urk. iv, 74, 14 (Fecht 1964, 58).

j. Note the abbreviated writing of rsw, with a š displac-
ing the normal r of rs (Gardiner 1957, 482, M 24), as in the
inscription of Amenemekhu from Tanur; see Hintz and
Reinke 1989, 1, 173, no. 564, II, 240, no. 564, and possi-
ably also I, 171, no. 558, II, 237, no. 558.

k. Reading [ddf ink bšk] 3h n nbf mh pr f m [nwb]. The
suggested restorations fit the lacunae and suit the con-
text; cf. the Ibrim inscription of the viceroy Nehy, Caminos
1968, 41, pl. 10, line 2 (= Urk. iv, 984, 7-9); Hallmann 2006, 19.
Other suggestions (Urk. iv, 1375, 13; Gutgesell and Schmitz
1981, 133, n. 14) are less convincing. On the phrase **ḥ3k ḫ3 ṃ ṅt b.f.,** including the Tombos example, see Gursch 1994, 86 and 223-4 (106) 01-03, to which add HT vi, 11, pl. 47, no. 371 (BM EA 1199), line 2 = Frood 2003, 60, fig. 1, line 2, and 65, pl. iv, and Davies 1930, 44, pl. xlv, 7.

1. On the various commodities listed here, see Drenkhahn, 1967, 125-6, 130-1, 132-3, 137-8; Zibelius-Chen 1988, 73-80, 85-86, with n. 152, 91, 93-4, with n. 253, 96-8, with n. 291, 99-100, with n. 306, 107-8, with n. 393, and 112-4; on khesayet and tishepes, see Edel 1984, 190, no. 5, and 191, with n. 6; Koura 1999, 234-5 and 238-40; on Nubia as a source of gold, ivory and ebony, see Hikade 2001, 71-5 and 92-5, with nn. 402 and 515.

m. Restoring 4. The n-sign is clear, the bottom of the nw-sign survives, and the skin-determinative is certain. There is room for an m at the beginning of the line, preceding *ḥ3m.*

n. Despite the partial loss, the reading m ṣpsw or ṣpssw n Ki ḫst here is clear. On ‘ḥpsw-„Kostbarkeiten‘ in such contexts, see Hallmann 2006, 293-4. The top of the t of ḫst survives.

p. On s̱r in this sense, cf. the contemporary parallel, Ušr. iv, 897, 6, cited in Wbr. 4, 32, 11. The reading ḫbey (misinterpreted by Breasted, see Šaw-Söderbergh 1941, 208, fig. 15, line 8, with n. 8) is definite. The second ḫ3-sign, which is not as long as the first, stops short of a hole in the surface at this point.


It follows from the inscription that the viceroy Amenemheb-khu had two names, Inebny/Amenemheb-khu, which are used here alternatively, and that he was still in active service in Year 20, when he conducted or effected the military campaign in question, one of at least two southern campaigns known to have taken place during the period of the co-regency. It also (almost certainly) confirms his identity with the ‘follower of his lord upon his footsteps in the southern and northern foreign lands, king’s son, troop-commander, overseer of weaponry of the king, Inebny’ of the British Museum statue (Colour plates IX-X). Although their secondary titles are different, both served as ‘king’s son’ during the same period (that of the co-regency) and

---

20 For the titles ‘troop-commander’ and ‘overseer of weaponry of the king’, see Chevrec 1994, 66, 11.15, and 194, 26.17. They serve here perhaps to articulate the military responsibilities subsumed in the post of viceroy. On the organization of the Egyptian army in Kush during this period, see Redford 2004, 43.
share a name, Inebny, which appears to be otherwise unknown. With the statue and Tombos inscription included, the total number of attestations of this viceroy rises to nine, as he is known from seven other rock-inscriptions, located at various points within the Nubian Nile Valley: at Sehel, 21 Shalfak (twice), 22 Kumma, 23 Tangur (twice), 24 and Dal. 25 Two more cases can be added to this corpus. One is a stela in the British Museum (EA 1015), probably from Buhen, again from the period of the co-regency, the other an ex-voto in the temple of Kumma. These are considered below, as is a relevant context in the temple of Semna.

**Stela British Museum EA 1015**

The stela 26 (Plate 3; Figure 3), made of sandstone (max. ht 510mm), is decorated with a scene showing two figures of a viceroy, facing inwards, giving praise to the prenomen ([Maatkare]) of Hatshepsut on the left and that of Thutmose III (Menkhheperre) on the right, surmounting an inscription arranged in four horizontal lines, giving the viceroy’s titles, epithets and name: ‘(1) Hereditary nobleman, governor, royal treasurer, sole companion, eyes (2) [of the king], ears of the lord of the two lands, one who is in the heart of the perfect god, one whom the li[n] has advanced (3) [knowing his effectiveness, mouth of the king of Lower Egypt in Khent-[i]-nefer, tongue of the king of Upper Egypt amongst the Rekhryt, king’s son, overseer of southern foreign lands (4) [inscription destroyed]’. Deliberate damage has been inflicted on the name of Hatshepsut, the figures of the viceroy and the last line of the inscription, which once identified the viceroy. The extent of the latter damage, which encompasses the entire line, suggests that a double name was once written here. The obvious candidate is now ‘Inebny/Amenemhekhu’. 27

**Temple of Kumma, Court B, ex-voto**

The second case occurs in a viceregal ex-voto in the temple of Kumma, placed beneath a larger scene of Thutmose III worshipping the god Khnum on a pilaster in Court B. 28 The ex-voto consists of five columns of inscription (Plate 4) followed by the figure of a viceroy standing with hands raised in adoration of the god. Once again the figure of the

21 Gasse and Rondot 2003, 43, fig. 4; Gasse and Rondot 2007, 136 and 481 (SEH 241), and possibly also 204 and 533 (SEH 339).
26 pm vii, 141; HT v, 10, pl. 35; smith 1976, 198 and 209; dewachter 1978, I, 412-4, doc. iv, bryan 1991, 9; panninger 1992, 100; spisher 2000, 197 and 300, no. 46.
27 or possibly ‘Inebny called (gdw-n.f.) Amenemhekhu’ or vice-versa (vermeule 1986, 85, n. 17; sabv-Sëderbergh and troy 1991, 205-6).
Kumma is provided by the rock-inscription (already noted above) marking the presence at the site of one of his close attendants. 30

The indications are that, like a small number of other senior officials who served during the co-regency, 31 Inebny/ Amenemhakhu suffered a dematric memsis, possibly because of his close association with Hatshepsut, although the persecution, as in the case of others so targeted, appears to have been unsystematic. While his name (together with image where present) was effaced at Tombos, Shalfak, Buhen, Kurnma (temple), and Schel, it was left untouched at Kumma (rock-inscription), Tangir and Dal, as well as in the two examples on his statue from Thebes where the name of Hatshepsut was actually removed. 32

Temple of Semna, Year 2 inscription

On the basis of the known dates for Amenemhakhu’s period of office - Year 18 (Shalfak) and now Year 20 (Tombos) - it is a reasonable assumption that he remained in post up to the disappearance of Hatshepsut in Year 22 33 (Thutmose III appointed a new viceroy, Nehy, who was in post in Year 23). 34 However, it is yet to be determined when Amenemhakhu took up office. That it occurred after Year 2 can be established from the text dated to that year inscribed on the exterior east wall of the temple of Semna, which tells of an order given by Thutmose III to his viceroy relating to the commemoration of a renewal of offerings. 35 The viceroy’s name occurs at the very bottom of the second column (Plate 5) 36 and is almost entirely lost (NB: not through deliberate damage but from natural decay of the stone surface). 37 All that survives of the name is a small trace, roughly triangular in shape (Plates 5-6). It was taken by Caminos (perhaps too definitively) as the rear protuberance or horned crest on the head of the ³³-bird’, on the basis of which he read the name as Nehy, which suits the available space 38 but is difficult to reconcile with the fact that Nehy is known to have followed Amenemhakhu as viceroy, being first certainly attested in office (as noted above) in Year 23. 39 The reading

Plate 5. Temple of Semna, Year 2 inscription. Bottom of columns 1-3.

Plate 6. Bottom of column 2 with restige of viceroy’s name indicated.

‘Inebny’ can also be discounted (the surviving trace is incompatible with the orthography of that name), as can ‘Amenemhakhu’ (on grounds of space as well as orthography). Among the remaining (known) viceregal candidates (comprising Seni, Sa, and now possibly Penre), 40 only ‘Sensi’ (vice-roy probably for most of the reign of Thutmose I and the reign of Thutmose II) 41 would seem to meet the requirements of the context. The remaining trace could be the right (top) end of an u-sign; 42 cf. the u-sign in column 1,

32 On the proscription of Hatshepsut, see Dorman 2005b, 267-9; also Arnold 2005; Roth 2005.
33 Dorman 2006, 57-8.
34 Dewachter 1976a, 155; Dewachter 1978, I, 48-9, Doc. 41; Müller 1979, 170-2, no. 6; Habachi 1980, 651-2, no. 8; Bâcs 2002, 57-8.
37 Caminos 1998, 14, n. 4.
38 Caminos 1998, 44, with n. 2.
39 Davies 2005, 54, with n. 56; Dorman 2006, 42 and 61, n. 36.
40 Bâcs 2002; Valbelle 2007a.
41 Already cited above with reference to his ex-votos in the temple of Kurnma, Seni is probably the viceroy of the biographical text inscribed on the exterior south wall of the temple of Semna (Dewachter 1978, I, 409-11, Doc. II; Caminos 1998, I, 27-31, pls 18-19; Bâcs 2002, 56-7, n. 25; Valbelle 2007a, 162, n. 11, and 173-5).
Plate 5) and there is room for the vertical in-sign to its right. The name might have been completed with the inclusion of a man-determinative under the u (as in other cases of his name), a grouping compatible with the available space.

Whether this suggestion is correct or not, the exclusion of Inebny/Amenemnehkhu as a candidate means that two viceroys are currently attested for the Thutmos III-Hatshepsut period, the first (possibly Seni) in office at the very beginning of the period (Year 2), the second (Inebny/Amenemnehkhu) towards the end (at least from Year 18 onwards). It remains to be ascertained if (and when) the former succeeded the latter or whether another viceroy intervened. However, there is currently no evidence for a rapid turnover of viceroy and consequent instability in the colonial administration during the co-regency, a period which saw an active programme of temple and other building in the Nubian Nile Valley and consolidation of the Egyptian presence in Kush – the latter strikingly manifested in the major new fortified town of Pnubs (Dokki Gel), just south of Tombos, its religious complex including a temple (the western temple) decorated by Hatshepsut.

Summary

These first results of the British Museum Tombos survey show again the value of revisiting original material, long known but inadequately documented. It has produced useful new prosopographical data, extending our secure evidential base for the history of the period and the Egyptian appropriation of the Middle Nile Valley, a process in which the viceroy Inebny/Amenemnehkhu appears to have played an active role during his (possibly long) period of office. It has also opened up interesting possibilities: that other viceroy (and indeed officials at large) currently known only by a single name (for example, Seni, Se, Penre, Nehr, Usrsatat) may actually have had two names - perhaps deployed alternatively on different monuments - that have yet to be connected.

Inebny/Amenemnehkhu is, to date, the earliest known viceroy to have left his mark at Tombos. A future report will consider the inscriptions on the Tombos mainland (east bank of the Nile), a corpus which comprises the famous stela of Thutmos I and commemorative texts left by two later viceroys, Usrsatat and Merymose, and other favoured officials, a presence which, together with the recent discovery of a near-by pharaonic cemetery including a large pyramid-tomb of a senior government official, possibly of the mid-Eighteenth Dynasty, supports the growing picture of Tombos as a significant node of the colonial administration.
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Colour plate V. Satellite image of Tombos Island (photo Google Earth).

Colour plate VI. Tombos Island. General location of the Thutmose III inscription (91/17) viewed from the east, boulder indicated by the arrow.
Colour plate VII. Tombos Island. Inscription dated to Year 20 of King Thutmose III.

Colour plate VIII. Tombos Island. Year 20 inscription, detail showing effaced names.

Colour plate IX. Statue of Inebny (BM EA 1131).

Colour plate X. Statue of Inebny, detail.