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**Kirwan Memorial Lecture**

**Meroitic royal chronology: the conflict with Rome and its aftermath**

**Janice W. Yellin**

**Introduction**

The Meroitic state was flourishing at the end of the 1st century BC to the first half of the 1st century AD. Royal burials under large pyramids, although plundered, have yielded Graeco-Roman objects that speak of wide contacts with the Mediterranean world. New features in royal pyramid architecture and chapel decoration as well as the resumption of royal burials at Jebel Barkal speak of cultural and political changes under Meroitic kings and queens. These rulers were politically, militarily and economically active in Nubia and might have established a Kushite province with its center at Faras (Török 2014). Their Nubian policies included military skirmishes with the newly established Roman rulers of Egypt that culminated in open conflict with the Roman Governor, Petronius, in 24/25 BC and in the Treaty of Samos with Augustus in 21/20 BC (Eide et al. 1998, nos 190, 204 and 205).

There is uncertainty regarding the specifics of Meroe's history during this period. The names of King Teriteqas, Queen Amanirenas, Queen Amanishakheto, Queen Nawidemak and Akinidad, the qpr who served all but Queen Nawidemak, are given on contemporary Meroitic monuments and in inscriptions. There are royal pyramids at Meroe (Figure 1), (Beg. N. 13, Beg. N. 20, Beg. N. 6, Beg. N. 21 and Beg. N. 2), the capital, and at Jebel Barkal (Figure 2), (Bar. 2, Bar. 4, Bar. 5 and Bar. 65) an important administrative and religious center where royal burials resumed after a hiatus and which, based on their architecture and decorations, belong in this time period. Of these, only two have securely attributed owners, Queen Amanishakheto (Beg. N. 6) and Queen Nawidemak (Bar. 6), both dated to the first half of the 1st century AD. Bar. 5, which is not royal, is included in this study because there are elements of its chapel reliefs that are similar to contemporary royal ones. To better understand the history of this interesting epoch, the iconography of these chapels will be interrogated to hypothesize a sounder relative sequence for these pyramids and more plausible attributions of ownership.

Because there are so few secure dates associated with Meroitic royal monuments, the sequence and dating of Meroe's kings' list have been developed by associating a ruler with monuments, often the unattributed royal pyramids at Meroe and Jebel Barkal. The foundational relative sequence for Meroitic rulers was proposed in 1923 by Reisner (1923) based on his typology of the royal pyramids' architecture, the desirability of their locations in their cemeteries and the dating of objects found with them. Over the succeeding decades his sequence has seen relatively few suggested revisions, but there have been frequent reassignments of unattributed pyramids to rulers whose names, but not burial places, are known. The various attempts to create a sounder Meroitic royal chronology, while sometimes upending previous attributions and dating of rulers, have also affirmed that some of them withstand scrutiny and so continue to be plausible. Conversely when a chronological suggestion fails to hold, this ‘failure’ is still useful because it redirects attention to where greater plausibility lies. In the absence of data that allows for certainty, the relative sequence and attributions presented here, of necessity seek to discover where this occurs.

Iconography of chapel decorations as a tool for attributing and sequencing their pyramids: Our understanding of Meroitic chronology, and thus to some extent its history, rests to a degree on the typologies of its architecture (i.e. Reisner 1923; Hinkel 1984), paleography (Hintze 1959; Rilly 2001; 2004) and visual iconography (i.e. Wenig 1964; 1971; 2015; Yellin 1995; 2009; 2014a). These place specific classes of monuments and objects in a relative sequence based on shared characteristics that disappear or change over time. Typologies are most useful when some of their objects can be dated. Using typologies for dating is not without its challenges. Most notably when, for whatever reason, one or more of the objects or inscriptions being used does not follow the pattern or trajectory identified as the basis for the typology’s chronological arc. This challenge can be mitigated by comparing results from different types of typological studies. When such a comparison is conducted (in concert with whatever

---

1 Dates and spellings of royal names are taken from Rilly (2010, 187-188).
2 Based on what appears to be the Meroitic practice of establishing and maintaining family burial grounds, the resumption of royal and elite pyramids at Jebel Barkal as well as continuation of burials at Meroe in the same period suggest periodic changes in ruling families (Yellin 2009, 11-15).
3 The paleography of Teriteqas’s inscriptions are identified by Rilly (2004) as belonging to the late 1st century BC (transitional B2) – the period of the conflicts with Petronius.
4 I.e. the Meroitic inscriptions from Dakke (Leclant et al. 2000a, REM 0092) and Hamadab Stele (Leclant et al. 2000c, REM 1003) among others. However, Rilly (2004) raises some doubts as to whether Aromeyose can be read as Rome in Amanirenas’s inscription on the Hamadab Stele and thus as to whether this inscription can be used to identify her as the queen who fought with Rome.
5 Other Barkal pyramids in the north cemetery, such as Bar. 1 and Bar. 3, are not royal based on the iconography used for their chapel decorations.
6 For a fuller discussion of this situation see Yellin 2014a, 76-77.
Figure 1. Plan, The Northern Royal Cemetery at Meroe
(after Fisher et al. 2012, fig. 166).

Figure 2. Plan, The Cemetery at Jebel Barkal
(after Dunham 1957, map 1).
other evidence from texts, objects, etc. is available) and if the results are congruent, then although certainty may be elusive, it can be argued that a hypothesis has a degree of plausibility.\(^8\)

The first typology for the iconography of pyramid chapel decorations was created by Wenig. Based on significant patterns of shared similarities (compare Figures 3a and b for two examples) he divided the royal chapels at Meroe and Barkal into three large chronologically sequential groups (Wenig 1971; 2015). This typology can be refined by noting smaller consistent changes or variations in content and iconography to create subgroups of chronologically and culturally related pyramids. Identifying trends in the way they are used can suggest their chronological order because for the most part these changes are not arbitrary. For example differences in the representations of family members who stand around the enthroned ruler reflect specific realities in the legitimation and succession of rulers within that family.

Not only do all the pyramids dating to this period belong to Wenig's group B,\(^9\) but because they all share a distinctive iconographical feature not seen in any other chapel, they form a subgroup, group B-II, allowing a relative sequence to be created by tracking trends whose trajectories are established by the ways specific visual features are depicted in later chapels (Table 1).

**Group B-II chapels: Beg. N. 13, Beg. N. 20, Bar. 5, Bar. 4, Beg. N. 6, Bar. 6, Beg. N. 21, Bar. 2 and Beg. N. 2**

This subgroup is distinguished from earlier group B chapels by a key diagnostic feature which is a distinctive figure of the crown prince who is offering the ruler fumigation and who always has five specific elements (Figure 4). He is:

1) large and is more prominently placed in the center of the wall.
2) holding a round object (sorghum?).
3) standing partially under the royal baldachin (indicating his status).
4) wearing a large bead necklace and has two short cords falling from his shoulder.
5) never separated from the ruler by an offering table that would create distance between them.

All chapels before or after this group demonstrate significant differences when representing the fumigation ritual as can be seen for example when comparing Beg. N. 2 (Figure 5a), the last chapel in group B-II, with Beg. N. 17 (Figure 5b), one of the first chapels in group C.

There are changes in the organization and sizes of specific motifs on group B-II's north and south walls\(^10\) demonstrating predictable patterns over time that continue in group C chapels (compare B-II chapels organized chronologically in Figures 6a-i). The patterns that form the basis for sequencing the B-II pyramids are:

1) an increase in the size of the diagnostic feature of the crown prince as well as in the size and number of family members standing behind him until he is the same height as the seated ruler (figure in red box).

---

\(^8\) As a control for the findings, Rilly’s (2004) paleographic sequencing and dating for this group of rulers were referenced only after the completion of this research. In each case, although he used very different data and methods, our conclusions were the same. As will be noted throughout the study, our findings were also congruent with Reisner’s pyramid typology and sequence and in most instances, the hypotheses Rilly and Reisner offered for them fit the iconographical data well. The sequence for the pyramids based on their iconography is the same as the one offered by Reisner 1923; Hofmann 1978; Török 1997; Rilly 2004.

\(^9\) As identified by Wenig in his doctoral thesis (2015, 22-28), Group B is comprised of Beg. N. 6 - N. 14, Beg. N. 20, Beg. N. 21 and Bar. 4-6 (Yellin 1990, 363-365).

\(^10\) Only lateral north and south walls were studied because many of the west walls are damaged or undocumented.
2) an increase in the size of the funerary procession of court members until it ultimately fills the eastern half of the chapels’ walls (figure in blue box), along with the inclusion of family members behind the crown prince (figure(s) in green box).

3) a concomitant diminution in the number and size of offering and mortuary text-derived ritual scenes that continues until their almost total disappearance in later group C chapels.

The degree of prominence of these motifs relative to other B-II chapels suggests each one’s place in a relative sequence.

**Beg. N. 13, King Naqyrinsan (?)**

Fragments of an offering table with Naqyrinsan’s name in a cartouche were found in Beg. N. 13 (Reisner 1923, 44; Dunham 1957, 75; Eide et al. 1996, no. 159). This is the first chapel to have the diagnostic figure of the crown prince (Figure 4). Due to its early date, as would be expected, the figure is quite small and no other family members stand behind him. The complex ritual and mortuary text scenes in the chapel are in keeping with previous group B chapels. The introduction of the crown prince offering incense on the north wall, as well as the bow and arrows held by the king, reflect changes in royal ideology that will be more prominently expressed in the reliefs of Beg. N. 20. The transitional nature of these chapel decorations indicate that the religious and ideological changes expressed by new iconography in group B-II chapels did not result from a major cultural or political rupture.

**Beg. N. 20, attributed to King Teriteqas (?)**

Evidence for attribution: The attribution of King Teriteqas to Beg. N. 20 is important since Teriteqas is thought to be the first of the Meroitic rulers to fight the Romans. Textual evidence indicates that Teriteqas is succeeded by his wife Queen Amanirenas (Bar. 4 (?), see below) and then by Queen Amanishakhet (Beg. N. 6). Paleography of Teriteqas’ inscriptions appear to date to the late 1st century BC. All three were active in the Triaconstaechoenus at the end of the 1st century BC.

**Beg. N. 20 is rarely considered for Teriteqas. It has erroneously been dated several decades too early because of a Horus name carved on its pylon (see discussion below) which has possibly been misdated and as a result Beg. N. 20 is often ascribed to Taneyidamai (second half of the 1st century BC). However Beg. N. 20 demonstrates connections to the newly resumed pyramid burials in Barkal’s north cemetery, particularly through its introduction of the type X.D superstructure and two chamber substructure that date it to the late 1st century BC; too late to belong to Taneyidamani. Paleographical similarities in inscriptions from Beg. N. 11 and Taneyidamani suggest that his burial place should be in close chronological relationship to Beg. N. 11 (Rilly 2004). Since Beg. N. 12 is next in the sequence (Reisner 1923, 44), it, rather than Beg. N. 20, is the likely burial place of King Taneyidamani (Yellin 2014a, 81-82).

1) The Horus name and dating of Beg. N. 20 to the time of...
Figure 6a. Beg. N. 13, north wall, Naqyrinsian (?) (after Chapman and Dunham 1952, pl. 11A).

Figure 6b. Beg. N. 20, south wall, Teriteqas (?) (after Chapman and Dunham 1952, pl. 12B).

Figure 6c. Bar. 5, south wall, Akinidad (?) (after Lepsius 1849-59 V, pl. 20).

Figure 6d. Bar. 4, north wall, Queen Amanirenas (?) (after Chapman and Dunham 1952, pl. 13C).
Figure 6e. Beg. N. 6, south wall, Queen Amanishakheto (after Chapman and Dunham 1952, pl. 16B).

Figure 6f. Bar. 6, south wall, Queen Nawidemak (after Lepsius 1849-1859 V, pl. 19b).

Figure 6g. Beg. N. 21, north wall, Unknown Queen (after drawing in Hinkel and Yellin forthcoming).

Figure 6h. Bar. 2, north wall, Unknown King (after Lepsius 1913, pl. 49).
Teriteqas: The Horus name, k3 nht carved on the pylon (Figure 7) has been used to date Beg. N. 20 to an earlier period. It was used by Ptolemy XII Neos Dionysos (80-58, 55-51 BC, in new numbering Ptolemy XI) who was active in the Dodescaschoneos (Eide et al. 1996, no. 160 no. 172; Zibelius-Chen 2006, 298) during Taneyidamani’s reign, but it was also used by later Ptolemaic rulers including Ptolemy XV (Caesarian) Philopator Philmetor (44/36-30 BC, in new numbering Ptolemy XII) who was active in the Northern Cemetery at Meroe. Beg. N. 13’s type X.C pyramid is only found in the Northern Cemetery at Meroe, appears for the first time in Bar. 5; they are thereafter used exclusively in all group B-II and other Barkal pyramids (Reisner 1923, 57).14

IV. Beg. N. 20 introduces new features to create the ideology of a warrior king: For the first time bronze cow bells were found in a Meroitic royal burial having been left at or near the sealed entrance to Beg N. 20’s substructure.15 As discussed by Lenoble (1994), the bells reflect the actual or symbolic sacrifice of cows, horses, donkeys and camels at the time of burial as a bellicose, triumphal expression of royal power.

The pylon publicly presents the ruler as a fearsome warrior king. The Horus name, k3 nht, carved on it and translated as ‘mighty bull’ references qualities of power and force. His triumphant persona is further expressed by his depiction. He is spearing his enemies (Figure 7) instead of striking them with a club as traditionally shown.16 Excavation numbers are 21-12-114-117 (Dunham 1957, 78, fig. 50, pl. LIV; Näser 1996, 155-62).}

14 One of only two Type X superstructure variants found at both Meroe and Barkal (Hinkel 1984, 318).
15 Objects found in association with Beg. N. 20, and indeed all burials, are in need of full study in the light of current research. In the interim, Török’s study (1984, 123) of imported finds places some objects within the appropriate time frame for Teriteqas: glass bowl fragments 21-1-92a (late Ptolemaic to Early Roman), 21-12-190 (late 1st century AD), if accurate, pushes the outer chronological limit for Teriteqas’s reign. It is not certain if these objects were found in situ.
16 Excavation numbers are 21-12-114-117 (Dunham 1957, 78, fig. 50, pl. LIV; Näser 1996, 155-62).
17 Later linked with Arensnuphis (Török 2001, 151).
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Of the six surviving decorated pylons at Meroe, only Queen Amanishakheto (Beg. N. 6), who ruled one generation after Teriteqas, also uses this image (Figure 10).

The king’s regalia includes two loosely laid double tasseled cords that fall down his torso (Figures 7 and 12) that may also be related to imagery associated with Onuris.

Significantly, Teriteqas’ stele from Meroe City Temple M 600 (Garstang et al. 1911, pls XIX and LXVIII; Leclant et al. 2000b, REM 0412) proves that Teriteqas wore these double tasseled cords (Plate 1).18 Queens Amanishakheto (Beg. N. 6) (Figure 6e) and Nawidemak (Bar. 6) (Figure 13) also wore double cords with wide double sashes under them and the double sash is also carved on Beg. N. 20’s pylon. These associations with Onuris amplify the pylons’ triumphal imagery.

Finally Teriteqas (?), Akinidad (?) and Amanishakheto hold bows and arrows (compare Figures 11a-c).19

Evidence for sequencing

Beg. N. 20 has the first chapel with fully developed group B-II iconography. Based on its location, it is a close successor to Beg. N. 13. When compared to Beg. N. 13 and earlier group B chapels, its crown prince, who exhibits all five basic features, is far more prominent than earlier officiants who are offering incense, yet he is not as large as in later B-II chapels. In contrast, Beg. N. 13’s officiant may not be a crown prince since that might be the smaller figure standing before, but not within the royal baldachin. (Figures 3a and b). The continued

18 Half of the double sash worn under the cords on Beg. N. 20 and Beg. N. 6 can also be seen on the stele, but it is damaged exactly where the second half of the sash would have been carved.

19 Török notes that “… bows and arrows [are] not as frequent as one would expect [in royal depictions]” (Török 1990, 168).
importance of offerings and scenes from Egyptian mortuary texts in combination with the minor role given members of the funerary procession (small figures on the lowest register) reflect Beg. N. 20’s early place in the sequence.

Summary
Beg. N. 20 is the second burial in this subgroup and the first to prominently display the crown prince. The iconog-
four of the five elements of the diagnostic figure used only in royal chapels (Figure 6c). The missing element is the large bead necklace of the crown prince, which is to be expected since its owner was not a king. The absence of the large beads in this circumstance is further proof that they are part of a crown prince’s regalia as noted by Rondot (2011, 432-433). Appropriately, no matriarchs, princes and other family members gather around the owner because there is no need to reflect circumstances surrounding a ruler’s legitimation and succession; instead Isis and Osiris take their place. Because the tomb owner is holding weapons, he is often identified as the pgr Akinidad who fought the Romans alongside Teriteqas and who served Teriteqas’s successors (Queens Amanirenas and Amanishakheto) as their pgr and peseto (governor of Lower Nubia). The depiction of weaponry in Beg. N. 20’s and Bar. 5’s chapels reflect military aspects shared by both owners. This and other similarities between Bar. 5 and Beg. N. 20 suggest a connection between the owners like that of Akinidad and King Teritiqas.

Evidence for sequencing
The chapel’s decoration and iconography are most similar to Beg. N. 20 supporting their chronological (and perhaps familial) proximity (compare Figures 6b and c). Based on its architecture, Bar. 5 is ‘… practically contemporaneous with Beg. N. XX’ (Reisner 1923, 60).

Bar. 4, attributed to Queen Amanirenas (?)

Attribution and sequencing
Both Bar. 4 and Beg. N. 21 (Figures 6d and g) have been suggested as burial places for Teriteqas’s wife and successor, Queen Amanirenas. Both share the diagnostic feature of the crown prince and the general decorative programme of this group. The use of the image of the queen sitting on a block throne to attribute Beg. N. 21 to Amanirenas is questionable (see Beg. N. 21 below). In Bar. 4 family members are given less importance than in Beg. N. 21 suggesting it is closer in date to Beg. N. 20 than Beg. N. 21. The profile rather than later frontal depiction of females’ breasts as in Beg. N. 21 (see Beg. N. 6 for a discussion of this feature) is also an indicator that this chapel is earlier than Beg. N. 21. If Bar. 4 is Amanirenas’s burial then Teriteqas’s burial at Meroe in Beg. N. 20, while she was buried at Jebel Barkal, could reflect a preference for being buried in one’s family cemetery.

Beg. N. 6, Queen Amanishakheto

Attribution and Sequencing
Beg. N. 6 is attributed to Queen Amanishakheto. Because inscriptions indicate that Akinidad served Amanirenas and Amanishakheto as well as Teriteqas (Eide et al. 1996, no. 179), it is unlikely that Akinidad would have lived long enough to serve another ruler whose reign intervened between these two queens. Therefore it is likely that Amanishakheto’s reign followed directly after that of Amanirenas.

While Amanishakheto’s chapel reliefs include the diagnostic figure of the crown prince, stylistic and iconographical
changes, most notably the depiction of females with fully frontal (as opposed to profile) breasts (Figures 14a-d) and the near total replacement of offering and mortuary book rituals on the eastern sections of the north and south walls by the funerary procession, foreshadow characteristics of later group C chapels. It is the absence of these features in Bar. 5 and Bar. 4 that places them before Beg. N. 6 in the relative sequence. The triumphal aspect of Amanishakheto’s imagery (weaponry, Onuris-pose on pylon) has been noted in the discussion of Beg. N. 20.

Bar. 6, Queen Nawidemak
The presence of the crown prince in Bar. 6 (Figure 6f) confirms Queen Nawidemak’s place in group B-II and the writing of her name in the chapel affirms her ownership. The trend of emphasizing the funerary procession at the expense of individual offering rituals and Egyptian mortuary text scenes continues and the rendering of female breasts frontally indicates that Bar. 6 and Beg. N. 6 (Figure 14b) were closer in date to each other than Bar. 6 was to Bar. 4 (Figure 14a), Bar. 5 or Beg. N. 20. Since Akinidad served Teriteqas, Amanirenas and Amanishakheto, it is unlikely that he could have served an intervening fourth ruler. This chapel would have come after Beg. N. 6.

Beg. N. 21, Unknown Queen
The depiction of the queen sitting on a block rather than a lion throne on the chapel’s north wall (Figure 6g), has catalyzed much discussion (Zach 1995; 1999, 690-693). A block throne is typically reserved for gods, so identifying the royal figure sitting on a block throne in the contemporary phase of Meroe Temple M 250 (Figure 15) as Amanirenas (Hofmann and Tomandl 1986, 188; Zach 1999) has been significant in attributing this chapel to her. However the surface of the wall in Temple M 250 is damaged and it is far from certain that the figure seated on the block throne is female. Dominicus and Hinkel rebut the earlier arguments for it being female (Hinkel 2001, 258-259, 144-145). Dominicus believes the figure is male. However Hinkel still argues for a female based on the long garment the seated figure in Temple M 250 wears, rightly stating that only females wear long garments in the pyramid chapels; however this is true only for the pyramid chapel reliefs. The prince in the Cairo Museum’s sculpture of a queen and prince (CG 864, Wenig 1978, No. 135, 212-
214) (Plate 2) is not only wearing a long robe, it ties over his right shoulder just like the one worn by the figure in Temple M 250. This statue, sometimes identified as being of Queen Shanakdakhete and her heir, might be of Queen Amanirenas and the pgr Akinidad. With the gender of the enthroned figure in Temple M 250 in doubt, the strongest argument for assigning Beg. N. 21 to Amanirenas is also in doubt.

Several factors indicate that Beg. N. 21 is several generations later than Teriteqas’s reign. The regalia of Beg. N. 21’s queen is similar to Queen Nawidemak’s since they have mantles draped over one shoulder below which hangs a small sack-like shape that may actually be extra fabric from the top of her garment folding over and draping down (compare Figures 6f and g).21 The large female standing behind the crown prince is typical in later chapels (i.e. Beg. N. 6 and Beg. N. 2). Beg. N. 21 also has a later position in Reisner’s typological sequence since it was built in a poorer location than Beg. N. 6 and Beg. N. 2 indicating to him that it was later that those pyramids (Reisner 1923, 44-46). These factors combined with the iconography make it unlikely that the owner of Beg. N. 21 lived in the time of Teriteqas. If Rilly’s proposed dating of Queen Shanakdakhete’s reign to this period is correct,

21 Similar to the draping fabric on the prince standing behind the queen in Beg. N. 11 (Török 1990, fig. 33) and perhaps on the gold statue of Nawidemak (Figure 13).
she might be buried in this pyramid (Rilly in Wildung and Kroeper 2006, 183-184; Yellin 2014b, 80-81).

Bar. 2, Unknown King
Bar. 2, the burial most often attributed to Teriteqas, is stylistically too late to be his. Its chapel iconography is very close to Beg. N. 2, the last chapel in this proposed relative sequence. The rendering of females’ breasts frontally, the total dominance of the funerary procession and the inclusion of a large family member behind the large crown prince reflect later developments seen in Beg. N. 2 (Figure 6i) and later group C chapels such as Beg. N. 17 (Figure 5b) that are not found in the earlier Beg. N. 20 (Figure 3b) and so Bar. 2 cannot belong to an early ruler in the sequence.

Beg. N. 2, Attributed to Amanakhabale (?)
Beg. N. 2 is the last pyramid in group B-II (Figure 6i). As with Beg. N. 6, new features appear alongside pre-existing ones demonstrating cultural change with continuity. There are new components in the king’s regalia similar to those found in Beg. N. 17 an early group C chapel (compare Figures 5a and b). The prominence of family members on the north and south walls is a marker for its late place in the sequence. The queen (?) behind the king is generously proportioned with fully frontal breasts while the winged Isis in front of her has traditional Egyptian proportions with profile breasts. This is a wonderful example of the conscious choice Meroitic artists made to naturalistically represent Kushite women as opposed to canonically render Egyptian goddesses. The winged Isis standing on a lotus behind the king is a feature previously known from Bar. 6.

Beg. N. 22, King Natakamani and Beg. N. 1 Queen Amanitore
The chapels decorated in type B-II iconography end with Beg. N. 2. The diagnostic feature of the crown prince does not appear in these two chapels. The decorations of Beg. N. 1 are unique and closest in general approach to those of her son, the crown prince Arikankhor (Beg. N. 5), while those of Beg. N. 22 introduce new elements found in a number of later group C chapels.22

Summary
Similarities in the iconography of all group B-II pyramid chapels indicate that the resumption of Meroitic royal burials in a hitherto unused area at Jebel Barkal does not represent a political rupture or even a definitive shift in the political and religious center of the Kushite state. Rather it appears that Meroitic rulers and elites shared the preference seen in the Southern Cemetery at Meroe (Yellin 2009, 11-15) for burial amongst their ancestors and family members. Two compet-

--

22 The attribution of Beg. N. 2, its place in the relative sequence and its owner’s relationship to Queen Nawidemak as first posited by Dunham (1957, 103) is the result of circular reasoning.

23 The decoration and iconography of Beg. N. 2 and later group C chapels will be the subject of a future study.
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Retail price £35. Available to members at the discounted price of £30 (p&p UK £4.90, overseas, Europe £9, Worldwide £15)

---

Gabati
A Meroitic, Post-Meroitic and Medieval Cemetery in Central Sudan.
Vol. 2: The Physical Anthropology

by Margaret A. Judd,
with a contribution by David N. Edwards
London 2012

xii + 208 pages, 110 tables, 15 figures, 66 maps, 73 colour plates
ISBN 978 1 901169 197

The cemetery at Gabati, dating from the Meroitic, post-Meroitic and Christian periods was excavated in advance of road construction in 1994-5, the detailed report being published by SARS in 1998. This complementary volume provides an in-depth analysis of the human remains. A final chapter, a contribution from David Edwards, the field director of the project, in conjunction with Judd, assesses the archaeological results in light of continuing research in the region over the last decade and more.

Retail price £33. Available to members at the discount price of £29.
(p&p UK £4.90, overseas - Europe £9, rest of world £15)

---

Please order these books from the Honorary Secretary at the Society’s address or via the website http://www.sudarchrs.org.uk/resources/publications/
The Debeira West excavation team 1964 with amongst others, Peter and Margaret Shinnie, John Alexander, John Anquandah and Tony Bonner (photo: SARS Alexander Archive, ALE P003.04).
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