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ABSTRACT

New evidence illuminates several problems in the historical geography of Nubia and its political relations with Egypt. At Gebel Uweinat, an inscription naming the country of Yam has changed what we know of the political and cultural geography of the peoples south of Egypt in the late Third Millennium. Regions of Northeastern Africa have been explored, such as the southern Atbara and the Fourth Cataract of the Nile, which is now fairly well known. Connections between these areas and lower Nubia help to understand the development of the archaeological culture known as the Pan Graves. The discovery of a new inscription in Upper Egypt and at Gebel Uweinat have challenged our assumptions about the scale of the Kushite state and its geography in the Second Intermediate Period. The changes are substantial, but they can be integrated with earlier evidence to produce a credible picture of Nubian-Egyptian relations.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENT

The following remarks on relations between Egypt and Nubia from the Old Kingdom to the heyday of Kush depend on some disclaimers and some historiographic observations. The topic, and parts of it, have been subject to scrutiny at various levels since direct knowledge of Nubian archaeology began over a century ago. To follow the eddies and flows of arguments and perceived evidence through any one of the possible subdivisions of this topic would require a monograph of substantial proportions. So the following will be neither fair, nor complete; rather it is an attempt to incorporate evidence that has appeared in the last generation into the discussion of Nubia and Egypt in the last half of the Third and first half of the Second Millennium B.C.

THE CONDITION OF RECORDS AND EVIDENCE

With practically only two exceptions, we have to make do with written records only from Egyptians, and these are inadequate, even by Egyptian standards. They are generally only fragments, and often ambiguous. Even the stories, where they exist, were not intended to give anything like an account as we would understand it, but refer to the careers of Egyptians and what they did in relation to Nubia. There are only a few reports of events, and these are mostly campaigns. Representations are important in Egypt, but they have often been subjects of dispute.

Key to this is that foreigners are often not labeled, and existing labels can be deceptive. However, in this discussion, I will accept representations as depicting foreigners, and their objects or animals, those that show definite differences from normal Egyptians in the same situation, mostly a tomb or closely related group of tombs, and preferably differences that can be pointed in some direction. In this, I recognize the Egyptian habit of representing types and that those types were subject to change.

Much of what can be said from the Egyptian side about this relationship is from material remains, but the only voice Nubia has in this period is, with the two exceptions noted above, archaeological. Throughout Nubian history, the core of our information is cultural and material.

Having only fragmentary, and often one-sided evidence, we have to use the fragments available, no matter how difficult, and to be prepared to make changes, even major ones to opinions and reconstructions, when new evidence is developed or discovered. Because there is generally no continuous stream of evidence, geographically or temporally, it means inferring connections across space and time.

BETWEEN A-GROUP AND C-GROUP

For some centuries after the end of A-Group in the First
Dynasty. Lower Nubia was hardly occupied. Passing peoples left occasional graves, even small cemeteries. A well-organized center at Buhene may have been for resource recovery and trade, but details are not yet available. In the meantime, the Pre-Kerma culture continued above the Third Cataract. All was not peaceful, however, for the famous attack by Snefru had to have reached well into Sudan, because Lower Nubia could have furnished little in the way of loot. In addition, the town of Elephantine was carefully fortified. Exploration in the Libyan Desert has resulted in the discovery of far-ranging Old Kingdom expeditions during the Old Kingdom. At the same time, Nubians were never really absent from Egypt as shown by their presence in at least one late Archaic representation, a settlement at Dashur, or for that matter, pottery from Elephantine.

THE COMING OF THE C-GROUP, KERMA BEGINNINGS, AND SIXTH-DYNASTY RECORDS

Sometime in the early Sixth Dynasty, Egyptian records indicate contact with specific regions and peoples located to the south, some previously known only by the larger geographic designation Ta-Seti, or Land of the Bow, or Ta-Nehes, Land of the Nubian. While these appear as names for the first time, it is clear that they were well established, and had been in place for some time. They occur both in contexts where persons were assigned to regulate contacts and where there was active fieldwork involved, notably the recruiting of soldiers and travel to foreign lands.

The places and peoples have occasioned a good deal of discussion with various locations being proposed for some of them, while others are well-known and located. At this point we deal with a tendency in Egyptology to underestimate the reach of Egyptian engagement in Africa, which has recently been confronted by evidence that the country called Tim was truly far away. Following are the more important lands, as mentioned in the principal documents, of Weni and Harkhuf, which give some geographical perspective:

**Wswi** Later established as the name for Lower Nubia from the First to the Second Cataract, it probably roughly corresponded to that territory.

**Irtt** Linked in order with Slw and Wswi in a single polity by the time of Harkhuf’s Third Journey, it may have been the southernmost of the three, although the order of Irtt and Slw may not be geographical in relation to Egypt.

**Slw** Linked in a polity with Irtt and Wswi

**Mhr** Mentioned once, reached from the Elephantine road, apparently above Irtt and Slw.

**Trrs** Mentioned once, reached from the Elephantine road, apparently above Irtt and Slw.

**Kbwm** Mentioned only by Weni, its relationships are uncertain.

**Tmh** Associated later with Libya, it was the objective of a campaign by the chief of Tm, which Harkhuf interrupted.

**Tm** As the main objective of Harkhuf’s expeditions, Yam has received considerable discussion. It has been assigned locations from the southern Libyan Desert (oases) to Kerma, to the Isle of Meroe, based on Harkhuf’s statement that it took a long time to get there and return to Egypt and Harkhuf’s mention that he was exploring a road to Yam in one instance, taking the Elephantine Road in another, and thirdly the Wela’s (oasis) road. Some fairly elaborate and well-formed estimates involving time, distance and original starting points have been brought to bear on the question, a number of them starting Harkhuf from Memphis by donkey in order to use up the seven or eight months required.

**Md** Well-known from the Old through the New Kingdoms, Md is widely associated with the Eastern Desert. For the Old Kingdom, scholars have argued variously for a location east of Upper Egypt or as far south as the Second Cataract. If the Egyptians had been faring as far south and west as Darfur in the west, and as far south as Punta in the east—both difficult, time-consuming and hazardous journeys—is there any reason to limit Medja so severely? Later, Sobeknakht II recounts that Kush mustered forces from Medjay and Punta, which would indicate that they were adjacent. This would imply that Medja had much the same location as the Bedja do today, occupying the Eastern Desert from about the Wadi Hamamat to the Ethiopian highlands. Given that this area is larger than the Levant, diversity is to be expected.

**Harkhuf and Geography**

Until recently, the only definite evidence of Tm’s location has been its association with broadly southern places in the documents. However, the discovery of an inscription in Gebel Uweinit has changed all that. This inscription, dating to Mentuhotep II, commemorates the presentation of tribute from Tm and an otherwise unknown place. It would not be reasonable, in the Egyptian sense, to commemorate the arrival of tribute in some place that was not at least on the road to its point of origin.
Quite clearly, the major arguments from plausibility, no matter how carefully constructed, were wrong. Other evidence also discovered within the last twenty years shows that Old Kingdom activities in the southern Libyan Desert were quite extensive.\textsuperscript{31} In addition to Egyptians' large-scale commitment to the northern oases, they established supply and watch points across the Libyan Desert and at prominent landmarks as far south as the El Kab oasis west of Dongola. In one case, the systematic caching of water jars reached across the desert toward the Gilf el-Kebir.\textsuperscript{32} In a very real sense, these caches give archaeological substance to an attempt to build wide contacts deep into Africa and exploit those contacts for trade and military purposes. There is no longer any reason to advocate a location for Timbuktu in or near the Nile Valley.

A location for Timbuktu, and thereby Timetim as meant at this period may not be exact, but there are some major indications. From Uweinat, the nearest place that furnishes goods of the type Harkhuf was seeking and could provide troops to defend is Darfur.\textsuperscript{33} A location at that distance would easily require the time indicated for a round trip by Harkhuf. It would also explain the Abu Ballas trail as a main road outward bound. The expedition could return partly by way of the Wadi Howar, which would provide water. If the valley was problematic, el-Kab would be a route, otherwise the expedition could follow the Nile, as indicated in Harkhuf's second and third expeditions. A location farther west places Timbuktu somewhere in Libya, but it also hints that the Western Pillar of Heaven, the ruler of Timbuktu's objective, was a serious piece of landscape, such as Tibesti (southern Libya and northern Chad).

So we reconstruct Harkhuf as having travelled onward close to the valley by the Elephantine road, once by an unknown road, and another time by swinging far out to the Gilf el-Kebir and Uweinat before going on to Timbuktu. He could have returned in each case by way of Wadi Howar to the valley, once requiring a large force to secure his goods that might tempt the newly-united polity of Hittite, Sippar, and Wawat. Thus the radius of action for the peoples mentioned in the Old Kingdom records covered much of Egypt, Sudan and Libya. The question of motivation I will take up after considering the archaeological events of this period.

The arrival of Kerma Ancien and C-Group

For the period between A-Group and C-Group, archaeological remains are extremely sparse in northern Nubia. At the upper end of the Third Cataract, the Sudanese Neolithic had been succeeded by a phenomenon currently called Pre-Kerma which in many respects resembles A-Group,\textsuperscript{35} including pottery, types of palettes, and even incense burners. When A-Group was eliminated from Lower Nubia, Pre-Kerma continued. Sometime before Weni's inscription, probably during the Fifth Dynasty, a new complex of material culture appeared from above the Third Cataract to Lower Nubia, where it is known as C-Group. The culture was highly developed in objects, pottery, and burial customs, all of which are distinctive. There are a few antecedent elements that appear earlier, as importations,\textsuperscript{36} but no definite place of origin has yet been identified, despite some vessels attributed to Sabalog,\textsuperscript{37} and some graves near the Omdurman Bridge.\textsuperscript{38} Most, including myself give this group an origin in the southwest although material from the Wadi Howar is not C-group.\textsuperscript{39}

Archaeological materials above the Second Cataract are normally designated Early Kerma or Kerma Ancien (KA) as first described. There, C-Group objects and customs were combined with some very different practices, such as stepped-ring tumuli. Exploration of this phase is continuing and some excavators actually see a brief phase of coexistence between C-Group and this Kerma Ancien culture in the Kerma area, which spread fairly rapidly to the Fourth Cataract region. At Kerma itself, the KA culture developed rapidly into a major center, building a large town with a mud-brick mountain-like shrine at its center before the end of the Third Millennium.\textsuperscript{40}

Both the KA and C-Group developed economies that were at least substantially pastoral, but not nomadic, creating large cemeteries that testify to an essentially settled life. Domestic small and large cattle played an enormous role, and real bovines were celebrated in rock art, various representations and ultimately funerary rituals in a way that relates these cultures closely to the cattle-cultures of ancient Sahara and even modern South Sudan. They also took to the river.

Now we come to questions of motivation. The Egyptians needed, or wanted, certain products from the south. In the Naqada Period, these could trickle northward through the Sudanese Neolithic/Pre-Kerma and A-Group. In the Third Millennium, the A-Group was gone, and despite a substantial point of exchange or industry at Buhen, the population needed to support a riverine trade did not exist in Lower Nubia.\textsuperscript{41} At the same time, the Neolithic had disappeared in the Shendi Reach, leaving another gap. So, it's little wonder that the Egyptians began a campaign of exploration in the Libyan Desert to supplement the supply of material arriving from the truly difficult maritime Pun trade. There was another problem looming on the horizon. Both on the desert and in their cities, Asytiotes were growing powerful. The rulers of Egypt perceived a threat and responded pro-actively (we assume) with attacks.\textsuperscript{42} These required manpower and it may very well be that Egyptians collaborated in, if they did not diplomatically instigate, the arrival of new people in the Nile Valley. They were certainly aware of the geography. In any case, in the person of Weni and other un-named commanders, they quickly recruited southerners of all types to serve in repeated campaigns to the north. By the end of the Old Kingdom, these Nubians\textsuperscript{43} troops came to be the most important element in relations between Egypt and Nubia, and a major factor in Egyptian politics.\textsuperscript{44}

This importance began already in the late Old Kingdom when a series of execution texts was deposited at Saqqara that named some 175 Nubians.\textsuperscript{45} Mention in such circumstances does not necessarily mean that they were hostile enemies, but that they were foreigners with power that it would be useful to weaken.\textsuperscript{46}
NUBIANS IN EGYPT AND EGYPTIAN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE KINGDOM

As the Egyptian state broke apart in the First Intermediate Period, limited wars broke out, especially in Upper Egypt. There, Nubian soldiers, especially archers, not only entered the country and sometimes settled there, as at Gebelein, they played a role in just about every struggle or military force whose composition is recorded, textually or visually. For the most part, these soldiers, serving in all parts of the country, for various commanders, returned to Nubia and were buried there. Actually, it is remarkable that a group so prominent in representations cannot be identified in burials, because there must have been casualties.

Soldiers were not the only persons to come to Egypt from the south. Six women buried in separate tombs in the complex of Mentuhotep II at Deir el Bahri had the title Royal Ornament. Their status was clearly quite special, closer to the pharaoh in many respects than other officials who may have held higher rank and more power. It appears that they were all southerners, Nubian or Medjay, and one, at least, had some Nubian (Medjay) servants. Mentuhotep II claimed to have conquered, and certainly, acquired possession of, or dominance in, Nubia as far as the Second Cataract. He certainly went there himself, and met with Nubians he recruited into service, which testifies to the mutual confidence and security of his relationships there. He had a continuing need for Nubian soldiers, not just to secure Egypt, but because he undertook campaigning against Asiatic towns.

It was also at this time that C-Group cemeteries were established north of Aswan, notably at Kubaniya and Hierakonpolis. Noteworthy in these installations is the fact that the cemeteries imply the presence of the full panoply of the culture, not just the limited equipment carried by a soldier.

Nubia’s involvement in Egypt continued and perhaps intensified in the first reign of the Twelfth Dynasty. Amenemhat’s reversal of Theban policy led to a profoundly disturbed situation amounting to civil war. It may well be that Nubian troops fought for both sides, but an important new factor was added to the situation. A counter-dynasty emerged in Nubia itself, possibly located at el-Riqqa, and continued for most of Amenemhat’s reign. It would appear that as Amenemhat and his forces increasingly got the upper hand in the Thebaid, troops loyal to the old Eleventh Dynasty such as the “captain” Tjemehau retreated to Nubia for a last stand.

That was not long in coming. The vizier Intef-Oker went on a campaign, which he celebrated for its destructive violence. Signs of it may be seen in the plundering at a number of phase I cemeteries, especially Aniba, but also smaller ones, such as Serra East. However, he was unable, and probably also unwilling, to eliminate the population and return to the policy of the Old Kingdom. Egypt still needed soldiers, especially since a new major power had arisen in the south.

Nevertheless, Intefoker’s campaign, and the subsequent assassination of Amenemhat marked a new era in relations between Egypt and Nubia. Egypt built a series of fortresses located at strategic points in Wawat, or Lower Nubia, almost to the Second Cataract. Senwosret I accompanied these constructions by campaigning against Kush, south of the Third Cataract. This new pattern lasted about two centuries. The entire area occupied by the C-Group had Egyptian fortresses, presumably already with patrols. However, there is no sign of an Egyptian territorial administration. There were military officials, and mines and quarries were opened to extract gold and valuable stones, but we see nothing of a civil infrastructure. The C-Group, now in the highly developed IIa phase, continued.

To the south, Kush definitely traded with Egypt—KA and KM graves as far as the Fourth Cataract regularly incorporate imported Egyptian objects and pottery. The date when the local manufacture of Egyptian-type objects is unknown, but ultimately metals and faience were processed there in an Egyptian manner. Kerma would have been a destination for both trade and expropriation. We know of a little campaigning by the Egyptians during this period, and one Egyptian mentions using gold of Upper Nubia (Khenty Ta-Seti), possibly a reference to a deep expedition. However, such events were probably opportunistic and episodic. (It must be admitted that our knowledge of day-to-day activities and events is very slight.) The rise of Kush made other changes in Egyptian behavior. The deep-ranging trading and diplomatic expeditions of the Old Kingdom and Eleventh Dynasty were ended with a great power now in the near southland. Trade with Punt on the Red Sea was expanded in a systematic way.

THE SECOND CATARACT FORTRESS SYSTEM, THE NUBIANS AND EXEORATION TEXTS

By the reign of Senwosret III, the rise of Kushite power led to a change in Egyptian strategy. We don’t know if some major event, such as a major Kushite attack triggered the change or how it related to large-scale changes in Egyptian administration and relations with Asia. We do know there was a large campaign in Asia, which apparently failed. At the same time, there was a large-scale administrative reorganization with an intense reliance on forced labor. In Nubia, there were major campaigns against Kush and a dramatic militarization of the Second Cataract frontier. Senwosret built and expanded a dozen forts there. The curtain walls and piers of the smaller fort at Serra East would have required about 15,20,000 cubic metres of brick. To fully garrison these fortifications several thousand men would have been required. Kerma was, by this time, a virile power that extended from the Second Cataract to above the Fourth. In his boundary stela, Senwosret appears to make light of the Kushite’s fighting powers, but he in fact tells us that their fluid projectile-based battle tactics were highly effective. The complex military architecture of the forts reveals to us that the Nubians’ service in the Egyptian military had equipped them with the knowledge and experience necessary to maintain a siege. Thus, the consolidation of Kush had made the Second Cataract border a serious business, one emphasized also in the famous Semna Dispatches that record daily activity on the
frontier in a detailed and professional manner. Within a few days, this activity included not only small river-borne trading contacts and attempts to enter Egyptian-controlled territory by family groups, but the entry of one body of 32 men, a potentially serious incursion. For their part, one of the Egyptian patrols included 70 Medjay in addition to the commanding (non-commissioned? Ahawy) officers, a platoon-level deployment ready to deal with an armed force. While the forts and their patrols were an attempt to enforce a “mudbrick curtain” protecting Egypt from incursion and an unwanted outflow of expatriates, there was a considerable knowledge that continued to flow along with the controlled contacts. The execution texts published by Koenig, Sethe and Posener and which date to this general period, reflect a knowledge of family relations among the leading rulers of Upper Nubia and the Eastern Desert. It is interesting to contrast the first periods of execution texts, which were concerned with Nubia and some Egyptians with the second, which saw a dramatic shift toward western Asia, even without losing a focus on Nubia.

C-GROUP, KERMA, PAN GRAVE, OLD KUSH, AND THE DESERTS

From the late Old Kingdom to the early Second Intermediate Period, two archaeological groups have been recognized in Nubia, the C-Group, extending from the Second Cataract to southern Upper Egypt, and the Kerma Culture, found south of the Second Cataract. Both of these had phases, but the Kerma Culture seems to show more tentative developments in its early period (KA), unlike the C-Group which almost appears fully formed. The large-scale surveys and excavations in the Fourth Cataract region have changed this picture. Initially, archaeologists were content to consider this area as simply an extension of the Kerma Culture. However, as more and more material emerged, the culture of the area appeared more distinct, and some archaeologists began to use the term Old Kush, to recognize both the similarities and systematic distinctions between the two regions.

Some of those distinctions relate the Fourth Cataract region to some archaeological materials from Lower Nubia, and later Upper Egypt. They did not pass along the Nile, for they are not found in the Dongola Reach, but across the Nubian Desert. As always in Nubia, pottery is fundamental to the discussion. The Old Kush II/KM pottery found in the burials of the Fourth Cataract is rather varied, but it includes an over-hemispherical bowl with deeply-incised linear and geometric patterns, a type not known in contemporary C-Group or normal Kerma contexts. The type does occur in Lower Nubia, most notably in the quarry dumps at Serra East where it is common. It is also the only type of Nubian pottery found in these contexts, despite the fact that Kerma and Pan-Grave pottery is very common in the fortress later. I consider it unlikely that it was a vessel imported for use by the Egyptian garrison because normal Egyptian contexts of the period do not have it—it belonged to the Nubians of the fortress who used it to prepare and consume their own preferred food. I conclude that these vessels were used by Nubians of the fortresses who had cultural connections, not with the local C-Group, nor with the Kerma Culture of the Dongola Reach, but with the Fourth Cataract and the intervening desert. The Nubians known to be part of the fortress garrisons were Medjay.

Sometime after deposition in the quarry dumps ended, (sealings included Amenemhat IV, the only royal seal), the fortresses fell away from control by the Egyptian government. In some cases, the forts were (probably) slighted and abandoned, but in others, resident Egyptian population remained and served the Ruler of Kush. The relaxation of the frontier permitted a new immigration and a new material culture appeared and spread along the margins of culture, ultimately deep into Egypt. The origins are now in dispute, and it must be admitted that even with some surveys, the Nubian Desert has not been systematically explored, finds have not been published, and some remain ambiguous. There is, however, strong evidence from the Fourth Cataract that a relationship existed with Lower Nubia similar to that in the fortresses. Some distinctive pottery vessels are identical between the Fourth Cataract and the Pan Grave culture. Others differ, but have features of shape or decoration that are shared by both groups, but no others. This does not mean they were identical, something hardly to be expected, but it does indicate a close relationship. So, in proposing, or re-proposing an identification, I raise the following points. While each of the major cultural groupings now recognized in the archaeology of the Second Intermediate Period has nuances of class, and some of region, five can readily be recognized, Asiatic, Egyptian, and three Nubian. Of the Nubian groups, one is definitely centered on Kerma, one definitely occupied lower Nubia and one existed primarily on the margins of Lower Nubia and Upper Egypt but had definite connections with the Fourth Cataract region and probably or possible connections in the Atbai, even the south. In the one document of the age that makes a clear geographical statement about Nubia, Egyptians clearly recognized four great regional populations to the south and east that were arrayed against them, entirely, or in part, Kush, Wawat, Medjay, and Punet. As yet, we have no archaeology for Punet, and it would be difficult to derive evidence from materials now available. Wawat and Kush are clear. The one remaining plausible identification for the clearly differentiated archaeological group called the Pan Graves is Medjay, and its differences from other groups in Nubia lie in the Eastern Desert and the eastern loop of the Great Bend. For these reasons, the identification of the Pan Graves as Medjay is maintained.

CONCLUSION AND EPILOGUE

As the Egyptians lost the will, or the ability, to control their southern frontier, that frontier was shifted northward to Aswan, and even there it was not an impermeable border. Nubians were able to enter the country in numbers, some keeping their own material culture. They certainly served in the military establishments of all sides, but they also were found in other
occupations. It is now clear that Kush gathered a multi-ethnic empire-sized sphere of influence and control, at least from the Aswan border to the upper limits of the Fourth Cataract, reaching across steppe and desert to the horn of Africa. At least once, they hurled an army with all these elements at Egypt and their success was such that objects, many of them funerary, and some of them royal, were deposited as trophies in the tombs of Kerma.
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NOTES

1. For an extended consideration of the Medjay, see Liszka 2012, for more general works, see Zibelius-Chen 1972 and 1988, Meurer 1996, and Schneider 2004. In the following discussion, Egyptian names will be anglicized unless some transliteration is required for clarity. For an extensive and thorough discussion of the location of Yam, see Cooper 2012.

2. For the Son of Re Segersenti, see Williams 2013, 1-8, especially 8, and for Tjemau, see 6-9 and Darnell 2003.

3. Williams 2013, 9 note 85 (Intel-Oker), and Davies 2003, for example.

4. Note the campaign of Intel-Oker and the attack by Kush on Egypt documented in the Sekhnhakhâti II tomb inscription for example. Williams 2013, 7 note 58 and 9 note 85; Davies 2003.

5. A significant issue is the fact that Egyptians often depicted foreigners without explicitly labeling them as such. For a complex example from the period under discussion, see Newberry 1893, PL XII, register 4. A man dressed in a long sleeveless garment presents a hornless bull or steer to Amenemhat of Tomb 2. His dress is clearly foreign, but he is not labeled. Two figures behind him, a herdsman with a staff walking on the balls of his feet leads a bull or steer with deformed horn, and other cattle in the row also have no horns. This contrasts with definitely Egyptian cattle shown on pl. XI which have normal horns. In the same chapel, pls. XIV and XVI, Nubian bowmen are more difficult to distinguish from Egyptians than the Asiacs. Note the foreigners, presumably Libyans, in tomb 14 (pl. XLV and XLVII), and the difference between them and Asiacs. For the same herdsman in Baqti III, see Newberry 1894, pl. VII, register 4, and for more mixed-horn cattle, pl. XVII, register 2. The herdsman with the sleeveless garment appears also in tomb 18 (1894, pl. XXIIA register 1). For more mixe-horn cattle in tomb 29, see 1894, pl. XXXII register 3; for him, see also pl X, reg. 1. His posture is as unusual as his appearance.

6. The herdsman of Meir also has cattle with deformed horns and cording dangling from the chins, which he grasps to lead the forward animals, in addition to his own unusual appearance (Blackman 1914, pl. IX, register 2. See Schneider 2003, 190). In Ukhib-Hotep’s tomb he has three ordinary cattle (Blackman 1915, pl III and VI). Again, his posture differs from other figures, although the second shows mixed horn types. See also pl. XI. The herdsman continues to appear (1915b, pls. III, middle register, and IV, lower register, where some of his cattle have deformed horns).

7. For the appearance of the man, see Williams 1983, pls. 104-105, also Váhala and Červíček 1999, pl. 68:260. In Nubian rock art, cattle are often shown with short cords or flaps of skin dangling behind the chin (Váhala and Červíček 1999, pls. 29: 100; 32: 111; 33: 116; 77:300, where the bovine—probably humped and therefore later, is being led by a bowman; 91:359, 96:378 [deformed horn]: 154: 610; 174: 693; 176: 697). Deformed horns also occur (Váhala and Červíček 1999, pls. 138: 543-544; 139: 548/A; 145: 578/A; 149: 591/D; 152:602/B; 602/C; 153: 607/B; 162: 643; 165: 648; 173: 689; 176: 698; 699; 177: 702; 178: 704; 186: 738; 740; 189: 741;742; 190: 754; 240: 935. Cattle with the chin cords are also shown in the tomb of Ankhmef at Mo‘alla, again in circumstances that indicate they are foreign—different from Egyptian cattle in the same tomb (Vandier 1950, pl. XXXVIII). Similar cattle also appear at Aswan in the tomb of Setka, above a register of Nubian bowmen (personal observation).

8. For a major example of the elaborate contrast of Egyptian and foreign without labels in the Eleventh Dynasty, see Morenz 2012, figs 2-3.


10. See, for example, Williams 2007, 1991, Geus 1991. Consider that the Paleo Stone preserves for the Fourth Dynasty only three years of Seneferu and possibly part of one of Menkaure’ (Wilkinson 2000, 141-149).

11. Smith and Giddy 1985, 318, comparing Nordström, Trigger, and Adams. Nordström (1972, 31) favored a date at the beginning of the-First Dynasty for the end of A-Group, or at least Egyptian imports. No evidence seen by me since that time indicates any later date.

12. See Smith 1983 and Smith and Giddy 1985, 317-319 for an analysis of the situation. For a few contexts that must be dated to this period, see Williams 1989, 121-135, which supports Smith and Giddy’s conclusion.

13. Smith and Giddy, 319-320 for Old Kingdom remains in Lower Nubia generally. Gratien (1995) identified a number of locations other than Buben with possible materials of this date. See Emery 1962. For color photographs, see http://www.digitalegypt.ucl.ac.uk
However, as noted in Williams 1989, 121-135, the remains from Lower Nubia do not indicate a genuine pattern of land-settlement of the kind seen in A-Group or C-Group.

Discussed by Jiménez-Serrano 2006, where, citing Chaix, he concluded that the territory attacked by Sneferu (tAnHs) was in the Kerma region, which supported a substantial (Pre-Kerma) population. See also Cooper’s discussion (2012: 7 and note 51) of possible hostilities between Nubia and Egypt, and Helck 1974: 214-217. Helck considered the inscriptions indicating hostilities between Egypt and Nubia to belong to the Fourth Dynasty, along with the Sneferu campaign. That would make Lopez nr. 27 the oldest mention of the name Wawat. By the Sixth Dynasty, Egyptians were recruiting soldiers in Nubia, and relations were stabilized, a condition that lasted perhaps until Amenemhat I (Williams 2013).

Ziermann 1993.

Detailed by Foerster 2007, 2011 and Kröapel in Kuper 2007, where they publish the astonishing discovery of an Old Kingdom “water mountain” mark at el-Kab Oasis west of Dongola, 24-25 and figs. 8-10.

For the late Archaic Period, see Williams 1989, 126 and Fischer 1963, 35-39. For the settlement at Dashur and the pottery from Elephantine, see Seidlmayer 2002, 97, 106 and works cited.

Wilkinson 2000, 141 does not read it with tt. From prior translations (Note 11, for example) and personal examination of the original, I believe it better to be read tt-nbs. See Williams 1986, 2, 165-170 for Ti-Seti. See Schneider 2003, 82-91 for its history and usage in this period.

Liszka 2012, 7, 149. Overseer of MdH, Tm and IrTT: note here MdH is treated as a location, and people from any southern location, including MdH, can be called nbs. This may have resulted in the situation reflected in Liszka’s Table 3 dealing with execution texts, where rulers of subdivisions of MdH can be called that, while their countries are listed as nbs. As such, the people from the region are not necessarily an artificial construct, nor is the possibility excluded that they were similar in language and social customs.

As mentioned by Weni and Harkhuf, Urk I, 98-105 (Weni’s expedition) 109: 1-5 (Weni), 124-131 (Harkhuf). For a new interpretation and a thorough examination of the problem of locating Yam, see Cooper 2012. His discussion contains a major review of prior opinion. For some perspective on the climate and geography of the central Sahara at this time, see Schneider 2010. See Zibelius-Chen 1972, 14-16 for sources.


Found in Harkhuf only, Zibelius-Chen 1972, 122 and 128. URK I, 125 line 2.

Found in Harkhuf only, Zibelius-Chen 1972, 176, Urk I, 125 line 2. Cooper (2012, 12) sees a second occurrence of IrTT spelled IrTT after TmT as indicating a different country. It might rather indicate TmT IrTT, compounding the two.

Found in Weni only Oising 1976, 146, Zibelius-Chen 1972, 161-161.

Found in both Weni and Harkhuf (and later). Zibelius-Chen 1972, 184-187. Its identification deserved her extended discussion and is more complex than MdH. In this context, I note only that it could be reached directly from Tm.

For the name and the alternate, (and possibly preferred) transliteration Imn, see Cooper 2012, 2-4. For earlier opinions and their development, see 5-12. Although one might attempt to defend a position for Tm on the Nile since the discovery of the Uweinat inscription (see, for example, Clayton, de Trafford and Borda 2008; note that they indicate a possible location far to the southwest, p 132, butpace Cooper p 15, they do not return to accept the location on the Nile), the likelihood that such a mention would be made so far from the country’s actual location or direction is extremely slight. The works advocating a Nilotic location for Imn/Tm are of historical interest, and the publications otherwise contain important information.

Found in both Weni and Harkhuf Zibelius-Chen 1972, 78-81, Clayton, de Trafford and Borda 2008. Mentuhotep II. Oising 1976, 146. See Arkell 1961, 42-44. The dramatic discovery of this country’s name in the inscription at Uweinat renders most prior discussion of Tm and its possible associations with other place names later obsolete. An early attempt to correct the tendency to minimize the Egyptian presence in Africa was made by O’Connor (1986). Weni and Harkhuf, Zibelius-Chen, 133-137, Liszka 2012, generally, especially 177-180. Oising 1976, 146. Schneider 2003, 94-99. He points out that Medja could have an ethnic meaning from the beginning, but see also Liszka 2012, 138-142.

Liszka 2012, 142-146 (for a history of discussion, see 16-40, Schneider 2003 92-99). Liszka believes that the Egyptians misunderstood the people and the land of (the) Medjay, but it should be kept in mind, nevertheless, that involvement with the deserts and the south was no new experience for them, but the result of millennia-old relationships we now have archaeological proof of extensive journeys (see notes 26 and 31 as well as Schneider 2003, 94-99). Although Egypt’s ritualized presentation of foreigners oversimplified reality, Egyptian had long experience with them on all sides.

Davies 2003; Davies 2005, 49-50. The picture given by this inscription reveals the contemporary Egyptians’ geographical view of the large-scale southern entities arrayed against them under the leadership or imperial control of Kush, namely Kush, Wawat, Medjay, and Punt.
Wawat was certainly contained both Egyptian and Nubian populations, while Kush, if it extended to the Fifth Cataract, contained different Nubian populations (for diversity depicted in the population of Kush, see Bonnet 2000, fig. 65). Most important, the inscription indicates that Medjay extended to the confines of Pun.

31 Foerster 2011, throughout.
32 See note 14 above.
33 See also Cooper 2012, 6-7. See Zibelliou-Chen 1972, 81, where she notes Arkell’s opinion that Yam was in Darfur (1961, 42-44), who discussed the products and logistics. Kröpelin and Kuper 2007, fig. 1 gives a route southward well to the west of Darfur.
34 Arkell (1961, 42-44) believed that he used the Darb e-Arba’un, but the Abu Ballas road was not explored by that time. Cooper (2012, 8-9) has some problems with the return route by the Nile, but accepts it as plausible logistically (more water needed for a heavily-laden caravan, perhaps). This would also argue for fairly good relations between Egypt and Nubians of the regions named. In any case, a route outward by way of Uweinat, and return by way of Wadi Howar and the Nile, or near enough to permit watering as needed, best fits the inscriptions.
35 For an introduction to Pre-Kerma, see Honegger 2004; while shapes (fig. 5) may resemble certain A-Group shapes, the decoration differs entirely. There are two small incense burners of A-Group type in the Kerma museum.
36 See Williams 1986, 63-64, table 18, and fig. 34.
37 Gatto 2007.
38 Arkell 1949, 95-106.
39 For archaeology of the southwest at this period, see Jesse et al 2004.
40 For Kerma in its earliest phase, approximately C-Group Ia, see Bonnet 2004, 12-15.
41 Smith and Giddy 1985, 317-319, modified somewhat by Williams 1989, 121-133.
42 For the large population of Palestine in this period, see Broshi and Gophna 1984. See Richard 1987: 34 for a positive connection between Egyptian campaigning and the end of the highly-fortified EB III, doubted by Wright and Pardee 1988, 157-158. Without engaging in details, which space does not permit, I will only observe that the five campaigns of Weni are quite a lot and that the representations of sieges in private tombs are quite specific, even though un-named, and even historical records, such as Sneferu’s can be frustratingly non-specific in dealing with places.
43 Using the term loosely to include all of the peoples mentioned by Weni and Harkhuf, even though some may have spoken something like To Bedawi, far from Nubian and some were from Yam and Tjemeh which also probably spoke very different languages and had quite different customs although language associations are very difficult here, either to make or deny. For a review of the second campaign rich in written records, see Rilly 2007, 421-491.
44 Williams 2013.
45 Using 1976 also see Ritter 1993, 137 note 611. Seidlmayer 2002, 96-98 connected these texts to Nubians mentioned in the Dashur Decree and possible growing friction between Nubians settled near the capital and the local populace, but the execution texts appear to be state documents. See also Cooper 2012, 2.
46 Ritter 1993, 136-142 discusses details of finds and the significance of execution texts generally.
47 Fischer 1963.
48 Bietak 1986. Note that the Old Kingdom representations of Saqqara and Dasha show only Egyptians and Asians, but both are quite poorly preserved and show none of the archers although arrows appear at Dasha.
49 Meurer 1996, 125-127. Some burials had rather rich objects, such as strands of gold and silver beads, that could have been acquired as awards for service in Egypt. Most tombs were thoroughly plundered for valuables, but gold and silver beads give some indication of wealth that would probably not accrue to someone doing herding. See Williams 1993, 51, P-B73-I, P-B74-2, B 43-2d all gold, and Williams 1983, 93, table 42 and 86-90 Table 41, T8, T12B, T46 U2, all silver, T134 and U3 Gold, for example; see pl. 117 e-h. Lengths of fiber core found in some tombs probably were from necklaces of gold or silver rings.
50 For a discussion, see Meurer 1996, 112-114, Lisska 2012, 9-10, 216-211.
51 Both Meurer and Lisska argue against using dark skin color as an identifier, but this does not take into account the representational contrast deliberately created by the artists of the period, or hair style, or the fact that Aashayet is portrayed like her Medjay servants as opposed to her Egyptian hairdresser. Fischer’s observation (1961, 76) that Aashayet, Kemnet, and Sadeh were all Nubians is appropriate here, and we could probably add Henhenet and even Mayet (The Car). See Meurer 1996, 113, notes 3 and 6. Only Aashayet’s servants are labeled as Medjay. Note that Tjemehau never explicitly states his origin although the context of his inscription makes it quite clear. While identifications can be difficult, we cannot insist on explicit identifiers at all ages.
52 Discussed by Darnell 2004.
53 Commented by Darnell 2004, 33, note 42.
54 The Kubaniya cemetery began in IB, probably the First Intermediate Period (Bietak 1966, 148-149). Despite the presence of a Ia shape, the phase seems not to be present, represented, perhaps only by the transitional “mischkultur.”
55 Williams 2013, 9, especially note 84.
56 See Steindorff 1935, pp 125-192, register. Williams 1983, 127-234 register, Williams 1993 64-120, register. Relatively few burials were even partly articulated, which contrasts with the a-Widay cemetery in the Fourth Cataract where most burials had been partly plundered, but with the burial left largely intact. See Emberling and Williams 2010.
57 Williams 2013, 4 note 29. For the campaigns, see Obsomer 1996, 254-261 (year 5).
58 Campaigns against Kush Obsomer, loc. Cit. for example.
59 For a summary of minerals sought in Nubia, see Zibelliou 1988, 71-91.
For example, Grapen 1978, 145 fig. 39, 174, fig. 49; Emberling and Williams 2010, fig. 33 c-d.


Ward and Zazzaro 2010 and works cited.

Tallet 2005, 172-177. Note that Senwosret III retreated before Asia fell, with Khn-Soheb fighting his way back.

Vogel 2004, fig. 10 and 73-91 for a general discussion of the system.

A pyramid 100 x 100 x 60 meters would require 200,000 cubic meters of material.

While a full defensive complement may not have been deployed at all times, each fort would have had to have a permanent caretaker force sufficient to repel a limited attack, and commanders would have needed a full defensive force within fairly easy reach. See Williams 1999 note 19 for an estimate of total normal forces.

Tallet 2005, 45-46.

Vogel 2004, 75-87.

See Vogel 2004, 81 (Dispatch 4) and 80 (Dispatch 3). Dispatch 3's event is dated two days after Dispatch 4's original report and one could guess if the Iken patrol was actually deployed on the east bank, it may actually have been intended to intercept the large body of men reported to Khesel-Medjay. See note 77 below.

We are here concerned with the three temporally interconnected groups of Exegetical Texts from Mirgissa (Koenig 1990), the bowls in in Berlin (Sethi 1923), and the statuettes in Brussels (Posener 1940). I review some evidence for dating. The text groups are interconnected as follows: The ruler of Kush in the Mirgissa texts (Koenig 1990, 108; Triath mother Khny father K33) has the same mother and probably father as the Kushite ruler in the Berlin/Sethi Texts (Sethi 1923, 33: swm, mother Kwny, father K33). The fathers of rulers of Kush in the Brussels texts (Posener 1940, 48; father swm, mother Tn, ruler Wtressst) and Shaat (Sai Posener 1940, 49; father Stxkbi, mother Rkh, ruler Rkh) in the Berlin vessel-texts were the rulers of these places (Sethi 1923, 33 Kush; swm, Sai; Stxkbi. See Posener 1940, 50 for the equation of the Sai names and the entire parentage). The Medja named in the Mirgissa text (Koenig 1990, 106, Whb-ib born to Twhy born for Wnkt), is still listed in the Berlin texts (Sethi 1923, 36, Whb-ib). The ruler of Whb-spf in the Mirgissa texts (Koenig 1990, 105) is still in office in the Berlin texts (Sethi 1923, 34). The five Egyptians listed in the Mirgissa texts (Koenig 1990, 116) are the first five in the Berlin texts (Sethi 1923, 62-68). All three of these text groups had to have been made within two generations and hardly more than half a century, if that.

Mirgissa may have been founded most likely by Senwosret II, although this is uncertain (Vogel 2004, 240). The Mirgissa and Berlin bowl inscriptions contain such names as Schebetep, Amyen, and Senwosret, which preclude a date before Senwosret I (Sethi 1923, 61-69; See Gee 2004, Posener 1987, 55; the still earlier Helwan texts contain an Intef-oker son of Intef-oker) and Sathathor, Sathathor-Nefere, Sbckhpt, which hint at a date much later, Whb-ib, if a contraction of Whb-ib-Rmns would press the date downward a great deal.

For a paleographical dating, Sethi (1923, 15) had only a brief report on the Heqanaht papers to use in his paleographical analysis, which would have given a different result. Some important paleographical benchmarks can be remarked. The Hatnub text that formed Moeller's primary resource for the period dates about to the beginning of Dyn. XII, not earlier (Moeller, 11). The Ilahum Papyry he used, he dated to the reign of Senwosret III, roughly the mid-Nineteenth Century. Posener reviewed various selected signs, and after some discussion, concluded (26-31) that the stelaetras belonged between Ilahum and Bulaq 18 in time, although he thought closer to the former. In writing, Sethi (15) summarizes his extensive paleographic results by saying that the Berlin texts closely resemble Sinuhe, and are sharply differentiated from Hatnub and what he had seen of the Hekanakht papers. Paleographically, Sethi and Posener dated their texts almost the same! Now, Posener's paleography was based on some relatively unusual signs. A comparison of some common signs from the Berlin texts with Moeller's Heiratische Paleography, gives, for example see Appendix (below) for Table 1.

Surprisingly, paleography gives a similar answer for both groups. Repeatedly, the comparisons favor a date in the late Middle Kingdom, and they tend to be strong with Papyrus Bulaq 18 (pace Posener 17) so Dynasty XIII cannot be excluded.

Sethi gave considerable weight to language and orthography in his version of dating the texts (14-18), but also concluded that he was dealing with a text formula from the Old Kingdom if not earlier (17—his citation of Kpni/Khn as evidence is telling on 18, since the new spelling is first found in Amenemhat IV according to Koenig 111, G2). If we ignore the archaisms and use only the persons and paleography, we find a clear date for the three interlocked groups of texts, the Mirgissa, Berlin, and Posener inscriptions from the end of the Twelfth into the Thirteenth Dynasties or in numerical terms, about the last decade or so of the Nineteenth and the first decades of the Eighteenth Centuries.

The conclusion is that the Mirgissa-Berlin-Brussels exocet text are the products of the Late Middle Kingdom, or earlier Second Intermediate Period, depending on how one classifies Dynasty XIII. In a dramatic way, they document the gathering storm. I am forced to wonder how much the cursing of enemies in all directions by the Egyptians may reflect a knowledge and collaboration among them, one that soon emerged full blown. In this respect, the name of the first ruler of Dyn. XIV, Nehesi, "Nubian," is to be viewed not as some kind of meaningless accident, but a political event of high significance (See, for example Ryholt 1997 94, 376-378). In Ryholt’s scheme, the appearance of the Semitic-named Khendjir, "Pig," (for this ruler, see Ryholt 1997, 342 and Schneider 2003, 157-159) would be less meaningful, as would the occurrence of scarabs in Asia invoking the names of rulers or official which cannot be taken to indicate an
official presence, since they are often reused in non-official circumstances, for example the scarab of Smsw n mn-pt named Nebesenu found in the grave of a 10-year-old girl at the Fourth Cataract (Emberling and Williams 2008, 18, fig. 7a).

Bietak 1966 remains the clearest and most complete exposition of C-group and its phasing.

72 Compare KA with IA already In Griffith 1978, 134-160 and Bietak 1966, pls. 1-2 and 93-96. For some aspects of tomb structure and cult, see Bonnet 2000, 22-25.

73 For burial customs in the Fourth Cataract at this period, see El-Tayeb and Kolosowska 2005, 53-58 which show a developmental sequence, including pottery, that differs from the KA/KM/KC series of the Dongola Reach. See Emberling and Williams 2010 fig. 26 a-e for OK II pottery of the type from late Middle Kingdom quarry dumps at Serra and figs. 31 and 32 for Pan Grave pottery. This is a developmental sequence.

74 Ukima tomb 215 (Vila 1987, 165-166, fig. 184:2, from a U-type tomb (Kenna Moyen).

75 There are similar, unpublished contexts elsewhere in the fortress system. We are handicapped a bit by the lack of burials for the garrisons in the forts. This should not surprise, since the occupants were transient. On the other hand it may also be considered a model for archaeological expectations elsewhere—that non-resident military units would leave few burials.

76 For a summary from the Semna Dispatches, see Schneider 2003, 197-199. He accepts Smither’s number of 70 (citing also Wente and Meurer; Smither’s query of the number in 1945, pl. III b-9 refers to an alternate reading of 30, and see pl. Iva b-14) for the Medjay in the patrol from Mirgissa (Iken). Lisza 2012, 162 accepts a small number, based on a rule generated from dispatch 2 (270-271). Intercepting the 32 men whose tracks were reported from Khesel-Medjay would not be done by a small patrol, so Smither’s number is not unreasonable. See note 70 above.

77 Not so the west, where the Köln mission has explored a wide swath of desert in the Wadi Howar and stretching north and south. For some description relevant to the current discussion, see Kuper 2002.

78 In the Fourth Cataract, the Oriental Institute found pottery of Pan-Grave type at the gold processing center of Hosh el-Geruf (Emberling and Williams 2010, fig. 32, see Bietak ibid.; for example) and in the transition between OK II/KM to OK III/KC in the cemetery of el-Widay (Emberling and Williams 2010, fig. 31). Burials in the cemetery were mostly in shallow circular pits (Emberling and Williams 2010, fig. 16; Bietak Pi), with stones surrounding the burial. Differences between the El-Widay cemetery and normal Pan Grave cemeteries in the north were fairly well-built stone tumuli, a lack of external deposit holes and a lack of neriya shells and rectangular deposit plaques. For some antecedents for the pottery, see El-Tayeb and Kolosowska 2005, figs. 5 and 9. For a Nubian pot of Serra quarry dump type, see Phillips and Kimaszewski-Drabor 2005, fig. 5. Materials similar to El-Widay were found throughout the Fourth Cataract region. See Zurawski 2010, figs. 49, 50, and 51.

80 Pan Graves in Nubia can be quite varied also. Compare Williams 1993, 124-132, Cemetery C at Serra East with Cemetery D, 133-142, which dates to the Napatan Period but belongs to a similar tradition. See Williams 1983, 224-228, tombs K82, and K92-K99. Note here that in K94, with two shafts, the C-Group III burial cut the Par-Grave. Compare both Cemetery D at Serra East and the Pan Graves from Adindan Cemetery K with the Sayala Pan Graves in Cemeteries B and G (Bietak 1966, 43-49, pls. 26-36).

81 Recognized in a very preliminary way already by Crowfoot (1928, 111-116 Group II), who had very limited comparable material to work with. Pl. XIII 1-10 are distinctive and would unhesitatingly be assigned to Pan Grave in Upper Egypt or Lower Nubia (See Bietak 1968, pl. 16, P7-P9). Fattovich (1989) p.108 relates the “Gruppo di Jebel Mokram” to the Pan Grave culture, but the ceramics he illustrates would not compare well with Lower Nubia unlike the sherds shown by Crowfoot. Ceramics of the Gash Group, on the other hand, compare well with the OK II/KM pottery of the Fourth Cataract (figs. 2-7; note especially the notched rim fig. 7). A photograph of Gebel Mokram group pottery in Fattovich, Marks, and Mohammed-Ali 1984 (fig. 6:3) does belong with Crowfoot’s types. For a summary, see Phillips 1997, 435-440. Material from this region has not been presented in sufficient detail to establish more than a significant relationship.

82 Pan-Grave material culture also differs systematically from what is known of material cultures at this time from the southwest. Note also from this period that the Handessi group in the Wadi Howar of the south Libyan Desert, see Jesse et al 2004.

83 For the social complexity of both Pan Grave and documented Medjay involvement with Egypt, see Schneider 2003, 92-99; Meurer 1996 83-139 and especially Lisza 2010, 248-315 for Medjay, 417-523 for Pan Graves. The various occupations do not exclude a military role, which is well-documented and of great importance. Such a role would not be represented very much in residential cemeteries. As noted above, the archaeological connection between Pan Graves and the south and east, including the Fourth Cataract region and the southern Arabai are both strong and exclusive, so I retain the connection between Medjay and Pan Grave, realizing that Pan Graves represent only a brief period in the career of Medjay, only a limited region, and that they mostly belonged to residents of various occupations.
APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>List Des.</th>
<th>Equations and remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ms</td>
<td>F31</td>
<td>Sethe 1926, Taf. 8 line 10/Moeller 408, best comparison Dyn. 13 (Pap. Bulaq 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>G43</td>
<td>Sethe 1926 Taf. 9 line 8/Moeller 1909: 524, Dyn XII-XIII plausible (Sinuhe), best comparison Dyn. 13 (Pap. Bulaq 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bookroll</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>Sethe 1926, Taf. 9 line 10/Moeller 1909: 538, Dyn XII-XIII (Sinuhe) closest, Dyn. XIII possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_separator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_separator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>G17</td>
<td>Sethe 1926, Taf. 2 line 6/Moeller 1909: 196, better formed version, closest Dyn XIII, simpler version (Sethe line 7) closest also Dyn XIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>V18</td>
<td>Sethe 1926, Taf. 2 line 9/Moeller 1909: 525 Dyn XII-XIII closest (Sinuhe), some resemble Westcar!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Paleography of Selected Signs in the Berlin Execlration Texts