Meroitic Studies IV: The Great Stela of Prince Akinizaz (Continued)

Author(s): F. Ll. Griffith

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 4, No. 2/3 (Apr. - Jul., 1917), pp. 159-173

Published by: Egypt Exploration Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3853882>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 09:15 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Egypt Exploration Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*

MEROITIC STUDIES IV

BY F. LL. GRIFFITH, M.A., F.S.A.

(Continued from p. 27)

THE GREAT STELA OF PRINCE AKINIZAZ.

IN the winter of 1913-14 Professor Garstang and Mr Phythian-Adams excavated a small temple built of crude bricks, two or three kilometres south of the main site of Meroe, near the village of Hamadab. On either side of the entrance stood an inscribed stela, facing the visitor as he approached the shrine¹. That on the left or north side, the subject of the present paper, contains the longest text yet known in Meroitic script. The corresponding stela on the right is smaller and in worse condition. Soon after its discovery, the text of the former was published with transliteration and index of words by Mr Phythian-Adams and a valuable note on its purport by Professor Sayce².

The long text, although still almost entirely unintelligible, contains words which are very suggestive in the light of history. In his note upon it Prof. Sayce has seized upon several of these with admirable acuteness³. For my own part I spent many days examining photographs which were kindly sent to me by Prof. Garstang, together with hand-copies by himself and Mr Phythian-Adams; I twice collated the resulting text with the original monument, which lay for some time in the portico of the British Museum and is now placed in the Egyptian Gallery; and finally by the kindness of Dr Budge I was permitted to have a squeeze taken of the whole of the worked face of the stela. From this squeeze the copy here published has been prepared. Although by good fortune the inscription is practically complete and the reading tolerably certain except in a few passages, the definite results at present reached will, I fear, seem ridiculously small. In the funerary texts, of which a multitude have been discovered and published, the scheme is so clear that it is easy to pick out names and titles and even to hazard a meaning for many entire phrases; but it is quite different with other classes of writings which are on no fixed plan of phrasing and have few finger-posts to guide the would-be interpreter. Until we begin to know the Meroitic language itself and to translate word for word we cannot hope that many facts will emerge clean-cut and indubitable from its monuments.

¹ View and plan in *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, vol. VII, Pls. VII, VIII.

² *Ib.* pp. 15-24 and Pl. IX.

³ *Ib.* p. 23. The fuller discussion under the title of 'The Stela of Amon-renas,' *ib.* p. 67, is disappointing.

The Roman expedition against Candace.

Prof. Sayce's opinion seems very well founded that we have in this stela a monument of the historic Candace whose troops raided the Roman frontier-posts of Augustus in or about 23 B.C. Of the raid and its punishment, Strabo, who was with Aelius Gallus the year before in Upper Egypt¹ and visited Syene, gives us what is no doubt an authentic account of these things from the point of view of the Romans:—

“The Ethiopians, encouraged by the fact that part of the forces in Egypt had been taken away to accompany Gallus Aelius in his war with the Arabs, attacked the Thebais and the garrison of three cohorts at Syene; by a sudden and unexpected onslaught they seized Syene Elephantine and Philae, reducing all the inhabitants to slavery and tearing down the statues of Caesar. Thereupon Petronius, who arrived with less than 10,000 infantry and 800 cavalry to oppose 30,000 of the enemy, first compelled them to retire to Pselchis, a city of Ethiopia, sending in envoys to demand the return of the spoil and a statement of their reasons for commencing war. They asserted that they had been unjustly treated by the nomarchs, to which Petronius replied that Caesar, not the nomarchs, governed the country. They then asked for three days' truce to consider, but as they did nothing that was needed, Petronius attacked them, compelling them to come out to battle, and soon put them to flight as they were badly organised and badly armed (their shields were of large size, oblong, and made of raw hide, and for weapons they had axes or mere punt-poles or in some cases swords). Some were herded into the city, others fled into the desert, and some took refuge on an island near by, plunging in and swimming across the strait (for the crocodiles here were not numerous on account of the current). Amongst these last were the generals of Candace who ruled the Ethiopians in our days, a masculine woman with one eye destroyed. All of these Petronius took prisoners, reaching the island on rafts and boats, and despatched them immediately to Alexandria. He then attacked and took Pselchis. When the number of those who fell in the battle is added to those who were captured it is evident that the remnant that escaped was exceedingly small. From Pselchis Petronius arrived at the fortified city of Premnis, having passed through those sand-dunes in which the army of Cambyses was overwhelmed in a tempest of wind; Petronius attacked and captured this fortress and then started for Napata. This Napata was the royal residence of Candace; her son was there and she herself was in a place near by. The queen sent envoys to establish friendly relations and returned the prisoners taken at Syene and the statues, but Petronius advanced and captured Napata also (whence the boy had fled), and destroyed it; and, after enslaving the inhabitants, he turned homeward with the spoils, judging that the ground ahead was difficult to traverse. Having on his way improved the fortifications of Premnis and thrown into it a garrison and two years' provisions for four hundred men he departed to Alexandria. Of the captives he sold some, and sent a thousand to Caesar (who had lately arrived from Cantabria), while some died of disease. Meanwhile Candace advanced upon the fortress with a force of many tens of thousands, but Petronius set out to its aid and was the first to enter the fort and, having strengthened it thoroughly, when the Ethiopians sent to negotiate he bade them send their envoys to Caesar. They professed however not to know who

¹ Strabo, xvii, 816.

Caesar was nor by what road they were to reach him, so he gave them conductors under whose guidance they arrived at Samos. Here was Caesar, despatching Tiberius to Armenia while he himself was about to proceed into Persia; Caesar granted them all they asked and even remitted the taxes which he had imposed¹."

Dio Cassius², writing early in the third century A.D., gives a brief account of this episode, mentioning no details, but describes Petronius more fully as "Gaius Petronius the prefect of Egypt" and says that Candace herself led the raid. Pliny the Elder (first century A.D.) also refers to it³ and to the vengeance of the prefect whom he wrongly calls P. Petronius. Of Candace he says that it was a name handed down from queen to queen in Meroe for many years⁴, and he implies that queens constantly ruled at Meroe, a view that is not well supported by the monuments, which usually show a king in the first place in any group.

It will be observed that Strabo describes Pselchis as a city of Ethiopia. Pselchis is the modern Dakkeh; the extensive excavations on the site carried out by Mr C. M. Firth for the Egyptian Government seem to show that Pselchis lay just outside the region of Meroitic culture, which begins only about ten miles further south at Medik, across the boundary of the Dodecaschoenus at Hierasycaminos or Takomposo. The Dodecaschoenus was occupied by Roman garrisons for several centuries after the conquest of Egypt and the antiquities in its cemeteries are those of Egypt at that period. It was much the same in the Ptolemaic age, but there were times when native kings asserted their sovereignty over it against the Ptolemies. Meroitic inscriptions of the third century A.D. are found at Kalabsheh, Dendûr and Philae, but the only Meroitic inscriptions of the "archaic" period yet found in or near the Dodecaschoenus are a group of three graffiti on the rocks behind Dakkeh and two graffiti naming the prince Akinizaz on the pylon of the Dakkeh temple. All of these seem to be of about the same age. In one of the Dakkeh inscriptions we find the prince in the company of king Teriteqas and queen Amanirenas. Upon our stelae on the other hand the prince Akinizaz follows the queen Amanirenas alone. We have seen that it was at Dakkeh (Pselchis) that the generals of Candace made their first stand against Petronius in 23 B.C. and were completely defeated. All this indicates that the archaic inscriptions of Dakkeh were engraved at a time when, in preparation for a great raid on Upper Egypt, king Teriteqas established an advanced base at Pselchis and collected his troops there under the command of Akinizaz. The king however must have died soon after and the raid was probably carried out by Akinizaz in the name of queen Amanirenas, the one-eyed Candace of the Greek and Latin authors; at any rate the king was dead when Petronius came, and does not appear on our stelae. Five or six years before the raid, in 29 B.C., the Ethiopian king, doubtless Teriteqas, had sent ambassadors to meet Cornelius Gallus⁵, and another explanation of the Dakkeh inscriptions might be that they were engraved at the time of this embassy. The text of the great stele unfortunately does not make use of the title Candace, but the repeated references to Rome and to Mezewi or Bezewi, which lay not far from Dakkeh, support these conclusions. It is also possible that in

¹ Strabo, XVII, 820, 821. Cf. MILNE, *History of Egypt under Roman Rule*, pp. 21-3.

² LIV, 5. ³ *Nat. Hist.* VI, 181. Cf. MILNE, *History of Egypt under Roman Rule*, p. 217.

⁴ *Ib.* 186. Cf. CROWFOOT, *The Island of Meroë*, pp. 33, 38.

⁵ See Gallus' record from Philae in DITTENBERGER, *O.G.I.S.* no. 654.

Akinizaz we may recognise the queen's son who, having retired to his mother's palace at Napata, fled when the avenging Romans drew near¹.

The last words of Strabo's account prove that after the disasters that had overtaken the realms of Candace at the hands of the Roman avenger, Augustus made various concessions which would save the face of the Ethiopians or might even be represented in their own annals as a triumph of arms. Amongst the concessions was probably the withdrawal of his garrison from Prem(n)is (Ibrîm) and the fixing of the southern extremity of Roman influence at Takompso (Maharraqa).

The stela.

After these preliminary remarks we will proceed to the description of the monument.

The stela (Pls. XXXI, XXXII) is a rather ill-shaped slab of gritstone weighing $3\frac{1}{2}$ tons. The top is imperfect but the present height is 2.58 m. The thickness of the slab is about 35 cm. at the top, 40 cm. in the middle; thence it thins downwards at the back, but this is compensated by a large bulge in front of the base which restores the thickness to about 40 cm. The face alone is smoothed; the back and sides are rough and the base is hardly even trimmed. The smoothed part broadens upward; its lower end measures exactly one metre across, but at the lower edge of the scene just below the fracture it is wider by 18 cm. Of the scene a height of 46.5 cm. remains, the inscription occupies 1.46 m. and the base is 62 cm. high. For the inscription 45 rules were engraved, 3 cm. apart, reaching almost to the base of the smoothed face, but the last three lines are blank.

Before proceeding to discuss the details, so often faulty and obscure, it should be explained that the inhabitants of Meroe had practically no good stone available for lasting records. The sandstone when of even texture was too soft and the harder kinds of gritstone contained on the one hand cavities, on the other veins and patches hardened by iron, quartz pebbles and the like. All this made the work of the sculptor and engraver very difficult and thankless, and it is evident that their skill was quite unequal to their task. For work on a large scale without detail, as in the scene at the top of our stela, a fairly satisfactory result could be achieved, but as soon as exactitude of line was required on a small scale, as in the row of prisoners and still more in the inscription, the engraver's difficulties began to be serious: his tool made little or no impression in some cases, in others it slipped and chipped away areas which were intended to be left standing in relief. In the row of prisoners he seems to have lost his head entirely. As he proceeded with the inscription, too, his patience failed and his work became more and more illegible, partly because the scribe who painted the inscription on the stone had drawn the characters smaller, more crowded and with less care; at length at a new or added section in l. 26 a fresh start was made with larger lettering and this went on merrily enough for a time. In the inscription we find lines either too short or carried on too far or broken by obstinate crystals. In the first line a cavity seems to have been filled in and the engraving continued over it; other cavities towards the end were simply avoided and left blank.

¹ Strabo, xvii, 820.

The scene.

Only the lower part of the scene remains, showing the legs of six standing figures, distinguishable by the position of the feet as male and female. On the left a woman with sandalled feet followed by a man barefooted confronts a god who wears the lion's tail; on the right the same pair confront a goddess.

Below these is a row of small figures of captives with heads to the left, lying helpless on their breasts, their legs from the knees bent over their backs and their feet tied to their arms. Bad design and worse engraving make it difficult to comprehend the arrangement except in the third figure from the end. The same mode of securing captives is seen in small figures in the round, both male and female, of the Saite period¹, but is not usual in scenes. The first three captives have objects in front of them which may be intended for their insignia, sceptres, or banners, as kings or chiefs.

The remains of the scene on the second stela show the lower parts of the same figures in the same order and attitude, except that the god is here in the right half and the goddess in the left; the row of captives is absent. It is very unfortunate that in both stelae the labels belonging to the figures of the divinities, as well as those of the worshippers, are lost with the upper part of the scenes where they were presumably engraved. We may surmise that the stelae had rounded tops and that on each of them a figure of the winged disk was spread above the scene. The god and goddess might well be Ammon and his consort Mut, but curiously enough there is very little support to be derived from other Meroitic monuments as yet published for this, or indeed for any such association of god and goddess². The inscription, it may be remarked, mentions various forms of Ammon, and probably the goddess Hathor.

With regard to the worshippers, the inscription gives us prominently the name of Akinizaz, a *paqar* and *psha(n)té*-prince, whose triple cartouche in hieroglyphic was found in the first season at Meroe on a block in the so-called Sun-temple. There also he is a prince, not a king, as is shown by the remains of his headdress, and he was preceded by a more completely royal figure³. In the scenes of the Lion Temple at Naga we have three royalties—the *qére* or 'king' Natakamani, the *Ka(n)take*, i.e. Candace or 'queen' Amanitêre, and lastly the *paqar*-prince Arikakharê⁴. Similar royal trios are seen in the Ammon-temple at Naga⁵ and are named on the columns of Amâra⁶. In these scenes the king and queen often wear sandals, while the feet of the prince are always bare, evidently as a mark of respectful inferiority⁷. On the two stelae of Akinizaz therefore we appear to have a scene of a full queen and a prince without the king: they are offering to a god and goddess, and, further, on the great stela a row of prisoners lie bound at their feet.

The inscription.

Below the scene on each stela has been a long inscription. On the smaller stela there may have been as many as 36 long lines, but unfortunately they are in wretched condition and very obscure, and the single photograph that I possess, excellent though

¹ See PETRIE, *Amulets*, no. 60 in Pl. V, and p. 19.

² An unpublished tablet from Meroe however shows Ammon and Mut thus associated.

³ *Meroë*, p. 61, inscr. no. 2 and Pl. XXXV.

⁴ *Inscr.* I, Pl. XVIII.

⁵ *Inscr.* I, Pl. XXI.

⁶ *Inscr.* II, Pl. VI.

⁷ *E.g.* L. D. v, 62, 67.

it is, is quite insufficient to establish the remains of the text. The great stela has a still more extensive text, of no less than 42 long lines in archaic style and, although many of the signs are very ill engraved on the hard gritstone and a few characters are wholly lost by flaking, there is very little that cannot be eventually recovered by careful examination, and the reader is greatly helped by the fact that long passages are repeated almost letter for letter in different parts. A considerable flake has come off the surface in ll. 17—20, destroying or obscuring many characters.

For convenience of reference I have broken up the text into paragraphs in the transcription. These §§ are of various lengths and generally have some sort of justification but are probably very incorrectly divided.

The protocol (§§ 1, 2).

§ 1 (l. 1) Amnirens : qêreli : kzweli : yitnizebhel : qêre-yi :

§ 2 Aki(l. 2)nizz : pqr-ñyi : peštê-ñyi : pqr : qêrisl :

As the queen is figured before the prince we may expect to find at the beginning of the inscription her name preceding his. Here in fact we seem to have two parallel phrases, the one commencing with the queen's name Amanirenas, the other with the name of the prince Akinizaz whose known titles follow. In l. 27 also he is *paqar* and *pesha(n)tê*.

It is illuminating to compare the protocols of two other inscriptions which name Akinizaz viz.:

(1) the small gritstone stela from the 'Temple of Isis' at Meroe. The inscription on this is ill-arranged, faulty and obscure. Prof. Sayce pointed out its connexion with our stela, and acting on this hint I have made a fresh copy of the worst and (at present) most interesting part (Mer. 12 c), obtaining from the original, now in the Liverpool Museum, a very different reading from my first attempt.

Mer. 12 c.
 11111 W 119 : 111919 124 W 11
 52 22 : 11103 5 W 4 12 3 5 2
 : 33 : 219 2 : 43 52
 : 15 14

(2) The graffito in a cartouche on the pylon at Dakkeh (*Inscr.* 92)¹.

Mer. 12 c [?] 1 W 119 : 111919 124 W 11

Inscr. 92 : 5 W 119 111919 124 W 11

Mer. 12 c [?] 52 22 : 111 12 5 W 4 12 3 5 2

Inscr. 92 [?] 52 22 : 111 12 5 W

Mer. 12 c [?] : 15 14 : 33 12 5 W 4 12 3 5 2

Inscr. 92 [?] 15 14 33 W 4 12 3 5 2 12 5 W 4 12 3 5 2

Thus both *Mer.* 12 c (the scene on which shows a king wearing the sandals of full royalty standing before Isis) and *Inscr.* 92 name a full trio of royalties, the *qêre*

¹ A new photograph of this has been published in ROEDER, *Tempel von Dakke*, vol. II, Pl. 23.

THE STELA OF PRINCE AKINIZAZ

Upper Portion

'king' Teriteqas, the *kazake* 'queen' or 'Candace' Amanirenas (in *Inscr.* 92 written Renas alone), and Aki(ni)zaz, whose titles here are of doubtful meaning but may have some relation to his youth or infancy.

Some remarks on the readings are necessary. The atrocious engraving of *Mer.* 12 is chiefly due to the hardness of the gritstone; the unskilful engraver blundered and failed, leaving sometimes a superfluity of signs. Its readings must therefore yield place to those of *Inscr.* 92, which is on smooth soft sandstone, though it has unfortunately been much injured by subsequent hammering in of rude animal figures.

According to my hand-copy made from the original at Dakkeh the name of the king in *Inscr.* 92 began doubtfully with 𐤊 , but the photographs show that 𐤋 , which is practically certain in *Mer.* 12, is quite possible. 𐤋𐤋 is certain in *Inscr.* 92 against 𐤋𐤋 which is equally certain in *Mer.* 12; in the latter the 𐤋𐤋𐤋 or 𐤋𐤋𐤋𐤋 is badly blundered.

As to the name of the queen, on the great stela part of it is lost in a hole which was probably filled with stucco before engraving; but 𐤋 and 𐤍 are certain, and there is no space for an intervening sign. In *Mer.* 12 c there is some appearance of an extra sign, perhaps a faulty letter which was abandoned. The writing Renas without Amani in *Inscr.* 92 is extraordinary; I find no other instance in Meroitic of an independent word beginning with *r* (nor are such found in Nubian). It can hardly be explained as an abbreviated writing for (A)renas, since initial *a* is generally written in these inscriptions. If the kingship in Ethiopia went by mother-right it would be strange that the queen should bear a non-native name. It seems best to look upon Renas as either an abbreviation of, or a mistake for, Amanirenas. The queen's title in *Inscr.* 92 was read *kzwe* in the drawn copy *Inscr.* II Pl. XII, but in my hand-copy from the original *kzke*, ib. p. 25. Either reading is possible by the photograph, and the great stela gives us *kzveli*; on the other hand the exact parallel in *Mer.* 12 c gives *kzke* certainly, and we may therefore accept this as the true reading. On comparing [*Ntkm*]ni; qére, [*Amnitère*]: ktke on the pylons of the Lion Temple at Naga (*Inscr.* 3, 4)¹ with *Teriteqs qére*, *Amnirens kzke* of *Mer.* 12 and *Inscr.* 92, it is obvious that *kazake* is only another form of *katake*, Candace. *z* varies with *t* occasionally in other words in Meroitic (*Kar.* p. 16).

In both of the short texts the prince's name is written without the syllable *ni* (Akizez in *Mer.* 12 should probably be corrected to Akizaz to agree with the other instances, including those with *ni*). This shorter form seems to me to belong to the early part of his career. The title or epithet šš in *Mer.* 12 may mean 'child'; compare the succession of plurals

br-leb : keze-bḥ : kzi-leb : mrêr-leb : šš-leb *Inscr.* 94/19

i.e. 'men, youths(?), women, maidens(?), children(?)'

In *Inscr.* 92 it seems possible that 𐤍𐤋𐤋 should be read instead of 𐤍𐤋𐤋𐤋 , giving the title *paqar*.

To return to the great stela. Here the royal trio are reduced to two persons, the Candace and the prince, evidently after the death of the king. A bold translation (or guess) of their titles in the protocol might be

§ 1 "Amanirenas monarch, royal-mother, monarch-regent of the chosen peoples.

§ 2 Akinizaz, *paqar*-regent, *peshaté*-regent, *paqar* of the monarch."

¹ See *Inscr.* I, pp. 55, 79.

At this period Akinizaz has the later form of his name and has assumed definite titles. To it probably belongs his name in hieroglyphic in *Mer.* 2, where he accompanied another figure and bears titles agreeing closely with the above. There is no proof that he ever reigned as sole king: in the inscription in the thickness of the pylon wall at Dakkeh¹ his name occurs (unaccompanied) apparently with the simple title *paqar*.

As to the words in the protocol, *qêre* 'king' is well known: *kzwe* may have some connexion with *kzke* 'Candace.' *yitnizebhel* is an interesting form; *-bh* is known as a plural element in the final words of the funerary formulae (*Kar.* pp. 25-6); from the above-quoted succession of plural words it appears that *-bhe* is the correct plural suffix for nouns which end in *ze*, parallel to the ordinary *-leb*. *-l* is of course the usual attachment of a word in the genitive relation when it precedes its governing word (*Kar.* pp. 23-4). The plural of the same root is seen again in l. 28 *tbi-tnizebhl*. *tnize* occurs in several names, *Amni(?)tnize* ♂ *Inscr.* 132/9, *Arêtnize* *Inscr.* 59 ♂, *Kar.* 28, *Šrbe-tnize* *Kar.* 24, *Tñki-tnize* ♂ *Far.* 4/9, ...*yi-tnize* ♂ *Far.* 44/8; cf. also *Arêtnye* *Kar.* 106, *Šbs-tniye* ♀ *Far.* 29/4, and *areze-tni* *Far.* 21/23, *Qeš-tni* *Far.* 21/22.

gerê-yi occurs parallel to words ending in *-ñyi* *Inscr.* 94/4; this second instance shows that *-yi* is correct with *qêre*. For the element *-ñyi* cf. *Inscr.* 92/16, the "extended invocation" (*Inscr.* II p. 59), and proper names in *Kar.* 109 (?) ♂, 119 ♀.

The campaigns (§§ 3—10).

There are three parallel passages, §§ 4, 6, 8, in the first half of the inscription, each of which ends with figures recording numbers of men and women. These must represent the prisoners taken in three campaigns. Two other passages, §§ 3, 10, are added here because they afford short but useful parallels. Divergences are printed in italics.

§ 3 (l. 2) *qêr* : *hrphelw* : *Qeš* : (l. 3) *Armeyšli*² :

{	§ 4	<i>qêr</i> : <i>hrphel</i> : <i>aḥrêsl</i> : <i>atbe</i> : <i>tmêt</i> : <i>hrphl</i> : <i>Armil</i> ³ : (l. 4) <i>Qeštê</i> : <i>abrs</i> l :
	§ 6 (l. 8)	<i>qêr</i> : <i>hrphel</i> : <i>aḥrêqesl</i> : <i>atbe</i> : <i>tmêt</i> : <i>hrphel</i> : <i>Qeš</i> : <i>nktê</i> : <i>arêbel</i> : <i>abrs</i> l :
	§ 8 (l. 11)	<i>abrs</i> l :
	§ 10 (l. 13)	<i>abrs</i> l :

{	§ 4	<i>yekezi</i> : <i>kzisl</i> : <i>arsli</i> : <i>tkk</i> : <i>yemêqe</i> : <i>qebeswi</i> : (l. 5) <i>yerki</i> : <i>Armeyšlḥe</i> ² :
	§ 6 (l. 9)	<i>yekezi</i> : <i>kzisl</i> : <i>arsli</i> : <i>tkk</i> : <i>emêqe</i> ⁴ : <i>qebeswi</i> : <i>erk</i> : <i>škte</i> : <i>arêbe</i> :
	§ 8	<i>yekez</i> : <i>kzisl</i> : <i>aresli</i> : <i>tkk</i> : <i>emêqe</i> : <i>qebeswi</i> : (l. 12) <i>yerki</i> : <i>apes</i> : <i>mki</i> :
	§ 10 (l. 14)	<i>yekez</i> : <i>kzisl</i> : <i>arsli</i> : <i>tkk</i> : <i>zqebeswi</i> :

{	§ 4	<i>azḥite</i> : <i>Qeper</i> : <i>abr 32</i> (?) : <i>kzi 135</i> (?) : <i>qêleb</i> :
	§ 6 (l. 10)	<i>azḥite</i> : <i>perite</i> : <i>abr 100</i> : <i>kzi 1·2</i> : <i>qêleb</i> :
	§ 8	<i>wetethē</i> : <i>azḥite</i> : <i>prite</i> : <i>abr 58</i> (?) : <i>kzi 223</i> (?) : <i>qêleb</i> :

¹ *Inscr.* 93, ROEDER, *Tempel von Dakke*, Pls. 16, 23.

² Or *Arḥeyêsl* here and in l. 5; in the latter *ē* is lacking, one stroke having probably been omitted by accident.

³ *m* fairly certain.

⁴ Throughout these transliterations I employ *e* for initial *Ṣ* (properly *ye*), *i* for initial *Ṣ* (properly *yi*), to distinguish them from the full spellings *Ṣ III*, *Ṣ III*.

Professor Sayce has already given admirable suggestions for the meaning of all the special words that occur in §§ 3, 4, but not correspondingly in §§ 6, 8, 10, viz.:—*Qeš* = 'Cush,' *Armeyés* = 'Roman,' *Armi* = 'Rome,' and *Qeper* identified as the name of the father of the two heroes worshipped at Dendûr.

Armi, the name of Rome, had already been found as *Aréme* in a late inscription¹.

Armeyés (or *Arheyés* in both ll. 3 and 5) might be a Meroitic genitive or a rendering of 'Ῥωμαῖος, the equivalent of which in Egyptian inscriptions, *Hrwmys*, is used to designate the emperor Augustus².

Qeš occurred in a suggestive phrase in *Inscr.* 94 'Qesh-wards to Azere, northwards to Pilaq (Philae)' (Azere lying at or south of the Second Cataract), so that I had already compared the name Cush with it³; but the *q* in place of Eg. , Hebr. , i.e. *k*, stood in the way. This difficulty has since been largely removed⁴. The word recurs in §§ 5, 11, 15, 19.

Qeper. At Dendûr the temple built under Augustus is dedicated to two heroes Pihôr and Petêsi, sons of $\Delta @ \square \diamond$. The name of the father is without variant, except that in two cases in one scene the $\diamond$ is omitted⁵, probably by accident. The @ is not very likely to be consonantal, so that the Meroitic *Qeper* would fairly represent $\Delta @ \square \diamond$.

Of the words in §§ 3, 4 common to §§ 6, 8, and 10 most can be illustrated from elsewhere and some are more or less intelligible:—

qér, occurring in *Far.* 21 = *qéri* in *Kar.* 127, is perhaps the well-known word for 'king.'

hṛphel, a high title, see the indexes of *Kar.* and *Inscr.*

ahṛé also in § 14 *Inscr.* 92/17, 125/4.

atbe *Mer.* 10/11.

tmét *Inscr.* 75/7, 9, 94/32, 33.

abr, *br* 'man' and *kzi* 'woman' *Journal* III, p. 123.

With *abrs*l : *yekezi* : *kzisl* : *arsli*

compare *abrs*li : *kezetê* : *kzisl* : *arezetê* *Inscr.* 92/12—14,

the meaning of these may be something like 'slaying men, enslaving women.'

tkk § 13.

yeméqe : *qebeswi*, §§ 15, 19, *qebes* also in §§ 9, 11, see below pp. 168–9.

yerki perhaps 'begotten,' cf. *Inscr.* 49.

qé-leb an important plural, *Mer.* 8/4, *Inscr.* 111/11, *Far. Ostr.* 2, also below §§ 11—14.

The Meroitic *qé* often suggests a connexion with the famous Egyptian word the Ka, 'person' and in late times 'name,' perhaps pronounced *ko*, but it is impossible as yet to prove it.

The last phrases must be something like "humbling(?) the Roman, capturing(?) 32 men 135 women living persons."

The special words in § 6 and § 8 include

nkté in § 6, cf. the title(?) *nk* *Kar.* 47/2.

arébel in § 6 and beyond *škte* : *arébe*, cf. § 5 note. Prof. Sayce in his translation suggests 'Arab' as the equivalent of *aréb*.

mki in § 8, cf. *mkiñ*, *mki* in § 7.

wete in § 8 occurs *Mer.* 9/3 *Inscr.* 97/7.

¹ *Inscr.* 129/4.

² SPIEGELBERG, *Rec. de Trav.* xxvi, 52, *ÄZ.* XLIX, 85.

³ See *Inscr.* II, p. 31.

⁴ See above p. 27.

⁵ BLACKMAN, *Temple of Dendûr*, p. 34.

perite in §§ 6, 8 is the well-known Egyptian title "the Agent," *Inscr.* II, p. 51. This is the earliest mention of the title in Meroitic. It is generally used of "the Agent of Isis" who administered the Dodecaschoenus which was the dominion of Isis of Philae, but probably the title survived also for other administrators.

For the numerals see *Journal* III, 22 *et seqq.*

Putting together the indications, all more or less conjectural, but confirming each other by their cohesion, we gather from § 4 that the first of the campaigns of Amanirenas the Candace and Akinizaz the prince was against the Romans. In this a fair number of prisoners was taken, including Qeper, a native non-Egyptian leader in Lower Nubia who presumably supported the Roman cause and had perhaps been established as petty king of the Triacantaschoenus by Cornelius Gallus in 29 B.C.¹ It should be noticed that his name ends in *r*, a characteristic termination of male names in Meroitic. His two sons Pahôr and Petêsis, bearing Egyptian names, were killed probably by drowning², doubtless in the course of the military operations, and a temple was dedicated to them at Dendûr (Tutzis), built under the auspices of the Emperor. As has been pointed out above, the three leading prisoners in the scene are distinguished by their accompaniments. The first would be Qeper with a straight bar lying horizontally before him. The other two would be the two Agents captured in the second and third campaign: in front of each of them is figured an object like an axe or spear placed obliquely.

Between § 4 and § 6 is the passage:

§ 5 l. 6 *yezhi* : *arbhteke* : *pqrli* : *yezê* : *Qešli* : *imlêke* : *trêzeb* : *abekb* : *mszetz* (l. 7) *ñrê* : *ezeteq* : *trêñl* : *trêzebkte* : *eqelbhe* : *yezk* : *arêbel* : *škte* : *Qeštê* :

yezhi "born of (?)," see Indices of *Mer.* and *Inscr.*, cf. *yerki* in l. 5. *arbhteke* is some kind of plural from *ar.* *pqr* the title.

yezê cf. *yez(?)k* below and *yez* in *Inscr.* *trêzeb* (plural?) cf. *trezebkte* l. 7.

trêñ *Inscr.* 86, 92. *aqe-lbhe* (plural) cf. *eqe-thñ* ll. 27, 28.

škte the combination *ŠŽ* is very rare and suspect, see *Journal* III, 117, and although an *Š* is quite clear here there is also the decided appearance of a tail as in *Ž*; in l. 9 we have *škte arêbe*, so here *arêbel škte* seems a reasonable correction.

Between § 6 and § 8:

§ 7 (l. 10) *apêtebes* : *tkk* : *mkiñ* : (l. 11) *ytes* : *mki* *weštel* :

Between § 8 and § 10:

§ 9 (l. 13) *apête* : *qebes* : *yetkbhi* : *yqêt* : *meh* : *ale* . l : *Qeštê* : *alleleb* :

there is some resemblance between the two passages, perhaps not really extending beyond the first word. *apête* 'envoy,' see *Kar.* and *Inscr.* For *apête-bes* and *apête-qebes* cf. *ahrêsl* and *ahrêgesl* in § 4 and § 6 respectively. *ytes* might be read *yter*, or even be corrected to *yqês* to agree with the parallel?. *weštel* seems a better reading than *šeš* to avoid the combination *ŠŽ*; cf. *Journal* III, 117³ and *weš(?) Inscr.* 92/17, *wes Inscr.* 94/26, 101/4.

yetkbhi also ll. 14, 38. *etk-te Mer.* 12 a, *etk-kte Turæeff* ll. 15, 16.

¹ See the inscription in DITTENBERGER, *O.G.I.S.* no. 654.

² BLACKMAN, *Temple of Dendûr*, p. 82.

³ The authenticity of both the examples of *ŠŽ* quoted from this stela is now shaken, increasing the probability of *Šll* = *Ž* with vowel *Š*.

119 HL 2482 25 WVSZ: 144WZ: 144682: 5651458: 4E3: V115252: 43W511: 48V11
 V11WVSZ: 45555552: 43 50: 5 5552: 3 53: 5110 11: 46V35511: V1152719: 141552: 455
 4/2E52WVSZ: 44035: 145252: 420115V519 8: 225: 45V11WVSZ 5V11 482: 382511: 5
 15 1555: 18553 45W6: 48V55119: 3519: V1114WVSZ: 13 55552: 46VW6: 43V115V555
 52: W119: 43R: 3R: 5V11511: V111548 55519: 56V55 45195: 4358 48V11519552
 511: V1114 3: 455110 1: 88: 335: 5113 5: 311152: 54485853: 455195
 A252: 055511: 5 5: 5R: W119: 451448252: 313: 43 45V115V555V V11
 17511: 455119: 18482 52: 555: 465W68: 10452: 3352: 2R52: 35193: W115: 5
 20 5WVSZ: 4511W3: 5V11: 1248582: 31W411: 31352: 853R: 3R: V1114485W11511: 5
 V111193: 4554 11582: 5V11: 5191R3: 56555V52: 5252: 5V11: 56V48214: 552R15: 42 116
 4WVSZ: 14481R5: 565V11: 5V11: 534515: 453519: 145W65: 65555V52: 455
 51913511: 85V11WVSZ: 85V11482: 1429: 548V115195: 48V11: 46W 12 47 5: 52545
 4823: 91198582: 455V382: 4513 3: 1448815: 56552R14: 14V28: 548V115V5193
 25 8: 528R145: 141W5: 48: 2488: 255 48: 324WVSZ: 3311582: 4652485: 2445411
 884/242521167 3: 4856V584WVSZ: W352: 85V1142W519: 14QV1152: 14V 84545
 1R3: 5R52: 8655195: 45R: 1R 3: 5254W192: 150352: 15W192: 110
 1584/254V5: 4545352: 444W192: 8655195: 45R: 1R 3: 5254W192: 150352: 15W192: 110
 V115WVSZ: 41352: 8V1114W63: 5WVSZ: 64V52R: 43V5W19: 56
 30 4852 1R65WVSZ: 4514W3: 5V11: 535: 5V11 8: 565W6: V11814W3: V11
 11153: 5V11: 519 1R5: 56555V52: 5253: 5V11: 56V48214: 552R14
 V11: 52454513: 443519: 145WVSZ: 65555V52: 458V111-133: 455V
 148V11: 466W4: 18482: 52565W6: 14WVSZ: 14481R5: 65V11: 5
 B: 548V115V519519135: 85V11WVSZ: 85V11482: 1425: 548V115195
 35 58421448: 23: 145813B: 555119: 63565W6: 525V11525852: 141R
 55: 54652: 3V551458 14: 55: 5451192: 565W6: 110: 525
 555: 445685W: 5V11: 525582: 45: 142R352: 14 58148: 52
 55: 5W6: 564555: 14W19: 2WVSZ: 552R14: 481R523
 12552: 5V1148: 2R352: V11V115WVSZ: 4R3 52: 525: 5V11
 40 5: 4852488: 56552X11: 5V11: 14V58 143: 555119: 52558242: 5
 5V1145 WVSZ: 14R1152: 14 5842458: 42R144: 14 2WVSZ
 5WVSZ 4856V584652 W352: 8

THE STELA OF PRINCE AKINIZAZ

Lower Portion

Disposal of spoils (?) (§§ 11—15).

To divide the first thirteen lines as above under two headings, 'protocol' (ll. 1—2) and 'campaigns' (ll. 2—13), may probably be considered justifiable. The rest of the inscription, ll. 14—42, is a maze of words almost without clues to the general meaning; at l. 27 however it is certain that a main division may be marked, beginning with the name of Akinizaz.

The lettering is now very bad, and unfortunately for many lines after § 10 there are no long parallel passages.

§ 11 (l. 14) awete(?) : etkb¹hi : arkezni (l. 15) egebeswi : hr²b³hi : allebsê¹ : pertes : Qeš : qēleb wi : hr²p³h² : (?)

§ 12 mlewslke(?) (l. 16) aleqes wi zeli : eqetezeb⁴he : sb : q(ē)leb wites : yesbe : nš : nši :

§ 13 qêr : a (l. 17)...eqepi : Mezewitel : ayêh...ešêbe : tkk : zz : [sb ? :] qēleb : wites : y(l. 18)esbe qebeslili : šbl : Mezewiteli :

§ 14 qêr : nl : : ye...tê : Amn.(?) (l. 19).. : qêr(?) mlêlh : Amnp : puk⁵k : ahrê : hr²p³hi : bt.k. : (?)...kwizê : qēleb : ye..(l. 20) l : yesbe wites : nš : nšlw : Amnp : yirêh : Mzewi : nš(?) :

Three approximate repetitions of a short phrase, very useful for establishing the text, are printed in italics; they did not escape the keen eye of Prof. Sayce, as is shown by his transcript in *Annals* VII, 70. The variation in the order of the words in the third case is noteworthy. *sb* see below §§ 15, 19. *yesbe* cf. *ysbete* *Inscr.* 94/18 and *yesbehî* in Indices of *Mer. Inscr.* and *Kar.* *mlêlh* cf. *mlêlh* *Inscr.* 45. *yirêh* cf. *yrehe-te* in *Inscr.* 89/12 (*Journal* III, 26).

The most intelligible thing in this passage is the association of Amanap, the deified Amenhotp (*Journal* III, 115), with the place-name Mezewi in § 14. Amanap is very commonly mentioned as a deity in the inscriptions of Karanog. His name occurs at Faras twice: in one case a "mesen of Amanap in Pezeme" or Amara is in question, Far. 34/4, in the other an *ant* or "priest of Amanap in Bezewi," Far. 21/6. He also is invoked(?) in a graffito at Dakkeh, *Inscr.* 91 c. Mezewi is known only on this stela, but Bezewe or Bezewi is commonly mentioned in later texts from the north, at Shablûl and Medîk and once at Philae³. With its worship of Amanap it is clearly the same place as Mezewi. Bezewi lay at or close to the frontier of the Dodekaschoenus. In late times it was the residence of a strategus and it may even be Dakkeh itself, with which place Akinizaz and his colleagues evidently had much connexion. On the east bank too at Dakkeh are remains of a temple built by Amenhotp III⁴. But it is more likely that Bezewi was within the Meroitic area which begins just south of Dakkeh.

A word must be said about Prof. Sayce's attractive identification of Mezewi, read by him Merewi, with Μερών Meroe. In demotic this is spelt *Mrwe* (i.e. Merowi)⁵, in hieroglyphic it occurs in a Ptolemaic inscription as *Mrw*, and earlier, on the stela of the

¹ Probably confused for *alleleb-šê*, cf. l. 13.

² Perhaps a numeral.

³ *Kar.* p. 81, *Journal* III, p. 27.

⁴ *Archaeological Survey of Nubia, Bulletin* no. 7, by FIRTH, p. 5.

⁵ *E.g.* GRIFFITH, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*, p. 177, note to l. 15.

Ethiopian king Nestesen, as *Brw*¹, showing the same variation of M and B as the Meroitic Mezewi. The difficulties in the way of this identification are two:

(1) The first regards the spelling. The Meroitic ω is *r*, and to imagine a special variety of *r* to represent $\mathfrak{r}$ is not easy in this region of Africa. There are no likely variants of $\mathfrak{r}$ with ω so far as I am aware, except that in some proper names the male termination ω seems sometimes to be replaced by another termination $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{r}$. There is nothing in the pictorial form $\mathfrak{R}$ to suggest a value *r*.

It is true that direct evidence for the value of $\mathfrak{r}$, alone among the alphabetic signs, is very scanty. On the other hand, if $\mathfrak{r}$ is read *r* then there is no equivalent left for *z* which however is found in Meroitic or Nubian names written in Egyptian. $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{r}$ seems to vary with $\mathfrak{t}$ and therefore should be related to that dental. The name * $\mathfrak{waz}$ *wazi* $\mathfrak{waz}$ ² for $\mathfrak{R}$ is not an unlikely source for the value *z*. Also there is one likely equivalence of $\mathfrak{r}$ with Eg. $\mathfrak{z}$ ³.

(2) The second objection is geographical. The texts mentioning Bezewi cluster round the north frontier of Ethiopia, especially at Medik and Shablûl, with single occurrences at Philae and Faras. One might indeed expect to find Meroe, the capital, named in inscriptions anywhere in the country, so that this argument is not by itself decisive; and now we have found Mezewi on a stela at Meroe itself. But the stela is historical; the events recorded upon it seem to have taken place on the northern frontier, so that such an important frontier post as we believe Mezewi to have been is likely enough to be mentioned.

Next follows a long passage which is fortunately duplicated further on:

{§ 15 (l. 20) sb : krteli : art(l. 21)hñ[ê]ki : teñkel : tewwibh̄t : sb : meke : azblel̄he :
 {§ 19 (l. 30) sb : krteli : arthñêkewi : (l. 31)teñkel : tewwibh̄he : sb : meke : azblel̄he :
 {enêqe : sb : mzeybeli : šqtes(l. 22)ñli : azblel̄h : tbrete : Qešli : l̄l̄itike : sb
 {enêqe : sb : mtey(l. 32)beli : šqtesñli : azblel̄h : tbrete : Qešli : h̄l̄itike : (l. 33) sb :
 {sbl̄he : enêwilê : wlbrt[e : hr](l. 23)phl̄ke : šwizê[: irh̄hi : sbwi : eqeswit : ekte : kzislw :
 {sbl̄h : enêwite : wlbrte : hrphl̄ke : šwizê : irh̄hi : sbwi : (l. 34)eqeswit : ekte : kzislw :
 {abrs̄lw : yemêqe(l. 24)eqebeswit : wkbte :
 {abrs̄lw : emêqe(qebeswit : (l. 35)wkbte :

krteli cf. *krtē-zes* in l. 30. *teñkel* §§ 16, 20 seems to designate the 'west' or some western district in the inscriptions of the Naga and Amara columns (*Inscr.* II, p. 13). *tewwibh̄l* or *t*, see *Inscr.* and *Mer.* and *etewwite* § 16.

azb 'land' or 'ships'? see *Kar.*, *Inscr.* and *Journal* III, p. 27.

mzeybeli the initial uncertain; the variant of *te* for *ze* is interesting, see above.

tbrte cf. *tbr-ke* § 20 (l. 38) and *wt(?)brte* l. 22.

¹ Respectively in DÜMICHEN, *Geogr. Inscr.* IV, Taf. 188 and SCHÄFER, *Aethiop. Königsinschrift*, p. 27. The form of the name with B seems to have survived in the Old Coptic $\mathfrak{wepore}$ *ÄZ.* XXXVIII, 86, 87.

² GRIFFITH and THOMPSON, *Demotic Magical Pap.* I, p. 64 note to l. 8; see also *Kar.* p. 16, no. 23.

³ *Journal* III, pp. 114 (aa), 116, 117.

After § 15 we have

§ 16 (l. 24) teñkelhe : etewwite : mmêli : zhbeli : Mzewe : mkze (l. 25) :
wwikewi : kzeylk : abrike : wi 3348 (?)

Mzewe looks like a proper name formed from the place-name Mzewe.

The signs at the beginning of l. 25 might be in part numerals, the last *k* or 9.

wwikewi or perhaps *wwi awi*, see §§ 17, 21 following.

kzeylk, *abrike*, evidently forms of *kzi*, *abr* 'woman,' 'man,' and it is remarkable that the former here has the precedence, as in §§ 15, 19 (ll. 23, 33).

A short passage with duplicate then follows:

{ § 17 (l. 25) wwikewi : erête : tinñke : (l. 26) wlikizbte : asnte : qerlisw :
§ 21 (l. 40) wwikewi : (l. 41) erête : tinnki : wlikizbte : asnte : qer[l]isw :
{ ašr : aħizebhe wi 1626
(l. 42) ašr aħizebhe wi 1032

ašr, probably the word spelt *šr* in later texts in *Kar.* and *Inscr.*

aħizebhe is another instance of the plural of nouns ending in *ze*, see above p. 166.

The word may be an adjective qualifying *ašr*. Compare *aħil* in l. 36.

wi is frequently found in association with numerals, on ostraca, etc.

The added inscription (§§ 18—21)¹.

The above passage terminates the whole inscription in ll. 40—42; similarly in ll. 25—26 it evidently ends a paragraph. The next section in fact seems to be an addition to the original inscription, the letters being considerably larger and more widely spaced. It may be objected that the figures which end § 17 in l. 26 are also on this large scale; but the explanation of that fact is easy. The original writing here has been erased, probably at the time that the addition was about to be made, and new figures have been written in on the larger scale. The reason for this may have been simply that the original engraving was inaccurate and difficult to decipher and was therefore re-written.

Between § 17 and § 19 we have

§ 18 Akinizz (l. 27) qê : pqrîê : peštêlê : pqrilke : mnê : nli : eqethñ : ant : (l. 28) Mnê
teslke : mnê (?) : nli : eqethñ : pqrili : peštîli : tbitnizebhe : (l. 29) qêrebki : Nptbiħ : Atre :
mħrlêš : Amni : Arress : (l. 30) krtezs : ħrphe : wsl : tkt :

The endings *qê*, *-lê*, *-lê*, are well known², perhaps a kind of demonstrative attached to personal names of deceased and of persons and gods who are figured in the sculptures.

"Akinizaz the *paqar* and *psha(n)tê* prince."

The ending *ke* occurs at intervals in the following and seems to offer a guide to the phrasing, though the meaning is very obscure—'the *paqar*'.... 'the priest of Ammon of Nête', 'the lands (?) of the *paqar* and *psha(n)te*.'

Atre, probably the goddess Hathor (*At:ri Inscr.* 15).

¹ § 19 has already been discussed with § 15, and § 21 with § 17.

² Cf. *Kar.* ch. iv, etc.

³ See *Inscr.* I p. 63, II p. 28.

"Ammon of Araras (?)," see also l. 39; Prof. Sayce (*Annals* VII, p. 78) is probably right in connecting the land of *Arrs* in the Inscription of Nastosen with this. Schäfer has shown the probability that this *Arrs*, with its city *Mh*, lay within the Ethiopian kingdom (*Aethiop. Königsinschrift*, p. 37). *Mh* is a name which belongs to the neighbourhood of Abu Simbel.

Between § 19 and § 21:

§ 20 [?]pezekeslke : [?]hrphlke : qêleb : wtezete : mk : wite pizelke : (l. 36) qê : [?]lhrphê : pbêli : ekk . . . : [?]wtezetelebk : aḥil : [?]plke : (l. 37) wtezete : Amnp[?]te : pizelke : sb : w(?)re-wheli(?) : . pet (l. 38) mkenêwi : teñkel : tbrke : qêrteb . . . : etkbḥt : [?]hr[ph]e : wsl : (l. 39) tkt : Amni : Arress : Amnp : ñtesli : [A]mnp : (l. 40) [?]pizelke : qêleb : štezebte : sb : teñkelḥe :

The ending *ke* continues here at intervals. *Amnp[?]te* is Amanapate 'Ammon of Napata' (*Inscr.* II, p. 28) rather than Amanap with suffix. *lhrphê : wsl : tkt*, the obscure reading assured by the parallel in l. 30 above (§ 18).

I much regret to have to state that, in spite of some attractive associations of known or half-intelligible words in various parts of the inscription, it does not seem worth while to print any more suggestions of translation, since none that I can offer could carry any sort of conviction as to their probability. The most obvious deductions from proximity of mere words are too often negatived by the scraps of grammatical knowledge that we may be said to possess. I can only conclude with the wish that other students may be more successful.

The following is an attempt to give a conspectus of the few landmarks gained in the inscription.

The protocol.

- § 1 Amanirenas, queen etc. pp. 164-6
 § 2 Akinizaz, *paqar*-prince, *pesha(n)tê*-prince, king's *paqar*. pp. 164-6

The first campaign.

- § 3 king (?) *charapach* Cush 'Πωμαῖος'. pp. 166-7
 § 4 king (?) *charapach* x², *charapach* Rome Cush; slaying (?) men, enslaving (?) women, taking (?) spoil (?), overcoming (or begotten?) 'Πωμαῖος, capturing (?) Qeper and 32 men 135 women living-persons (?) (nearly = § 6, cf. §§ 8, 10). pp. 166-8

The second campaign.

- § 5 born (?) . . . *paqar*-prince . . . Cush *arêbe škte* Cush. p. 168
 § 6 king (?) *charapach* x, *charapach* Cush *nktê arêbe*; slaying (?) men, enslaving (?) women, taking (?) spoil (?), overcoming (or begotten?) *škte arêbe*, capturing (?) the Agent and 100 men, 12 women, living-persons (?) (nearly = § 4, cf. §§ 8, 10). pp. 166-8

¹ Apparent root-meanings are given in order as written; their grammatical connexion is quite obscure.

² X, Y, Z represent three short passages repeated in almost the same words.

The third campaign.

- § 7 envoy... *mki*... *mki westel* (cf. § 9). p. 168
 § 8 slaying (?) men, enslaving (?) women, taking (?) spoil (?) overcoming (or begotten ?)
apes mki wetetthe, capturing (?) the Agent and 58 men 223 (?) women, living-persons (?)
 (= part of §§ 4, 6, cf. § 10). pp. 166-8

A fourth (?) campaign.

- § 9 envoy.....Cush...(cf. § 7). p. 168
 § 10 slaying (?) men, enslaving (?) women, taking (?) spoil (?) (= part of §§ 4, 6, 8). pp. 166-7
 § 11Cush living souls (?) *charapach*.. p. 169

Disposal of spoils (?)

- § 12*sab* living-souls (?) Y. p. 169
 § 13 king (?)....in Mezewi.....[*sab* ?] living-souls (?) Y....in Mezewi. pp. 169-70
 § 14 king (?).....Aman....king (?)..Amanap.....*charapach*....living-souls ? Y
 Amanap..Mezewi.. pp. 169-70
 § 15 *sab*....west(?)..*sab*..ships(?)..*sab*....ships..Cush..*sab*.....*charapach*....*sab*
women men.....(= § 19). p. 170
 § 16 west(?).....Mazeweye.....woman man..3348(?). p. 171
 § 171626 (= § 21). p. 171

The added inscription.

- § 18 Akinizaz the *paqar* prince and *pesha(n)té*, *paqar*-prince Z prophet of Amanête
 Z *paqar*-prince and *pesha(n)té*...s kings (?) Napata Hathor..Amani of Arares..*charapach*
wsl tkt. p. 171
 § 19 *sab*....west(?)..*sab*..ships(?)..*sab*....ships..Cush..*sab*.....*charapach*....*sab*
women men.....(= § 15). p. 170
 § 20 ..*charapach* living-souls (?) *wtezete* god *wite pizelke*..*charapach*.....*wtezete*
 Amanapate (Ammon in Napata) *pizelke sab*.....west(?).....*charapach wsl tkt* Amani
 of Arares Amanap..Amanap *pizelke* living-souls (?)..*sab* west(?). p. 172
 § 2110320[?] (= § 17). p. 171