Jochen Hallof

The Meroitic Inscriptions from Qasr Ibrim

Studien zu den Ritualszenen altägyptischer Tempel
Horst Beinlich / Jochen Hallof (Hg.)

SRaT Volume 9.5 – 2020

JOCHEN HALLOF

THE MEROITIC INSCRIPTIONS FROM QASR IBRIM

III. Inscriptions on Stone, Wood,
Parchment and Gourd

Text

This volume is of interest to the fields of:

Meroitic Studies

Egyptology

Nubian Studies

Sudan archaeology

Africanistic Studies

Linguistic Studies

CONTENTS

Dedicated to Pamela J. Rose

PREFACE

The publication of the Meroitic inscriptions from Qasr Ibrim comes to an end with the present volume. Looking back to the preface to the first volume of the series (published in 2011), in which the number of volumes was estimated to be three, the fact that the number of volumes has doubled clearly shows the outstanding importance of the Meroitic inscriptions from this site. This is also absolutely clear for the Meroitic inscriptions on stone, wood, gourd and parchment collected and edited in the present volume. The catalogue includes 107 texts, of which only 17 have already been published. The texts are written on many types of object, including offering tables, royal and non-royal stelae, a lion statue, wooden boards, one parchment and one gourd. The series of objects is completed by in situ votive inscriptions scratched on the walls and the floors of various buildings at Qasr Ibrim. Besides their contribution to the lexis of the Meroitic language, their special value lies in the fact that they often provide parallels to already-known texts. Their analysis and the identification of their correspondences and divergences is especially valuable for understanding the grammatical structures and establishing the basic forms of many nouns, verbs, prefixes, infixes and suffixes. The results are presented in a separate chapter in the summary at the end of the volume.

As with the preceding volumes the preparation of the manuscript has benefitted from the support of many colleagues. First of all I have to thank Dr. Claude Rilly (Paris) for the integration of the inscriptions in the numbering system of the *Répertoire d'Épigraphie Méroïtique* (REM) which makes the quotation of the texts straightforward. I have to thank Dr. Claude Rilly again for giving me access to his unpublished *Lexique Méroïtique*. The impressive number of quotations shows the importance of his work for the development of my commentaries to the inscriptions in this final volume. Further thanks are due to Dr. Julie Anderson and other colleagues of the Department of Ancient Egypt & Sudan of the British Museum (London) who gave me the opportunity to check the stele of queen Amanisakheto (REM 1141) in the store rooms for some hours, which has resulted in several important improvements to the transliteration of this historical text. Thanks to Dr. Julie Anderson, I am also able to add the papyrus inscription REM 2201 to this volume because she photographed this heap of very fragile papyrus fragments now stored in the British Museum. Further thanks are due to Prof. Michael Zach (Vienna) and Dr. David N. Edwards (Leicester) for their manifold support of my work, by providing literature, informations about details of the excavation, and photos.

I have to say some more words about the contribution of my wife Gabriele. As with the preceding volumes she has carefully read all the pages and verified the transliterations, notes, references, indices and bibliography. If I had to pay her for every mistake she found, I would now be a poor man. That this had not happened I owe to the generous financial support of the "Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft" (DFG) and the efforts of Prof. Horst Beinlich (Würzburg) who initiated the research project in 2007.

My greatest thanks, however, I owe to Dr. Pamela J. Rose (Cairo). Without her unselfish help, her careful twofold proof-reading of the whole manuscript, her innumerable notes especially about the historical context and her valuable remarks, the publication of the Meroitic inscriptions from Qasr Ibrim would never have had this happy ending. To her the last volume of the serie is dedicated.

Dresden, March 2020
Jochen Hallof

INTRODUCTION

The present volume is the final book in the series "The Meroitic inscriptions from Qasr Ibrim". It unites all Meroitic inscriptions from this site written on materials other than ceramic and papyrus. It begins with the re-publication of the inscriptions REM 1141, REM 1158, REM 1163, REM 1171-1172, REM 1177-1179, REM 1198-1199, REM 1228, REM 1248 and REM 1324-1326, from the year 1971 onwards. As with the papyri and ostraka this is only a very small part of the documents in this category. The main part of the catalogue is devoted to the publication of 88 hitherto completely unknown documents on stone, wood, parchment and gourd (REM 2692-2780). The inscriptions are separately documented by drawing and/or photos, and these have been already published in 2016 as volume 6 of this series.

The catalogue is followed by a short appendix in which some improvements are presented to the transliterations of the ostraka REM 1162, REM 2050, REM 2068-2069, REM 2071 and REM 2136, published in the first volume of this series, and to the papyri REM 1232, REM 2186 and REM 2210, published in the second volume. Furthermore, the Meroitic fragments of the collection of papyrus snippets REM 2201 are transliterated and documented; these were not available when the second volume of this series was published. Finally, the omitted drawing of papyrus REM 2293 is added.

A summary, palaeography, word index and the list of abbreviations follows. While the palaeography gives only a selection of signs from the different palaeographical periods, the word index unites all the complete and fragmentary words and strings. The summary deals with personal names, divine names and place names mentioned in the documented inscriptions. Other paragraphs are devoted to titles, numbers and verbs and their formative elements. A special focus is the documentation and explanation of the great numbers of parallel texts and phrases, found in the course of the analysis of the inscriptions. The observation of the correspondences and divergences amongst them permit deep insight in the lexis of Meroitic words and the structure of Meroitic sentences. The 39 examples of the so-called "décrets oraculaires amulétiques" are the most impressive collection in this group of texts.

The book concludes with an index of all references to Meroitic texts quoted in the catalogues, the summaries and the paleographies of the volumes 1 (ostraka), 2-3 (papyri) and 5 (stone, wood, parchment and gourd).

The catalogue

The main part of the book is the catalogue of the objects with their inscriptions, and are described and analysed according to the following schema:

REM xxx [QI xxx/MI xx] The REM number is the number under which the inscription will be included in the *Répertoire d'Épigraphie Méroïtique*. In brackets are the Qasr Ibrim find number and – for all inscriptions from the 1978, 1980 and 1982 seasons – the Meroitic Inscription number (MI). The texts already published form the first part of the catalogue, and the unpublished follow thereafter, beginning with REM 2692. The sequence of the unpublished documents follows their find numbers.

DETAILS: Particulars of the object.

PHOTO: Number(s) of the negative(s) in the Qasr Ibrim film archive, followed by the number of the plate with the reproduction of the photo of the object in volume SRaT 9.6.[1]

DRAWING: Number of the plate with the drawing of the object in volume SRaT 9.6.

SIZE: Detailed measurements of the objects as given on the find card, normally its height (H),

---

1   Hallof, Plates 2016.

and width (W). Differences between the measurements and the scale on the photo(s) of the
object itself are recorded in the footnotes.

REG. NO.: Registration number of the object.

PRESENT LOCATION: The present location of the object as noted on the find card.

FINDSPOT: Findspot of the inscribed object.

DATING: Proposed dating of the context in which the inscription was found, as given on the
find card. When these designations are written in square brackets, the information about the
dating is questionable. A question mark in square brackets "[?]" indicates that no dating of
the context of the object is available, for various reasons.

PUBLICATION: Bibliographical references to published Meroitic inscriptions can be found here.
Otherwise the object is characterized as "unpublished".

INSCRIPTION: Transliteration of the Meroitic inscription. Its arrangement follows the exact
arrangement of the text on the original object. If the number of lines of the whole
inscription can be determined precisely, the lines are indicated with a current number. If
the existence of one or more preceding but now lost lines is possible, the current number
is prefixed with "x+". If an object is inscribed on both sides, the indication of the line is
prefixed with the designation "rto." (= recto) or "vso." (= verso).

COMMENTARY: The commentary is mainly devoted to the discussion of the completeness of
the text, textual criticism, dating, particular features, and its possible content. General
conclusions, however, are left to the summaries.

Transliteration
The Meroitic signs are transliterated and arranged as follows:

| a | e | i | o | y | w | b | p | m | n | ne | r | l | h | ḫ | s | se | k | q | t | te | to | d | : |

The letters of the transliteration with the exception of the word divider are separated from each
other by a hard space. In the commentaries and the summary, however, the transliteration is
written as *scripta continua*. Questionable signs and reconstructed signs are given in square
brackets. Lost signs are represented by dots, whereby one dot stands for one lost sign. If the
number of signs cannot be restored, the gap is marked by three consecutive dots "...".

CATALOGUE

REM 1141 [QI 1964/1]

MATERIAL: sandstone

DETAILS: stele, broken in two pieces with top missing

PHOTO: 1963 P1/8A; P2/36-37; P6/32-34 (pls. 9-11)

DRAWING: pl. 8

SIZE: 77 x 116 x 16 cm. (W/H/T)

REG. NO.: 64/1

PRESENT LOCATION: The British Museum, Inv.-Nr. EA 1836

FINDSPOT: church, north aisle, reused in church flooring

DATING: C

PUBLICATION:[2] REM 2000: 1670-1671; Plumley, Pre-Christian Nubia 1971: 19; 20, fig. 8 (photo); Edwards, Stelae from Qasr Ibrim 2007: 82-90 (transliteration, photo, facsimile);[3] Aldsworth, Cathedral church 2010: 27-28 (photo).

INSCRIPTION: 38 lines of Meroitic cursive inscription, cut into the sandstone surface

 (1) *a l e q e se: w o s: te b w e te l i: m e d e w i*

 (2) *k e: a r o d o k e l w: m [e] s: s ḫ i b t i: a b e n*

 (3) *b i te l w: a m n i [s] ḫ e to: q o r e y i: k d w e*

 (4) *ne y i: a k i n i d d: ḫ e n s ne y ne y i: p q r*

 (5) *ne y i: e n m d e: p k r t r: d e l i k r o r [o:]*

 (6) *n i r l [i]: t r e t d: e l ḫ: i r ḫ .: n i r*

 (7) *l i se: d t r e: n b e y r o s i: [a] r o k e*

 (8) *se q e se: p ḫ t: se l [e] m i te l i se: k e ne*

 (9) *[y i]: m k l[:] t e b: te w [w] i: k p . . .[:] y te*

 (10) *p l e to: n i r l: [p] b o: e q o . [te]: e q e*

 (11) *d e to: t m e y: [y] . ne: ḫ r p ḫ ne[:] . [r] r*

 (12) *k e se: t d ḫ se ne: q [b] te [d] e l: p [q] l e:*

 (13) *n b e y r o se: e l to[:] q e se n . l: w o*

 (14) *l e se: t d ḫ se [ne: t] p l i m . t ḫ [l] h: p q*

 (15) *l [e]: n b e y [r] o se: w i d o: e l to: a*

 (16) *d b: p e n n i d e te: s h r te: p [e] to*

 (17) *h e w i: p e t m e te: te ne k e l i: m*

 (18) *l te l i: p t y i [h] l w: p e to h*

 (19) *te: s h r te: p t ne y i ne: a r*

 (20) *k r i s te: [m] n i: e l ḫ n k i[:]*

 (21) *a d o w i d o: s: d o l i: i d n*

 (22) *k i: a d o l i: i ḫ r ḫ r k i*

 (23) *a m n p: ne te se l w: w o s: ne te*

 (24) *se l w: a l e q e se: s h r te: e*

 (25) *k [e] l w: a to: a [p] e se l: s d te:*

---

2   Further mentions of this inscription are found in Plumley, Qasr Ibrim 1963-1964: 4; Steffen Wenig, Amanishakhetê, *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* I, Wiesbaden 1973: col. 170-171; Heyler – Leclant – Hainsworth, Préliminaires à un REM 1975: 30; Inge Hofmann, Zu den meroitischen Titeln „ktke" und „pqr", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplement III,2 XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Wiesbaden 1977: 1407, n. 29; Inge Hofmann, Zum Problem der gesprochenen und geschriebenen Sprache im Meroitischen, *Afrika und Übersee* 63, Hamburg 1980: 269; Hofmann, Material 1981: 12; Hainsworth, Textes méroïtiques de Qaṣr Ibrîm 1984: 448, n. 1; László Török, Der meroitische Staat I, *Meroitica* 9, Berlin 1986: 264 e; FHN II: 723 (number 4).

3   Together with Claude Rilly as co-author.

(26) *a s r: a p e se l: p [l te]: a to: e*
(27) *q i te l ẖ [r] p o l d e . . se: p t ne*
(28) *y i ne: p ẖ: a se r o: t . . [h] d o l*
(29) *w: a p ne te: t h t h d o [l w]: e q e d e*
(30) *p e te y i d te: n . r o: [a] ẖ r o: s te*
(31) *w i d o: p t ne y i [n] l: m [se]: p d h o se*
(32) *l i se l w: m se: m k l [i] se l w: s*
(33) *a r w i n k e* 1000: *e r e . [te]: w b e r*
(34) *te: a k r e: w t k e h r n se l e: s*
(35) *te w i d o: m s l i n k e: w h . te* 100
(36) +30[:] *t m e y: m d e p e te w i t . m r e: h*
(37) *[w/s] b e r o n w* 20[:] *b o[:] t ẖ . . h t: a*
(38) *. . [ne/d] . . [y] . . . . t [w]*

COMMENTARY: In the 1964 season, the area of the church was selected for detailed excavation and cleaned down to the original pavement. Among other features, the entrance to a crypt was discovered in the north aisle. The stair well leading to it was sealed by a rough stone pavement covering an area of 5.2 x 2.1 m. At its west end was a slab broken in two which forms an almost complete Meroitic stele. The two pieces were laid side by side in such a way that the bottom of the lower part lay along the right-hand side of the larger upper part. The pavement belonged to phase 3 of the building history of the cathedral church, a phase consisting mostly of repairs dating between 956, the occupation of Qasr Ibrim by the Arabs and 1371, the burial of bishop Timotheus in the north crypt.[4]

Even at the time of the first mention of the stele,[5] Plumley was able to date it to the period of queen Amanisakheto and prince Akinidad. However, it was only in 2007 that the stele was published by Edwards and Rilly. For the present publication, a new drawing of the inscription has been made with the aim of showing the shape of the signs more exactly than in the drawing by Edwards and Rilly. The text was collated with the original in the British Museum and this has resulted in some improvements in the transliteration from the latter publication. The representation of the stele is almost completely lost except for the very ends of some of the feathers of the winged disk. Other stelae show clearly that neither gods, the queen nor Akinidad were depicted, because the wings of the disk end just above the first line of text. Because the traces in the middle are of a rectangular shape, they represent the ends of the ankh-signs, suspended from the uraei to the right and left of the sun disk.[6] Line 38 does not form the final line of the original inscription. As Edwards and Rilly pointed out, the partly-preserved two grooves on the left half of the bottom which damage lines (35) to (38) are equal in size as the complete groove, which damages lines (6) to (12), so that a loss of six lines or more can be assumed. Originally the stele stood upright and was accessible to visitors, who were able to touch the surface and thereby damage it.

The text begins with the word *aleqese*, for which the translation "text; inscription" is proposed,[7] which makes good sense here. Interestingly, another inscription of Amanisakheto begins with the same word (REM 1041).[8] The begin of the inscription can be compared with three other royal texts using the same word. A comparison of the texts shows that the name and title of the ruler can stand before *aleqese* (REM 1044), but always in a non-inflected form.

---

4   Edwards, Stelae from Qasr Ibrim 2007: 82-83; Aldsworth, Cathedral church 2010: 27-28. The location of the stele as found is
     depicted on pl. 46. The dating of phase 3 is discussed on p. 143-144.
5   Plumley, Qasr Ibrim 1963-1964: 4. The information is based on a study of the text by M.F.L. Macadam.
6   Cf. the stelae REM 0085, 0126, 0406, 1090, 1229, 1234, 1249 and REM 1273. In the stelae REM 0049, 0412, 0832, 1038 and
     REM 1044 with representations of persons, the wings do not extend to the beginning of the inscription.
7   Hintze, Stele des Tañyidamani 1960: 142; cf. Rilly, Langue du royaume de Méroé 2007: 200.
8   Other royal inscriptions with *aleqese* are REM 1044 (king Taneyidamani) and REM 0075 (unknown ruler).

Here the title and name of the ruler follow it in line (3) and are also in a non-inflected form. The meaning of *aleqese* can perhaps be more closely defined as "(written) announcement". Two parallel phrases begin with the name of a divinity each: *wos* – "Isis": *wos tebweteli medewike arodokelw* (lines 1-2) and *ms* – "Mas": *m[e]s shibti abenbitelw* (lines 2-3). *tebweteli* (line 1) can be separated into the place name *tebwe* (the Abaton at the island of Bigge near Philae), the locative ending *-te* and the article *-li*. It forms the main epithet and designates the goddess as Isis from Bigge.[9] It is followed by another toponym, *medewi* (lines 1-2), the archaic form of the name of Meroe, here enlarged by the ending *-ke* which indicates a spatial distance.[10] In Meroe, Isis from Bigge seems to have had a guest cult. The following *arodokelw* (line 2) can be separated into *ar* – "Horus", a binding vowel *-o-*, *doke* – an adjective of unknown meaning[11] and the ending *-lw* – "for".[12] Together with the preceding *aleqese*, the opening phrase can be translated as "a (written) announcement for (*-lw*) Isis in Bigge from Meroe (and) Horus (with the characteristic) *doke*" and analysed as *aleqese* – divine name – epithets – postposition *-lw*. The analysis of the following phrase is more difficult because none of the words is attested in other texts. The reading of the vowel in the following *m[e]s* is unsure but the short lines above and below the large hole best fit its completion as ϟ. Whether the following *shibti* in line (2) can be divided into the adjective *shi* – "young; fresh" and an ending *bti* is difficult to say, but possible. The word *shibte* in a stele from Meroe (REM 1251C/x+7-8)[13] can perhaps be instanced as a similarly-constructed word. Concerning the final *abenbitelw* in line (2-3), words like *yikidbitelowi* (REM 1182/13) and *adbiteli* (REM 1044/48) allow the separation of *-bite* as a formative element after the stem *aben*, the meaning of which cannot be established. Neither *shibti* nor *abenbitelw* looks like a toponym or divine name, but they can form other kinds of epithets for a god, the divine name of whom is hidden in the first word *m[e]s*, and perhaps forms a variant writing of the divine name *ms* – "Mas".[14]

The royal protocol then follows (lines 3-5), and says: "Amanisakheto, being king (*qoreyi*),[15] being Kandake (*kdweneyi*), Akinidad, being *hensneyneyi*,[16] being prince (*pqrneyi*)". The leading position of the otherwise unattested title *hensney* is noteworthy, as is the absence of the second title of Akinidad, *peseto* – "viceroy".[17] For the following *enmde* (line 5), a relationship with *yetmde* and consequently its translation as "nephew; niece"[18] was proposed by Edwards,[19] but this is not convincing because the word stands between two titles (*pqr* and *pkrtr*) and should therefore express a kind of title rather than a relationship, the more so because no-one is named who could be his aunt or uncle.[20] The following title *pkrtr* (line 5) forms a variant of

---

9   The Egyptian equivalent would be *Ꜣs.t m tꜣ iꜣ.t-wꜥb.t*. This combination of divine name and place name, however, is not attested in Egyptian texts. In the latter the goddess is called either *Ꜣs.t iw-wꜥb* or *Ꜣs.t n.t iw-wꜥb* ("Isis of the Abaton") in Demotic texts and *Ꜣs.t djt ꜥnḫ nb.t iꜣ.t-wꜥb.t* ("Isis, the donator of life, Lady of the Abaton") in hieroglyphic inscriptions; see LGG I,68,a and Aylward Manley Blackman, The temple of Bîgeh. Les Temples immergés de la Nubie, Le Caire 1915: passim.

10   Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 112, s.v. *-ke* (3) with a broad hint towards the present example.

11   Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 80, s.v. *doke*.

12   An alternative separation of the word *arodokelw* as a third place name *arodo* (not attested so far) and the postposition *-kelw* "and" is possible but not very likely due to the parallelism of the two phrases. Cf. also REM 1044/1 *aleqese iblpmnisimdelw*; REM 0075/1 *aleqese eqetertklw*; REM 2732/B1 *aleqese d[e]te teneke[l]ti b[m]sekebelselw* and *aleqese shrte ek[e]lw* (line 24 below), which show the same construction with *-lw* as the closing postposition.

13   Millet, Meroë stele 2004: 105, side c. The stele forms the larger part of the already-published inscription REM 1251 (Hallof, Dotation für Amesemi 2018: passim).

14   For the hitherto-attested writings of the name of the god, see Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 155-156, s.v. *Ms*. The change of the vowel *e* to *a* is frequently attested (Rilly, Langue du royaume de Méroé 2007: 308) but according to his overview only in the late period "Tardif". The present inscriptions, however, does not belong to this period.

15   A contraction of *qore* and the ending *-neyi* (Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 206, s.v. *qore*).

16   The identification of the first letter as *ḫ* is sure.

17   Cf. the compilation of the titles of Akinidad in FHN II: 726.

18   Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 294-296, s.v. *yetmde*.

19   Edwards, Stelae from Qasr Ibrim 2007: 86.

20   The only person named so far, queen Amanisakheto, is his mother; see FHN II: 726-727.

pqrtr,[21] a combination of the already-mentioned title *pqr* – "prince" and the adjective *tr*, for which a translation "great" was proposed by Griffith.[22] The reading of the following word can now be defined as *delikror* (line 5). It is unknown from other texts. The end of line (5) shows a large damaged area after the final sign *r*, in which are some holes. They allow the restoration of the vowel o (∕) and a final word divider after *delikror*, which results in a separation of the word into the noun *deli* and the adjective *kroro*. The noun, however, is not attested as a word in its own right and other clear examples of the use of this word as part of composita are not known from other texts,[23] while the adjective, which can be translated as "princely", is known as an element which forms or qualifies titles,[24] to which category the word *deli* should be assigned. The list of titles ends with *nirli*. Because most of the words of the first lines of the stele are understandable, the paragraph shows that the announcement is addressed to Isis from Bigge, Horus and perhaps to the god Mas. More specifically, the announcement is addressed to the Isis from Bigge worshipped in the capital Meroe, and Horus with the specific characteristic *doke*. The god Mas as the third addressee is questionable. The other annotation concerns the royal protocol. While Amanisakheto has the common titles of king and kandake, Akinidad's title *ẖensney*, which stands before his title "prince", is unknown. On the other hand, his title "prince" is listed twice, because it occurs again as *pkrtr*. The differences between *pqr* and *pkrtr* are unknown and difficult to explain, because the adjective *tr*, which normally upgrades the leading noun, does not result in a change to the sequence of *pqr* and *pkrtr* in this list of Akinidad's titles.

The narration begins with *nirli*. The word occurs in three different forms: *nirl[i]*, *nirlise* (lines 6-7) and *nirl* (line 10). The basic form is *nir*, which is also attested in REM 1044/33. In all three examples the article is added to the stem, but it is unclear why in one case the basic form -*l* is used and in the other cases the variant -*li*. The genitive form *nirlise* (lines 6-7) allows the definition of the preceding *irẖ* as a noun. The function of *elẖ* (line 6) as a verb that closes the preceding sentence is clearly attested by its use in the benediction formula A.[25] Multiple occurrences allow the identification of its stem as *l* and its meaning as "to give". Because the just-mentioned benediction formula A, *at mlo elẖ*, is parallel in structure with the present phrase, the hitherto-unattested word *tretd* (line 6) perhaps functions as an adjective for the noun *nirl*, and defines a quality of it. In summary, the phrase says that an object *nirl* will be given. Concerning the regens of the rectum *nirlise*, its completion as *irẖ[ẖ]* is possible, but not as *irẖ[to]*, because the sign *to* is too large for the available space before the word divider. Therefore, the suggestion that it forms another verb as attested in REM 1044/46 can be discounted. Whether the restored word forms a variant of *irẖẖi*, attested in REM 1003/23 and 33, is unknown, as the context differs.

The following lines are much more difficult to explain, because most of the words are unknown, as *dtre* (line 7), *pẖt* (line 8), *sel[e]mite* (line 8) and *kene[yi]* (lines 8-9). Concerning *nbeyrosi* (line 7), the word occurs again in lines (13) and (15) in the slightly varying form *nbeyrose*. The differences between the forms cannot be explained. It can be regarded as a kind of noun and the regens of a genitive to which the following *arokeseqese* (lines 7-8) forms the rectum. It is followed perhaps by another genitive, formed by *pẖt* (line 8) and *sel[e]mitelise* (line 8). A connection of the two phrases with the conjunction *kene* would be welcome but a word divider is definitely not written at the end of line (8), so that *kene[yi]* forms a new word with unknown meaning. The separation of the next word is difficult because the word

21 *pkrtr*: REM 0078/1-2 (*pkrtrl*); REM 1044/41-42 (*pkrtrqorise*); *pqrtr*: REM 0017/1 (*pqrtrlo*); REM 0020/1 (*pqrtrlo*).
22 Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 267, s.v. *tr* with bibliography.
23 With the exception of REM 0089/11-12, because the word *qorodeli* can perhaps be explained as a composite of *qoro* (i.e. *qore* + article -*l*) and *deli*.
24 A list of titles can be found in Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 21-22, s.v. *akroro*.
25 Cf. for example REM 0427/5-7: *at mlo elẖ*.

divider after *mkl* (line 9) is not conclusive, because as line (17) clearly shows, the writer left a space between the word divider and the following *te*, which is not the case here. It is therefore doubtful whether *mkl* – "the god" is written. The alternative word *mklteb* is reminiscent of a genitive plural construction, found in GA 04/9, where the phrase *perite wosteb* must be interpreted as *perite wos-se-leb* and translated as "many agents of Isis". The only difference is the addition of the article *-l* to the word *mk* – "god". If this interpretation is correct, *keneyi* must be regarded as a noun and the whole phrase as the third genitive in a series. The following word *tewwi* (line 9), which can perhaps be connected to *wwi*,[26] is associated with divine names. This observation makes the interpretation of *mklteb* as a genitive plural more likely. The complex sentence terminates with the verb *ytepleto* (lines 9-10). This special form of the verb *pl* – "to offer" is not attested so far, but the elements *y* and *to* are attested,[27] and the syllable *te* between them may be the verb *te* – "to give", which functions as a kind of verbal prefix[28] and gives the adjacent verb a causative meaning.

The already-discussed *nirl* in line (10) opens the next sentence, which continues with *pbo*, the first letter of which is only visible from its traces. The word is attested in REM 1361D/5 but in a different context. Other unclear or partly-destroyed words follow, before the sentence ends with *eqedeto* (lines 10-11), perhaps a form of the verb *d(e)*.[29] Consequently the following noun *tmey* – "Libyan" forms the subject of the next sentence. Whether *tmey* is really written or is part of a word with *tmey* as the opening string is debatable, because the area around the word divider is covered with dot-like holes similar to the two dots of the word divider. The first sign after *tmey* looks like the sign *y* but its reading as *se* is possible. In neither case can the word in question be restored. The word definitely ends with *ne*, after which the well-attested title *ḫrpḫne* follows in line (11). Normally, the administrative district is written after the title for which the *ḫrpḫne* – "governor" is responsible, but this is not the case here. The ending of the incomplete word *[r]rkese* (lines 11-12) is reminiscent of a verb (ending *-kese*) or a genitive (ending *-se*). Because the verbal ending *-kese* of the 2nd person plural indicates a shifting of the text from a narration to direct speech, against which stands the verbal form *elto* (i.e. the verb *l* – "to give" with the pronoun 3rd person plural *-to* in line (13)), the genitive construction is given preference here. It finds a parallel in *ḫrpḫne kdilekyese* (REM 2044/4-5), which shows the same structure. The word itself (*.rrke*) is unattested so far and its completion not possible. The following *tdḫsene* (line 12) is known from REM 1044/154 but in a different context. Perhaps a derivation from *tdḫe* – "child",[30] its exact meaning is unknown. The text continues with partly destroyed and/or unknown words. The only certain feature is the end of the sentence after the verb *elto* (line 13), again a form of the verb *l* – "to give". Concerning the noun *nbeyrose* before it, see the explanations to line (7) above.

The following sentence shows a certain parallelism with the preceding ones, as the following compilation shows:

(11)-(13): *tmey [y].ne ḫrpḫne .[r]rkese tdḫsene q[b]te[d]el p[q]le   nbeyrose elto*
(13)-(15): *qesen.l   wolese tdḫse[ne] [t]plim.tḫ[l]h pql[e]   nbey[r]ose wido elto*

Although the content of both phrases remains obscure, they show the same pattern of construction. A genitive is placed before *tdḫsene*, and *pqle nbeyrose elto* is written at the end of the phrase. As the occurrence of the word *nbeyrosi* in line (7) shows, *nbeyrose* does not form the rectum of another genitive construction, because the final *se/si* is part of its stem. The word *wido*, without an ending, between the verb *elto* and the noun *nbeyrose* can be best

---

26 Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 255, s.v. *tewwi-*.
27 *ipleto* REM 0075/5 and REM 1044/50; *yplt* REM 1367/1.
28 Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 244, s.v. *t-* (1) and 247-248, s.v. *te-* (1).
29 For the verb, its variants and proposed meanings see Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 72, s.v. *d*.
30 Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 247, s.v. *t-dḫe*.

explained as an adjective.[31] The reading of the word before *nbeyrose* is not sure because in both examples, one of the signs is destroyed or damaged. This is also true for the second example at the end of line (14) and the beginning of line (15), in which the last sign looks more like *s* than the vowel *e*. The examples together form *pqle*, a word not known from other texts. Contrary to the first phrase, in which at least some parts of the word are known, neither *qesen.l*, nor *wole*, nor *[t]plim.tḫ[l]h* are known from other texts.

The next sentence contains the known words *adb* – "district" (lines 15-16), but unusually without a preceding title, and *shrte* (line 16), known amongst other examples from REM 1044/40-41 and there marked clearly as a noun by the article *-l*.[32] The word between them can be best transliterated as *pennidete*. Examples of *penn* (for example REM 0089/12 and REM 0094/13) and *dete* (REM 0094/23), however, suggest that perhaps a word divider might be added between *penni* and *dete*. The verb *toh* – "to bring" forms the end of the sentence, although the special form *petohewi* (lines 16-17) is only attested in this inscription. The sign *h* is not very elaborate in form compared with the sign at the end of line (19) where the same verb is again written. It marks the end of the next sentence, which begins with *petmete* (line 17). Unlike the reading and discussion given by Edwards[33] it is unlikely that it forms an example of the name of Qasr Ibrim. On the one hand, the third sign is clearly legible as *t* and on the other, even if an interchange between *d* and *t* is assumed,[34] the writing without *e* after the changed consonant is not attested, so that instead of *t* the sign *te* should have been written here. Whether the designation of the direction *tenekeli* – "west" follows in line (17) is another question. The translation of the word *teneke* with "west" seems sure, but as text REM 2732/B1-2 shows (see below), there are other texts in which the translation "west" makes no sense. After two unattested words, the verb *toh* – "to bring" once more terminates the sentence. The valence of the verb fits well with the ending *-lw* on the preceding word, which marks the dative. Whether *ptyi[h]* (line 18) designates a person, a place name or an object is not known because the word is unique. In the following sentence, which ends with *elḫnki* in line (20), *shrte* and *ptneyine* (both line 19) occur in other lines of the text of the stele: *shrte* in line (16) and *ptneyine* in line (27-28) and (31). Further conclusions cannot be drawn because the words occur in different contexts. *mni* is a possible restoration of the partly-destroyed word in line (20). It is the last word before the word *elḫnki*, formed by the verb *elḫ* – "to give" (also written in line 6) and the string *nki*, the function of which cannot be explained but which is written almost exclusively at the ends of words.[35] The expected word divider thereafter is lost because of damage at the end of line (20). The character of *wido* as an adjective, as explained above relating to its occurrence in line (15), helps the understanding of the word *adowido* (line 21) as a combination of *ado* (unclear in meaning[36] but attested as word in its own right in REM 0094/10, REM 1160/2 and REM 1116/5) and this adjective. The isolated sign *s* looks on the first view like an error of the writer. The phenomenon, however, is known from at least two other texts: REM 1067/14 (*s ptonel*) and GA 22/8 (*s qoye*). While *s qoye* is explained as a wrongly-separated element by Millet,[37] REM 1067/14 and other examples makes the existence

31 Already assumed by Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 278, s.v. *wido*.
32 For other examples see Edwards, Stelae from Qasr Ibrim 2007: 87, note to line 16.
33 Edwards, Stelae from Qasr Ibrim 2007: 87, note to line 17.
34 Or *t* with *d*, if *petmete* is assumed to be the older spelling because of the age of the inscription of Amanisakheto. Both phonetic changes (*t → d* and *d → t*) are attested (Rilly, Langue du royaume de Méroé 2007: 308).
35 Cf. *tinnki* REM 1003/41, *artxnki* REM 1003/20-21, *ewkenki* REM 0405/b11-12 and *mlonki* REM 0451/2-3. The two exceptions are perhaps *itnk[i]hlhto* REM 1044/42-43 and *nki.......* REM 1138/3-4, but in both cases the signs after *nki* are destroyed and word dividers are also possible.
36 Proposed meanings of *ado* are, among others, a title, a divine epithet, the ancient name of the modern Gebel Adda, "fortress" or "residence".
37 Millet, Inscriptions from Gebel Adda 2005: 19.

of the word *s* as a designation of an important authority likely.[38] The latter suggestion is supported by the following *doli* (line 21), which is regarded as an adjective and characterizes the authority. Due to its ending *-nki*, the word *idnki* (lines 21-22) can be regarded as a kind of verb as is the case with *elḫnki* in the preceding line. The meaning of the verb *d*, to which *idnki* can be reduced is a matter of discussion and ranges from "to send" to "to give" and "to make" and "to produce".[39] The text continues with a short sentence (line 22), consisting of the noun *ado* (see *adowido* above line 21) and the verb *iḫrḫr*, the first enlarged by the article *-li*, the second by the verbal ending *-ki*. The verb looks like a reduplicated form of the verb *ḫr* – "to offer". Because the next word begins with the vowel *a*, a word divider should be written, but the punctuation mark is neither visible at the end of line (22) nor at the beginning of line (23).

An interesting sequence follows, characterized by the ending *-selw*. According to Rilly,[40] X-*selw* means "by the power of/under the protection of X", where X is the name of a deity.[41] Indeed the names of the deities Amanap and Isis are written in line (23), but both are followed by the word *nete* before the ending *-selw*. It is therefore not likely that the translation "by the power/protection of Amanap (and) by the power/protection of Isis" fits the situation here. Instead *-lw* must be regarded as the postposition of the dative, preceded by a genitive construction with the divine name as regens and *nete* as rectum. As the example *netel* (REM 1001/14) shows, *nete* cannot be regarded as a locative because the final *te* is part of its stem. The whole phrase can be translated as "for Amanap of *nete* (and) for Isis of *nete*" in which the meaning of *nete* is unclear. The embedding of the phrase in the structure of the sentence, however, is difficult to explain because the phrase stands after a verb but before *aleqese*, which introduces a new sentence or even a new paragraph. Perhaps the phrase was removed from the normal word order to emphasize that the *aleqese* is in favour of Amanap and Isis.

aleqese – "(written) announcement" also occurs in line (1) where it forms the opening word of the whole inscription, and is discussed there. There names of divinities follow, while in the present example the deities are mentioned before it. Interestingly, the name of Amanap occurs only here, while Isis is mentioned twice after each of the examples of *aleqese*. Despite the fact that the following *shrte* (line 24) is already known from lines (16) and (19), its function and meaning remains unclear because it is again in a different context. Clearly it forms an apposition to the preceding *aleqese* because like this it stands in the nominative. The final *ek[e]lw* cannot be satisfactorily explained. Neither the separation of *-kelw* nor the separation of the ending *-lw* makes sense, in the former case because a word *e* is unknown, and in the latter because the remaining stem *eke* is also unattested so far as a word in its own right.[42] The text continues with two phrases, identical in their construction. The key words and subjects of the sentences are *ato* – "water" and *asr* – "meat",[43] the final words *sd* and perhaps *pl*, of which the latter is known as a verb, perhaps with the meaning "to offer".[44] It is therefore likely that *sd* forms another representative of this kind of words with a more or less similar meaning. The word between them is again difficult to explain. On the one hand, the existence of the word *apese* in REM 1003/12 strengthens the suggestion that *apese* is the basic word (here enlarged by the article *-l*) which then forms the object of the sentence. However, this makes no sense, because "water" cannot act and do something with *apese*. It is therefore more likely to regard

---

[38] Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 216, s.v. *s*.
[39] None of these translations seems to mirror the meaning of the verb exactly (see Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 72, s.v. *d*).
[40] Claude Rilly, Un problème d'identification sémantique en méroïtique - A propos d'un récent article de Carsten Peust. *Göttinger Miszellen* 177, Göttingen 2000: 103-111.
[41] Cf. *wosselw* REM 0094/6 – "by the power/protection of Isis"; *mnoteselw* REM 0094/5 "by the power/protection of Amanote"; *mkedokeliselw* REM 0094/6-7 "by the power/protection of Makedoke".
[42] But cf. *yeke* (REM 2705/rto. 18-19 and REM 2705/vso. 7) which could be a late form of the earlier *eke*.
[43] Or perhaps more general nourishment; see Hallof, Inscriptions on ostraka 2011: 27; 61; 116.
[44] Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 189, s.v. *pl* (2).

apesel as the rectum of a genitive which qualifies the products *ato* and *asr*.[45] Therefore *ato a[p]esel sdte* (line 25) says that "water of the quality *ape* shall be offered" and *asr apesel p[lte]* (line 26) says that "nourishment of the quality *ape* shall be donated" (or something like this). The text continues with another nomination of *ato* – "water". After this the text becomes unclear and the structure is not recognizable. *eqitelḫ[r]polde..se* (lines 26-27) is unique, and other words with *eqi* as the opening string are unknown so that a segmentation of the complex word is not possible. *ptneyine* already occured in line (19) in a different context. The only spotlight is the occurrence of the verb *pḫ* (line 28).[46] Because it is written without any ending, the preceding words can be regarded as nouns which form the subject and perhaps the object of the sentence. This corresponds with the observation that *ptneyine* shows no ending. The text continues with another donated object, *asero* (line 28), known from a list of items for donation on a stele from Meroe.[47] Other examples of this product, which is also written *sero*, are REM 0406/6, another stele from the time of queen Amanisakheto, and a papyrus from Qasr Ibrim.[48] The concentration of occurrences of the word *asero/sero* in texts from the time of this queen shows the appreciation of this product in her time, which was attested in the south as well as the north of the Meroitic kingdom as shown by the texts from Meroe and Qasr Ibrim. In the stele from Meroe, the word is determined by the logogram ♡ which looks like a cup. The occurrence of the logogram ꠸ nearby in the same inscription shows it does not depict the object itself but the container in which *asero* was measured. The next partly-destroyed word *t..[h]dolw* may designate the receiver or donor of the product *asero* as the dative ending *-lw* – "by/from/for" indicates. Clearly the next two words follow the same pattern, despite the fact that the decisive ending *-lw* is uncertain. However, if the restoration is correct, the hitherto-unattested *apnete* (line 29) designates another product which *ththdo* either receives or donates. It is highly probable that *ththdo* is also the donor or receiver of the product *asero* mentioned in line (28), because the partly-destroyed word can be restored in exactly that way, and underlines the similarity of both phrases. The expected verb is hidden in the following *eqedepeteyidte* (lines 29-30), the first part of which is known as a verb (*eqedeto*) from line (10-11). The replacement of the ending *-to* with *peteyidte* is noteworthy. Perhaps *petey* forms another verbal complex directly linked with the preceding *eqede*, and the thus-formed compositum is terminated with the ending *-idte*, known from the verb *yinnidte*.[49]

In the same line, *aḫro* attracts special attention, because the word is known mainly from historical inscriptions.[50] It is followed by another noun, *stewido* (lines 30-31), composed from the word *ste* – "mother" and the adjective *wido*.[51] The special characteristic of the mother, expressed by *wido*, cannot be defined. The following *ptneyi[n]l* (line 31) stands in a close relationship to the word *ptneyine*, known from lines (19) and (27)-(28). It is likely that the change of the final *ne* into *n* has something to do with the addition of the consonant *l*, which perhaps forms the article. On the other hand, examples such as *aritenel* (REM 0094/1), i.e. the name of the god Aritene enlarged by the article *-l* show the inadequacy of this explanation. The final sign *l*, however, is clearly legible and the traces of the preceding sign do not suit the expected *ne*. The alternative separation of an ending *-nl* (i.e. *-nlw*) – "in the presence of/

---

45 For the occurrence of the article at the end of the genitive after the rectum, see for example *pqr qorisel* – "wesir of the king" (REM 1003/2).
46 Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 186, s.v. *pḫ*.
47 Millet, Meroë stele 2004: 104, line B10; For a recent investigation see Hallof, Dotation für Amesemi 2018: passim
48 REM 1322/15 (written *sero*); Hallof, Inscriptions on papyri 2015: 31.
49 Only known from REM 1001. See the explanations by Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 297, s.v. *yinnidte*.
50 Attested as *aḫro* in REM 1003/19 and *aḫrol* in REM 1361D/3. The other examples show the word as the opening part of composita. For the discussion of its meaning see Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 20, s.v. *aḫro*.
51 See the explanations to lines (15) and (21). The word divider between the preceding noun and *wido* is optionally written by the writer of this inscription.

before"[52] makes more sense. The text continues with two identical phrases (lines 31-32), composed from the word *mse* and followed by a person. The word *mse* designates a countable product but perhaps also a kind of measurement.[53] *pdhose* – "Lord"[54] and *mk* – "god" are the persons, by the power of whom (*-selw*) the product *mse* is available. Who follows *pdhose*? Inscription REM 0094/7-8 clearly reads *mnpte pdhose mlolise* and marks *pdhose* as an epithet and designation of Amun of Napata. If *pdhose* is used synonymously for Amanapte, one is astonished that after the nomination of a special god the general word for god, *mk*, follows, and not another deity, as for example Isis. The architrave REM 2741/1 (see below), however, shows the compositum *qorepdhosemlo*, which can be translated as "the king, the good lord" and clearly assigns *pdhose* to the king. It is therefore likely that the product *mse* is given by the will of king and god in general. One wonders that the god is listed after the king, but as the blessings *wteli [p]keli qore[t]meli [mk]etmeli* in the "décret oraculaire amulétique" REM 2209/2-4 clearly show,[55] this order is not unusual.

The continuation of the text raises a serious problem. The isolated sign *s* is written at the end of line (32). It is followed by the noun *arwi*.[56] The tail of the sign *n* is touched by a structure which resembles the consonant *m*. However, as the writing of the divine name *amnp* in line (23) shows, the writer does not ligate the signs *m* and *n*, so that a reading *arwimnke* can be excluded. At the end of line (32), it is therefore very likely that the same short word *s* is written here as in line (21). The very elaborately written numeral 1000 follows. There are two parallel strokes visible above the long tail which seem to belong to the numeral. However, the two strokes are not bent, so that their identification as the multiplier 8 can be excluded. They also cannot be regarded as the multiplier 2, because as the ostrakon REM 2112 shows, the decisive strokes of the numeral 2000 are placed under the long tail. Unfortunately, an unclear paragraph follows, in which most of the words are unknown or damaged, such as *ere.te* (line 33), *wberte* (lines 33-34), *akre* and *wtkehrnsele* (both line 34). Therefore, the role of the mother (*ste*), qualified by *wido*, remains unclear. The first sign of the word *stewido* (lines 34-35) looks somewhat strange because it is interwoven with a sign which looks like a small *b*. The occurrence of *stewido* in line (30-31), however, confirms the reading. The following *mslinke* in line (35) may be a noun, once again formed by the ending *-nke* as *arwinke* in line 33. The remaining stem, however, is not attested.[57] Surprisingly, a restoration of the following word *wh.te* is not possible despite only one sign being lost, because there is no word available which fits the situation here and could offer a suggestion. The elaborate number 130 follows, perhaps bounded by a word divider, which is, however, not very elaborate and unusually small in size. The text continues with another mention of a *tmey* – "a Libyan", here clearly separated by a word divider from the following word, contrary to the occurrence of this word in line (11). The word that follows is unknown, so that it remains unclear whether a special person of Libyan origin is referred to, whose name was mentioned after his nationality. The next word before the number 20 is unknown and cannot answer the question. The word divider after the numeral is again not very elaborate, but it is likely that it was once present because the writer seems to put such a punctuation mark after all numbers in the text. The final one and a half lines are heavily damaged and permit no further insight into the text. The existence of a word *bo* directly after the number in line (37) cannot be verified.

---

[52] Rilly, Lexique méroïtique 2003: 168-169, s.v. *n-lw*.
[53] See *sr* 23 *mse* 3/12 (REM 0359/4-5) in which *mse* stands parallel to *sr*. For further discussions see Hallof, Inscriptions on ostraka 2011: 54 and 79.
[54] For *pdhose* – "Lord" see Millet, Kharamadoye inscription 1973: 42; 46.
[55] Hallof, Inscriptions on papyri 2015: 61.
[56] Cf. also *arwito* (= *arwiselo* REM 0086/2-3), and the examples REM 2445/rto. x+3 and x+7, where *arwi* is followed by the pronoun *qebese*.
[57] But cf. *msliḫsi.ke* REM 2030/5-6.

The long but incomplete stele preserves a royal inscription from the time of queen
Amanisakheto and prince Akinidad. It was carved at a time when Amanisakheto was king and
kandake, and Akinidad was khenasaney and prince, i.e. in the last years of the first century
BCE or the first years of the first century CE.[58] This dating corresponds perfectly with the
paleographic shape of the signs, which can be assigned to the period "Transitionnel A" and
therefore also to the first century CE, despite many of the signs showing some variation.[59]
While the titles of queen Amanisakheto and their ranking are known from other monuments,[60]
the series of titles of prince Akinidad are unique, because his leading title *ḫensney* which
precedes his title *pqr* – "prince" is attested only here. The text belongs to the category of texts,
named after its opening word *aleqese*, which may designate an announcement. Its content can
be characterized as a kind of donation. Interestingly, the word *aleqese* reoccurs in line (24)
and one wonders why two announcements are made in one text. A possible explanation may
be that the first twenty-four lines form the general introduction, while the special donations
are listed after the second *aleqese* from line (24) onwards. All offerings and products and their
quantities are listed in the remaining fifteen lines. The inscription is written in the narrative
form as the absence of the verbal ending of the 2nd person -*kese* shows. As far as verbs
can be extracted they show the following forms (in the sequence of their occurrence in the
inscription): *elḫ*, *ytepleto*, *eqedeto*, *elto*, *petohte*, *petohewi*, *elḫnki*, *idnki*, *iḫrḫrki*, *sdte*, *plte*,
eqedepeteyidte, *arwinke* and *mslinke*. The following prefixes can be extracted: *e-*, *eqe-*, *i-*, *y-*,
pe-, *ø-* as well as the following suffixes: -*idte*, -*wi*, -*nki*, -*ki*, -*te*, -*to* and -*ø*. Among them, the
prefixes *e-*, *i-*, *y-*, can be found in other royal inscriptions while the prefix *pe-* is known from
verbs in the benediction formulae. In accordance with the other royal inscriptions, -*to* (and
perhaps its variant -*te*) forms the most frequently used suffix while -*idte* and especially -*nki*
and -*ki*, which seem to be variants of one suffix only, are clues to identify words as verbs in
this kind of text and to enlarge the lists of suffixes given in the grammars.[61]

Who is the beneficiary of the donation? It is not the queen nor the prince, because they are
mentioned only within the dating. Deities are named in the direct environment of the word
aleqese: in line (1) Isis in Bigge from Meroe, Horus and perhaps Mas after *aleqese*; in lines
(23-24) Amun of Napata and Isis before *aleqese*, both characterized by the feature *nete* of
unclear meaning. While the grammatical relation between *aleqese* as the subject and the deities
mentioned as datives is obvious in line (1), the translation of *amnp neteselw wos neteselw
aleqese* (lines 23-24) as "an announcement in favour of (-*lw*) Amanap of *nete* and in favour
of (-*lw*) Isis of *nete*" seems impossible due to the word order of Meroitic sentences, because
in this case the subject would stand wrongly after the dative.[62] Nevertheless, the beneficiaries
of the *aleqese* are mentioned here with great plausibility because the phrase *amnp neteselw
wos neteselw* stands after the verb *iḫrḫrki* (line 22) and cannot belong to the preceding
sentence. It is therefore likely that it forms an emphasized term standing outside the normal
word order before the subject *aleqese*. There are also contextual arguments which support the
suggestion. Amanap and Isis are the last deities mentioned in the text and while up to line (24)
neither special objects or numbers occur which qualify and quantify the royal donation, the
following lines are full of them. All the deities mentioned are invoked in "décrets oraculaires
amulétiques" from Qasr Ibrim and this shows that they are present in one of the temples
there.[63] The role of Isis at the Abaton and in Meroe at the beginning of the text is difficult to

58 FHN II: 723; cf. also p. 725-728.
59 Rilly: Langue du royaume de Méroé 2007: 320; 321; 330.
60 *amn[i]sḫeto qor kd[kel]* (REM 1041A/1-2); *amni[sḫeto] qor kdkel* (REM 1293/I1); *amnisḫetoqo qoro ktkelo* (REM 1294/A1).
61 Rilly, Langue du royaume de Méroé 2007: 567-569 with further tables and references; Breyer, Einführung 2014: 285-286.
62 Rilly, Langue du royaume de Méroé 2007: 500-502; Fritz Hintze, Meroitisch und Altnubisch. Eine vergleichende Studie.
    Beiträge zur Sudanforschung 4, Wien 1989: 97-100.
63 See the comprehensive study of the "décrets oraculaires amulétiques" in the summary below.

explain. Perhaps the royal donors wanted to mention the most northern and most southern cult places of this goddess to illustrate the size of their kingdom. Whether Amun is mentioned in line (20) is unclear because the word is partly damaged. The products are of special value because they give an interesting insight into the purpose of the donation. Besides *ato* – "water" and *asr* – "meat", *asero*, *apnete* and *mse* are mentioned, all measurable products widely known in the Meroitic kingdom in normal use, and therefore available in large quantities, as is shown by the numbers in the text. Absent, however, are valuable products made from gold or precious materials given in small quantities. It is therefore likely that the text outlines the establishment of a cult for Amanap, Isis, Horus and perhaps Mas, and its safeguarding with essential goods to meet daily needs, which makes good sense in the time after the peace treaty between Rome and Meroe in 21/20 BCE, and the reestablisment of the political and cultural presence of Meroitic rulers. Whether a Libyan was chosen to act in the cult service remains unclear despite the two examples of a *tmey* in the text.

REM 1158 [QI 1976.02.07/4]

MATERIAL: wood

DETAILS: plaque

PHOTO: 1976 P.1/23; JEB D/24 (recto); JEB D/25 (verso) (pl. 13)

DRAWING: pl. 12

SIZE: 9.3 x 4.3 cm. (W/H)

REG. NO.: 74/244

PRESENT LOCATION: Egyptian Museum Cairo, JdE 94226

FINDSPOT: House X-30, refused fill

DATING: X

PUBLICATION:[64] REM 2000: 1704-1705; Plumley – Adams – Crowfoot, Qasr Ibrim 1976: 44; pl. VII,3 (photo of the recto); Hainsworth – Leclant, Préliminaires à un REM 1983: 22 (transliteration of the text on the recto).

INSCRIPTION: At least five lines of Meroitic cursive inscription on the recto and at least five lines of Meroitic cursive inscription on the verso, both written in black ink.

(rto. 1) *[se] l e b ne y e te*
(rto. 2) *m e y k d i y e w e*
(rto. 3) *[te] y ne s r d e te q [o]*
(rto. 4) *[l e] b d r p l y l b*
(rto. 5) *w y e te ne q e r*
(vso. 1) *ne d q e [r] ne a m [y]*
(vso. 2) *[e] te r e k e s t 10 d e*
(vso. 3) *q e r l i d e k . . [m q]*
(vso. 4) *te d . . . .*
(vso. 5) *. . . . [r] . . . y i*

COMMENTARY: The wooden plaque preserves a complete inscription written on recto and verso with five lines on each side. The state of preservation of the text differs noticeably between the recto and verso. While the recto shows only minor damage, especially at the lower right corner, the last two and a half lines on the verso are faded and difficult to read. The undamaged lines are written in a clear hand but without any word dividers. Thanks to the help of parallels, it is possible to separate most of the words and to structure the text.

   Recto: With the help of inscription REM 2068/rto. 1[65] the first line can be separated into

---

64 Further mentions of this inscription are found in Hainsworth, Textes méroïtiques de Qaṣr Ibrîm 1984: 448, n.1 and Hainsworth – Leclant, Le REM 1984: 443. A facsimile of the recto and verso can be found in the notebook "Meroitic II" on p. 12.

65 Hallof, Inscriptions on ostraka 2011: 73-74. Due to the parallel text on the wooden tablet, the transliteration given there must