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Abstract
The study of placenames in Egyptology is generally confined to lexicographic collection and problems of localisation. More than filling in the blanks on a map, studies in toponymy can address many questions regarding the relationship between people and their environment. This thesis is an area-study of toponyms in the Eastern Desert, South Sinai, and Red Sea as found in Egyptian texts from the Early Dynastic until the end of the New Kingdom (c. 3100BC-1050 BCE). For the urban civilisation of pharaonic Egypt, these regions were arid hinterlands, exploited for their mineral wealth, but never directly colonised or controlled. Many placenames of this region, most notably Punt, have not been satisfactorily located - their finite geographical positions having long been a desideratum of Egyptology. An integrated approach that studies all the placenames of these regions may however yield greater insights into the regions geography, while matching specific archaeological remains with toponyms known from texts.

As this region is proximal to Egypt, yet outside political control, it is notable for exhibiting placenames in both Egyptian and foreign languages. This might be compared to the situation in New World toponymy, where an introduced European stratum of placenames commonly replaces, but not eradicates, an older indigenous toponymy. The area thus reveals a multitude of toponymic phenomena and un-located placenames, yet is geographically homogenous and differentiated from the urban toponymy of the Nile Valley. This work comprises of two parts. The first is a descriptive section, reconstructing the historical geography of Egypt’s peripheral regions by marryng a database of toponyms with textual and archaeological sources. The second is an analytical investigation of the culture and language of placenames as apparent in these marginal regions. The database involves translating all texts where the relevant toponyms occur, analysing the etymology of these names (in Egyptian or foreign-languages) and locating them with respect to archaeological sites. The analytical section evaluates semantic and linguistic features in the placenames, and attempts to explain the social processes behind placenaming in Egypt’s marginal environment.
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Preface and Conventions

As this work must deal with linguistics, philology, and history it is worth making the following terminological distinctions. The term ‘Cushitic’ refers to the East African language group, and has nothing to do with the Nubian or biblical ‘Kush’. Likewise, when ‘(Old)-Nubian language’ is mentioned it refers to the grouping of Nubian Languages (Old Nubian, Dongolawi, Kenzi, Mahas) and not generally to any languages spoken in historical Nubia.1 ‘Semitic’ is used generally to label any Semitic language (Akkadian, Arabic, Aramaic, Hebrew, Epigraphic South Arabian etc.), and ‘Ethiosemitic’ is likewise used for the Semitic languages of the Horn of Africa (in preference to ambiguous ‘Ethiopic’).2 The term ‘Epigraphic South Arabian’ is abbreviated to ‘ESA’.

When quoting linguistic material, the citation form of a work is generally kept (on occasion without divergent vowel diacritics), except for Egyptian transcription where this work regularises transliteration to the general standard present in English language Egyptology. Due to the widely different transcription standards present amongst Semiticists, Ethiopists, Egyptologists, Cushiticists, and more generally in African studies (Afrikanistik), it is not possible in this work to ascribe to a general transcription system for all linguistic material, except where rendering a toponym in International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) (Fig. 1). IPA notations is used in forward-slashes / / for broad transcription (phonemic) and [ ] for narrow transcription (phonetic). Uppercase V and C refer respectively to an indefinite ‘vowel’ and ‘consonant’.

In Egyptian philology a distinction is made between Egyptian z and s only in toponyms and relevant linguistic material, but not in the running transliterations where z and s are in free variation after Old Egyptian. For the translation of Egyptian texts, standard philological marks are used, ( ), [ ], { }, < >. The graphemic meanings of determinatives or classifiers are marked in square brackets where relevant, e.g. Ⲝ Ⲙ [HILL-COUNTRY]. The sign * marks a reconstructed pronunciation and/or root.

The program Google Earth © has become a vital and freely accessible tool for geographical research. While it is possible to use various mapping surveys for this thesis, Google Earth provides an accessible database of high quality satellite imagery coordinated with local features without using overly technical and inaccessible GIS software. Various topographic maps have been consulted such as the Egyptian Survey Authorities 1:50,000 series (1989) and the US Army Map Service, Corps of Engineers 1:250,000 (1954), but they are not cited here as they are not

---

2 For the breakdown of Semitic languages, see E. Linpinski, Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar (Leuven, 2001), 47-49.
freely accessible and often contain information superfluous for the purposes of this study. Citations of modern toponyms, like linguistic material, generally employs standard citation forms in the scholarship unless this spelling differs radically from a *communis opinio* in Egyptological literature. Little effort is made to standardise all Arabic transcriptions as this would hamper general intelligibility, so preference for *Wadi Allaqi* not *Wâdi el ‘Allaqi* (Egypt Working Sheet 1: 250,000) or *Wâdi el-‘Allâqi* (Army Map Service, 1:250,000). When a placename is cited for its lexical form and linguistic purpose it is given in italics, e.g. ‘*Aswan* derives from *Swn.t*’.

Figure 1: The International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) chart of consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants (pulmonic)</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Coronal</th>
<th>Dorsal</th>
<th>Radical</th>
<th>Laryngeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilabial (nasal)</td>
<td>m, n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n, n</td>
<td>n, n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilabial (plosive)</td>
<td>p, b</td>
<td>t, d</td>
<td>t, d</td>
<td>c, j</td>
<td>k, g, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>f, v</td>
<td>z, s</td>
<td>z, s</td>
<td>x, y</td>
<td>x, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximant</td>
<td>v, j</td>
<td>j, j</td>
<td>j, j</td>
<td>j, j</td>
<td>j, j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap, flap</td>
<td>b, r</td>
<td>r, r</td>
<td>r, r</td>
<td>r, r</td>
<td>r, r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral fricative</td>
<td>h, h</td>
<td>h, h</td>
<td>h, h</td>
<td>h, h</td>
<td>h, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral approximant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral flap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where symbols appear in pairs, the one to the right represents a modally voiced consonant, except for murmured h.

Shaded areas denote articulations judged to be impossible. Light grey letters are unofficial extensions of the IPA.

Consonants (non-pulmonic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clicks</th>
<th>Implosives</th>
<th>Effortives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilabial fricating</td>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>Alveolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laminal alveolar fricating (&quot;dental&quot;)</td>
<td>Dental or alveolar</td>
<td>Dental or alveolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apical (post)alveolar fricating (&quot;retroflex&quot;)</td>
<td>Palatal</td>
<td>Velar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subapical retroflex</td>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>Alveolar fricative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laminal postalveolar fricating (&quot;palatal&quot;)</td>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>Alveolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral alveolar fricating (&quot;lateral&quot;)</td>
<td>Velar</td>
<td>Alveolar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consonants (co-articulated)

- M: Voiceless labialized velar approximant
- W: Voiced labialized velar approximant
- M: Voiced labialized palatal approximant
- F: Simultaneous x and / (existence disputed)
- Tj: Affricates and double articulations
- Gb: May be joined by a tie bar

Footnotes are arranged in the style following *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, where the work is cited in full in the first reference and in an abbreviated form thereafter, e.g. P. Smither, ‘The Semnah Despatches’, *JEA* 31 (1945), 8 thereafter Smither, *JEA* 31, 8. This is the case except with authored papers in edited volumes, whose titles are still cited in full for the convenience of the reader. Journal abbreviations follow the standard Egyptological conventions, for which see the IFAO list of abbreviations in B. Mathieu, *Abréviations des périodiques et collections* (Le Caire, 2010). Journals not regularly encountered in Egyptological works are not abbreviated. The following common abbreviations are given here:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Johnson, J., (ed.) <em>Chicago Demotic Dictionary</em> (Chicago) [online manuscript, 2012]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Sethe, K., <em>Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte</em> (four volumes, Leipzig, 1908-1922).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

*Since History must concern itself with the location of the events which it investigates, it must continually raise, not only the familiar questions why? and why then? but also the questions where? and why there?*\(^3\)

Gordon East,  
*The Geography Behind History*

The regions immediately to the east of Egypt, the Eastern Desert, Red Sea, and South Sinai, were peripheries or hinterlands of the Egyptian State. These regions were never permanently settled by Egyptians, but the ancient documentation suggests that Egyptians regularly travelled there for the purpose of obtaining mineral and botanic wealth. Archaeological surveys in these areas are still in their infancy, and the little that we do know of Egyptian activity in the region is confined to the large mining sites exhibiting rock inscriptions like Hatnub, Serabit el-Khadem, Wadi Hammamat, or Wadi el-Hudi. Demonstrative of our expanding knowledge in this region is the recent discovery of harbours on the Red Sea coast, a whole new series of Egyptian inscriptions in the Sinai (Wadi ʿAmeyra) and in the Atbai (Bir Murrat). In this respect, toponymy, the study of placenames, has much to offer this region. It may elucidate exactly *where* Egyptians travelled in these vast hinterlands, and match a location with a placename mentioned in texts. As the epigram of Gordon East raises, the very idea of history must concern itself with *where* and also ask *why there?* In this respect where did Egyptians go in the desert, and why did they go there?

Toponymy may answer both these questions. Through locating a toponym we may answer the where, and in investigating the etymology we often know why a place was named. In this region there are many sites to which no toponym has been attributed, and also many toponyms for which there is no known site. The study of placenames, methodologically called ‘toponymy’, is one way in which we may ascertain the *where* of Egyptian civilisation and record a regional history of this peripheral area. Even the mere presence of the toponym is a record of an event, an encounter between an individual and the landscape. It is the basic task of the historian and linguist to investigate *where* the toponym lay for the general benefit of historical reconstruction.

In the study of ancient cultures, the location of the placename, rather than the *name* itself, has been deemed the most important aspect of toponyms. The referent area of a toponym should not be ignored, but neither should the meaning and form of a placename. Names are first and

foremost artefacts of cultural output. Like an artefact, a name is produced by a culture in a particular time and place. As such, the analysis of toponyms should give us information not only about the process by which placenames are ‘bestowed’, but it should also tell us something about the people that named a place. Thus, it is the intention of this thesis to analyse the semantics of placenames, in addition to their location. Therefore, this study offers two avenues of research, a historical description - ‘historical geography’ (where, when) and an analysis (who, what, why). A regional study has the advantage of integrating multiple proximal placenames into a single study, and approaching the same landscape diachronically. In doing so it is possible to see how names for similar landscapes have developed, in addition to addressing the many questions related to Egyptians ventures in the peripheral deserts and Red Sea.

When Egyptians travelled to these regions they were pushed into distant corners of an alien environment. It is this foreign nature of the topography that makes it the perfect case study for peripheral toponymy, as it is one of the few cases where Egyptians applied their geographic vocabulary to decidedly non-Egyptian landscapes. Rather than designating settlements, pyramids, and temples of the Nile floodplain, the placenames of this region refer to large desert tracts, mines, wadis, and harbours, and also exhibit many indigenous non-Egyptian names for places. Little is known about Egypt’s connections with the regions in this study, Arabia, the Atbai, and the Red Sea shores. The archaeological data for trade interactions provides a tantalising glimpse at long distance trade-routes, but the data is far too sporadic to be sure of the precise destination of Egyptian maritime voyages. All that we do know of Egyptian voyages on the Red Sea are expeditions relating to the region of ‘Punt’, Sinai, and Edom. With such gaps in the archaeological data, toponyms have the potential to provide a framework for Egypt’s geographic awareness. Some key questions which toponymy may answer: Is there any evidence for Egyptian occupation or knowledge of the region around Berenike? Is there any terminology referring to the Gulf of Aqaba? What is the Egyptian name for Arabia? Did Egyptians travel as far as the Bab el-Mandeb? In the field of critical toponymy, the thesis hopes to address issues relating to the creation of placenames and the referent landscapes that toponyms designate. The point of entry into toponymy must be the ancient texts, the repository of all toponyms. Only after a philological and lexicographic analysis of toponyms in the texts can one answer analytical questions.
The primary perspective of this study is a reconstruction of the ancient geography. This is achieved through locating a placename (location), commenting on its referent landscape (feature), and also analysing its meaning and linguistic meaning and affiliation (etymology) (Fig. 2). Such a study may reveal the exploration of the region by Egyptians, as well as interactions between Egyptians and foreigners. The secondary perspective of this thesis is one of toponymic analysis, investigating the culture of placenaming in Egypt as evidenced in these placenames. In combining both these viewpoints it is possible to use the placename to explicate hidden aspects of Egyptian placenames – and address issues as to when and why a place was named, how it was named, and who named it. In summary using the toponym as the subject of analysis, this work will investigate the locations of toponyms in the Red Sea region (geography), as well as comment on the meaning of placenames and the underlying labelling culture present in this corpus (linguistics).
**Scope**

This thesis investigates toponyms in the peripheral zones east of the Nile Valley. This includes the Eastern Desert (Zone 1), the South Sinai and adjacent regions of Edom and Midian (Zone 2), and the Southern Atbai and Further Red Sea (Zone 3). These zones are heuristic devices and do not necessarily relate to any historical realities. As placenames are conservative elements of language, often displaying limited change in the backdrop of their linguistic community, it is necessary to take as wide a chronological scope as feasibly possible. The chosen period of this study is from the Early Dynastic and the advent of writing until the end of the New Kingdom (c. 3100BCE-1050CE). This formative period of Egyptian history exhibits the largest number of toponyms in this region compared to later documentation (with the exception of the Graeco-Roman period) and also gives us insight into the origin of Egyptian activity on their eastern periphery.

![Figure 3: The zones of the Toponymic Study](image-url)
Chapter 1: Toponymy and Ancient History

1.1 The Unit of Study - The Placename

Linguistically, toponyms are proper nouns, that is, they refer to one unique object and are therefore separate from the general lexicon in that they do not necessarily have meaning but have a ‘unique intended referent’. Proper nouns are distinct from general vocabulary in that their meaning need not necessarily correspond to its use in language. A toponym is a proper noun that applies to a finite location. The theory of studying placenames is called toponymy, a branch of onomastics. Most linguists accord no distinction between the terms ‘toponym’ and ‘placename’ and accordingly both are used interchangeably in this work. In Egyptian, as in all languages, there is the general definitional problem of how to distinguish between a placename and general geographic vocabulary. The task of identifying placenames in the Egyptian script is made somewhat easier by the practice of appending toponymic determinatives (, , or ) to placenames. Unfortunately, these signs in themselves do not mark proper nouns, as they could also be used for general geographical vocabulary like, ‘town’, ‘mountain’ and ‘river’.

Capitalisation of initial letters in English is only one method of indicating specific referents in written language. Other languages may add morphemes to indicate that a word or phrase should be treated as typologically specific or unique. The phenomenon of ‘proper names’ has been the subject of much debate in linguistics and philosophy. Current research emphasises proper names as being driven by reference rather than descriptive elements. In other words, the proper name simply has to apply or ‘belong’ to one unique thing rather than describe it. While this is true, the degree of descriptive content in a name is wholly dependent on the namer(s) and the manner in which something is named. This act of baptismal ‘bestowal’ is an important social process, because it represents a tacit agreement by a group as to what to name a person, place, or thing. Van Langendonck distinguishes two types of such bestowal processes:

5 W. van Langendonck, Theory and Typology of Proper Names (Berlin, 2007), 116.
6 L. Hill, Georeferencing: The Geographic Associations of Information (Cambridge; London, 2006), 110 defines a ‘toponym’ as subordinate to a placename, with the toponym ‘often being an administrative modifier’. Such a definition fails in most languages and belongs to the jargon and hierarchy of government databases. Almost all philologists and linguistics use these terms interchangeably.
7 For different morpho-syntactic strategies in proper nouns, see C. Lyons, Definiteness (Cambridge, 1999), 121ff and D. Nash & J. Simpson, ‘Toponymy: Recording and Analysing Placenames in a Language Area’, in N. Thieberger (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Research (Oxford, 2012), 399. It should be emphasised that unlike English, some of these strategies occur in spoken language.
10 van Langendonck, Theory and Typology of Proper Names, 322.
1) An ad hoc active process, where a pre-existing ‘proprial lemma’ is assigned to a referent, e.g. assigning the name ‘John’ to a child at birth. The referred object (in this example a person) need not have any relationship with the etymology of ‘John’.

2) A gradual passive process, where an often descriptive appellation is ‘semantically bleached’ into a proper noun, e.g. ‘Oxford’ from ‘(the) ford of oxen’.

Van Langendonck’s methods of naming remain to be tested against Egyptian data, or many corpora, and it may be that their nuances are at odds with culturally specific placenaming practices. In Egyptian toponymy, the process of marking a lexeme as ‘proper’ can be marked textually by the transition from a general lexeme with its own classifier, to one that uses one of the toponymic classifiers, for example, for example 𓊥𓊟𓊤 ‘pillar’ to 𓊥𓊝𓊣𓊡 ‘the pillars’ [PLACE] Heliopolis. Thus the classifiers reveal more than just orthographic and semantic differences, but could be considered on occasion to mark the shift of common noun to proper noun.

However, the use of toponymic classifiers was not confined to proper nouns and could also be applied to general geographic vocabulary, and thus in Egyptian hieroglyphs there is no sure way of discerning a specific placename over a general term. One may duly question the notion of whether a ‘proper noun’ is an explicit category in Hieroglyphic Egyptian. Beyond the toponymic determinatives there is also 𓊝 for personal names, but again this does not specifically mark a proper noun, as it can be used on any lexeme under the semantic heading of [PERSON], e.g. 𓊝𓊤 ‘priest’. Indeed, the Egyptian word for ‘name’, 𓊝, generally refers to contexts that would indicate a proper noun. To know the 𓊝 ‘name’ of something was a process of description and attribution, as Assmann summarises in regard to theophoric names:

\[ \text{The relationship between the named and the essence} \text{ [the attributes of the proper noun] ran in both directions: everything that can be gathered from a name says something about the essence of the named, and everything that can be said about the essence of a person can be ascribed to that person as a name. The Egyptian concept of the name thus included what we understand by “predicate.”} \]

11 This meaning of 𓊝 is supported by its use for not only personal names, but also for all classes of objects such as deities, plants and places, see J. Johnson, ‘What’s in a Name?’, LingAeg 9 (2001), 143-152.

12 J. Assmann, The Search for God in Ancient Egypt (Cornell, 2001), 84.
The notion of the Egyptian ‘name’, then, is surely to be connected to its descriptive quality, i.e. its ability to describe or say something about the unique referent, be it a person or place. Therefore one has to take a rather pragmatic approach as to what constitutes a toponym in texts, as the *rn* may often denote a purely descriptive predicate – rather than what a modern linguist would call a ‘toponym’. Ideally, it would indicate something that describes the essence of the referent, but this is not mandatory. Toponyms, in particular, are often padded or coupled with a generic term that assists in description e.g. ‘Sydney-Harbour’. A ‘generic’ in a toponymic phrase is not mandatory, but as a semantic unit is likely to exist ‘neurologically’ even if not uttered or written. This means that all proper nouns belong to poorly established sets of semantic categories like ‘women’, ‘men’, ‘cities’, ‘countries’ even if not marked in speech or writing. If these categories are socially conditioned, it then holds that Egyptian writing used classifiers to represent a manifestation of these mutually understood categories.

From the view of the referent of toponyms, specificity or definiteness is required, but even here not all definite appellatives can be included in this toponymic study. For instance such phrases as *p1 dw* ‘the mountain’ or *h3s.t tn* ‘this foreign-land’, while specific, are only accorded specificity due to definite articles or demonstratives. In these examples the referent topography is specific, but the name is not unique and could conceivably be duplicated in a variety of contexts for different places. Furthermore, these placenames do not go through an excursive process of description and community attribution, but rather are definite ad hoc constructions that often have a resumptive function in texts. These ‘definite appellations’ are of course worthy of further research, but it is outside the confines of this work. As such, a toponym in this thesis is pragmatically defined as a specific geographic appellation, which uniquely refers to one topographical unit of variable size.

From a grammatical point of view, almost all toponyms are noun phrases. Yet there is no real reason why a toponymic study should limit itself to such constructions. Indeed, the practice of using adverbial clauses for a specific toponym in Egyptian is attested. For instance, in the pictorial depiction of fortresses in Seti I’s campaign in the North Sinai, the placename *dmi kdn hm=f m ml3.wt* ‘the town which his majesty built anew’ is a specific entity. This practice of using such clauses in Egyptian ‘proper naming’ is decidedly common in personal names, e.g. Ramesses

---


15 KRI 1, 7.6. Less contentious examples of this practice include the names of pyramids, for example *Kii nfr.w-imn.w-m-h3.t* ‘exalted is the perfection of Amenemhat’, see R. Stadelmann, *Die ägyptischen Pyramiden* (Mainz, 1985), 231.
Ra.w-msi-sw (lit. ‘Ra is the one who bore him’). Excluding such appellations from Egyptian names would therefore be culturally incongruous.

1.2 Toponymy in Egyptology

Most monographs dealing with Egyptian toponyms have either been reference works and compilations or area studies collecting placenames from a finite region. This work falls into the latter category. Reference works of Egyptian toponyms include volumes by Brugsch, Gauthier, Al-Ayedi, and the appendix of Hannig’s *Großes Handwörterbuch* – each of these works making an effort to record all hieroglyphic/hieratic toponyms in published material. More chronologically specific referenced works include Zibelius-Chen’s and Gomaà’s compilations of placenames in the Old and Middle Kingdom, but no such work has been produced for the New Kingdom. Area studies of Levantine toponymy in Egyptian documents are encountered in Ahituv’s *Canaanite Toponyms* as well as Edel’s and Görg’s work on placenames inscribed on Amenhotep III’s funerary temple. African placenames in Egyptian documents have not received nearly as much attention, the major work being Zibelius-Chen’s *Afrikanische Orts- und Völkernamen*. However, the much older work of Schiaparelli is still relevant and provides many untested hypotheses on the locations of African names. This thesis is designed to fit in the geographic ‘gap’ between the Levantine and Nubian focus of previous works and could be considered similar to Schiaparelli’s and Zibelius-Chen’s work, albeit with the focus shifting to the regions expressly east of the Nile.

Local area studies may match toponyms to known archaeological remains, and in this manner, can with some confidence apply a toponym to a location by combining in-depth studies of local archaeology, inscriptions, and geography with data known from texts. Local studies on the Fayum

---

(Zecchi) and Middle Egypt (Gomaà et al. and Kessler) have yielded positive results in their ability to equate local topography and archaeological material with toponyms and thus arrive at more precise locations for placenames. This is the clear advantage of such works which have local geographic parameters, where the toponymy can be assessed in tandem with local archaeological remains and topographic knowledge. While the area represented by this work is geographically large, its sparse habitation and the relatively small number of archaeological sites make it possible for a similar approach to be maintained.

1.3 Critical Toponymy and Semantics

The application of any coherent or critical theory or model of toponymy is almost absent within Egyptological literature. This is primarily due to the focus of geographical studies in Egypt, where the primary task of toponymic works is to reconstruct historical geography. In dealing with toponyms, this thesis attempts to deal with the entirety of specific geographical vocabulary that may be applied to Egypt’s eastern peripheries. As such, the required method is a lexicographic survey of the textual material, involving the collection of individual instances of toponyms from Egyptian Hieroglyphic and Hieratic texts.

Outside Egyptology, the school of toponymy which has focused on ‘historical toponymy’ and etymology has been criticised in its attempts to recreate ‘bygone’ maps. Its superordinate discipline, onomastics, has also suffered criticism, being called an ‘academic orphan’ due to its intersection on the edge of diverse fields such as anthropology, cartography, linguistics and environmental psychology. While the etymological and historical methods of toponymy have been criticised, it is clearly still necessary when addressing the meaning and hence reasoning behind a name. A new school of ‘critical toponymy’ has sought to answer more complex questions. It has emphasised the role of social relations and hegemonic practices inherent in toponymy and the power of name as a unit of territoriality. This emphasis placed on the human agency and social ‘bestowal’ in toponymy may elucidate cultural patterns in response to landscapes, space, and place. Problematically, for these critical issues to be addressed in ancient world studies, the traditional ‘etymological’ method is still necessary in order to establish why a place was so named.

To answer any of these questions and generalise about naming practices, it is essential to deal in quantitative and qualitative methods. Finite data, such as the etymology, location, and temporal setting of a placename, must be addressed to place an individual toponym in a broader context. In order to generalise, a quantitative survey is also required, where a series of placenames can be collected and grouped into categories within an established typology. Using a toponym typology, it is possible to treat a large corpus of placenames and subject them to a variety of questions to address cultural processes in labelling. With such a typology more complex questions can be addressed regarding toponyms.

1.4 Toponym Typologies

Ancient world studies have generally lacked a consistent typology when approaching toponymy. Due to our reliance on texts to reconstruct ancient topography, more often than not the discussion of placenames takes place in the context of reconstructing the historical geography of an area and equating toponyms with archaeological sites, in the words of Quirke, ‘allocating ancient placenames to specific geographical locations’.22 Perhaps the first methodical attempt to deal with Egyptian placenames is Lutz’s attractively titled article ‘Toponomastic Patterns of Ancient Egypt’.23 But the work is highly anecdotal, focusing almost entirely on settlement-names derived from mythological or cultic motivators and provides some suspect naming motivators such as ‘Stone Cults’. However, the article does provide many examples of calques in Greek and Arabic from earlier Egyptian exemplars.24 Quirke’s contribution on toponyms identifies some systematic problems inherent in the study of ancient Egyptian toponymy. Quirke proposes some categories of Egyptian toponyms, based upon the type of features to which they refer:

1) places not located on earth (the Jenseitstopoi of German commentators)
2) places located on earth but applicable to the otherworldly sphere
3) places located on earth, with wide scope (regions and lands)
4) places located on earth, with narrower scope (a specific settlement or monument or natural feature such as a hill).

Zibelius-Chen offers a general treatment of placenames in a short paper given at the First International Congress of Egyptology.25 The aim of the article is not the production of a typology

---

24 A calque is a word translated from a foreign language. These are often difficult or impossible to identify in ancient toponymy unless there is documentation from two or more languages applying to the same region.
per se but rather to investigate the ‘relationship of the Ancient Egyptian to his place names’; Zibelius-Chen distinguishes several categories of Egyptian toponyms:

- Personal Names derived from Placenames
- Theonyms formed from adjectival Placenames
- Placenames derived from Theonyms
- Placenames derived from Royal Names
- Placenames derived from Personal Names
- Shift Placenames of Theonyms
- Pun Placenames
- Epithet Placenames (of King, or Deity)

In a separate article focusing on placenames from the Old Kingdom, Zibelius-Chen gives a treatment on the main forms of the placename. This is probably the most thorough treatment of morpho-syntax of Egyptian names, where the following linguistic subcategories are identified: 1) substantives, in singular, plural, and dual, 2) adjectival substantives, 3) genitive expressions and 4) adverbial or adjectival sentences, especially in Pyramid Names. Semantics are also treated, and a number of categories are identified from Old Kingdom toponymy such as 1) settlements, 2) geology, 3) soil quality - *Bodenbeschaffenheit*, 4) botanical names, 5) faunal names, 6) names derived from gods or myths, 7) names derived from objects (and vice-versa), 8) names derived from human activities, 9) names derived from buildings and *technische Anlagen*, 10) events (often mythological), and 11) abstract concepts.

Quaegebeur and Vandorpe, in a treatment on Egyptian onomastics, deal with some basic patterns in Egyptian toponymy. In their survey they identify three different types of toponymic formations:

**a)** city-names compounded with terms such as *niwt* (city), *dmi* (town), *grg* (foundation), *śwy* (house, hence hamlet).

**b)** [Toponyms] adapted from geographical reality, related to the soil (*mḥy*, newly gained land; *ṣtḥ*, wood; *ḥḥ*, field; *ḥf*, sand), the water (*itrw-ḥḥ*, great river; *rḥ*, mouth of a water branch) or constructions such as temples (*pr*), stables (*ḥy*).

---


27 That is the *nfr-sw* sentence, see B. Ockinga, *A Concise Grammar of Middle Egyptian* (Darmstadt, 2012), 31.

e) The two preceding items can be defined by, for instance, adjectives (Hw.t-wr.t, the great palace), names of gods (NiW.t-Imn.w, The city of Amun), or royal names (Pr-Rṣ-sw-mry-Imn.w, Piramesse, house of Ramesses, beloved by Amun)

While a unique system, this typology has problems in application. Categories a), b), and c) overlap, especially where they refer to artificial structures like pr, which could designate the settlement surrounding a temple/palace as well as the structure itself. Furthermore, the survey is clearly adapted to referent features, not semantic motivation. So a) must refer to settlement types, and b) represents topographic features, while c) can refer to both. Despite this, Quaegebeur and Vandorpe identify several important processes which few toponymists have noted, namely the presence of allonyms for many settlements, where the same town can have an administrative and cultic name. More importantly, they highlight a key issue in toponymy theory in general, that is the question as to at what point a descriptive appellation becomes a proper name. The importance of determinatives as proper noun markers in Egyptian is stressed, but not systematised.

These systems, do little to address the motivation behind naming a place, and are mainly geared to the kinds of features to which toponyms are applied (e.g. settlements, mountains, rivers). While knowledge of their referent feature type is necessary, a typology should cater for more analytical questions beyond the type of location to which the placename refers. This can only be assessed by addressing semantics of placenames. On occasion, ancient toponyms are analysed from the viewpoint of establishing the register or genre of a text in which the placename occurs, but this indicates more about the use of the placename as a literary or religious motif than the reason for the christening of a placename.

It would be mistaken not to emphasise the difficulties in establishing typologies without knowing the semantic diversity apparent in placenaming. The difficulties are manifold when one is dealing with non-Egyptian placenames in hieroglyphic texts, where the meaning of the name requires specialist linguistic knowledge and a known set of phonetic correspondences to a foreign language. To date only one author, Franci, has endeavoured to analyse foreign toponyms in Egyptian texts typologically. He does this in a small survey devoted to Semitic words in the Egyptian Execration Texts. The ample contemporary lexical data in Semitic means that one can be fairly certain of the respective semantic types, but the relative lack of quantitative data means that only a small number of categories - ‘plants’, ‘animals’, ‘hydronyms’, and ‘geonyms’ - could

29 See, for example, A. Tokovinine, The Classic Maya Place Name Database (2007) [online-resource], whose typology addresses the syntax of a placename in a sentence, and whether it functions as a royal or mythological epithet.
be identified.\textsuperscript{31} These studies are important in that they move the focus of study to foreign toponyms (autonyms) and from concerns of location to linguistic issues.

Unfortunately, there is no generally agreed-upon typology in onomastics or toponymy, where many often complex and multi-layered models exist to categorise placenames. These are often constructed with a specific region, time period, and linguistic situation in mind and can be based upon a myriad of variables.\textsuperscript{32} However, most modern typologies are focussed on addressing the name itself and its semantic motivation, which is usually revealed through the name’s etymology. Such typologies often separate placenames into descriptive names, emotive names, foreign names, borrowed names, and the like – that is they attempt to address the naming process itself rather than the referent feature or area of the toponym. Typologies may also address morphological criteria, and the form and syntax of the name itself, whether it is a single word, a phrase, or a compound. Toponymic compounds are extremely common in most languages and often form a generic geographical feature. These ‘generics’ or ‘topographic descriptors’ use words such as ‘river’, ‘mountain’, and ‘town’ to construct a noun phrase, i.e. ‘River Nile’ or ‘Mount Sinai’\textsuperscript{33}. Alternatively an adjective, often referring to its relative location, may be used, such as ‘Upper Egypt’ or ‘Eastern Desert’. An added distinction in some typologies, especially in areas which experience diglossia or multiple languages, is the linguistic affiliation of the toponym. The common distinction of endonym/autonym (the indigenous name for a place) vis-à-vis exonym (the foreign name for a place) is important and may reveal much about the social and ethnic groups originally responsible for creating a placename.

Not all typologies can handle this data simultaneously and it is often necessary to create subcategories. It is prudent here to introduce some of the toponymic terms which may not be familiar to the reader (Tab. 1).\textsuperscript{34} Note these terms are not a typology, and do not address

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} For instance toponymists in the Americas or Australia must make a sharp distinction between indigenous names (Amerindian, Australian Aboriginal) and European names (Spanish, English, French, Portuguese), see S. Arias & M. Meléndez, ‘Space and Rhetorics of Power in Colonial Spanish America: An Introduction’, in S. Arias & M. Meléndez (eds), \textit{Mapping Colonial Spanish America: Places and Commonplaces of Identity, Culture and Experience} (Cranbury, 2002), 13-24. For Australian and American examples see the typologies listed in J. Tent & D. Blair, \textit{Motivations for naming: a toponymic typology – Australian National Placenames Survey Technical Paper No.2} (2009), 1-18.
\item \textsuperscript{33} The extent to which a ‘generic’ term is part of the placename itself is a debated subject. Hercus and Simpson note that these words are helpful to ‘newcomers to an area’, see L. Hercus & J. Simpson, ‘Indigenous placenames: an introduction’, in L. Hercus, F. Hodges & J. Simpson (eds), \textit{The Land is a Map} (Canberra, 2002), 15.
\item \textsuperscript{34} These definitions are paraphrased from those of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, \textit{Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names}, (New York, 2002). In Egyptological literature the forthcoming article of R. Gundacker, ‘The Significance of Foreign
etymology or naming practices, but rather define different placenames according to their referential feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allonym</td>
<td>A toponym referring to a feature with two or more names.</td>
<td>Byzantion, Constantinople,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonym/Endonym</td>
<td>A toponym used by the indigenous inhabitants of a place.</td>
<td>Al-Qahira (Cairo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>A toponym applied to a large area.</td>
<td>Eastern Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eponym</td>
<td>Name of a person or group of persons after or for whom a place is named.</td>
<td>Gebel Musa (Mountain of Moses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exonym</td>
<td>A foreign language name for a place where the language is not spoken.</td>
<td>Egypt (as opposed to the Arabic Misr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydronym</td>
<td>A term applying to a hydrographic feature.</td>
<td>Gulf of Suez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odonym</td>
<td>A name applying to a route or traffic features, either aquatic or terrestrial.</td>
<td>Darb el-Arba’in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oronym</td>
<td>A name applying to an elevated feature.</td>
<td>Gebel Uweinat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Common terms relating to toponyms with examples

In addition to these –nym types this thesis will use oikonym ‘building or settlement name’. It is also prudent to create another name-type non-existent in previous literature, Latonym, a term for mines or quarries. In themselves these terms cannot be applied as a typology, as they neither describe the etymological reasoning behind the label, nor address the particular syntactical construction of the toponym. However, they do differentiate the application of placenames, and thus can be used to generalise about the features and classes of toponyms.

The typology applied to these toponyms is adapted from the Australian Placename Project, a toponymic survey that must deal with toponymy in a multi-lingual area. The model used here (Tab. 2) has deliberately changed taxa to suit the naming-practices evident in Egyptian toponymy and omits those categories which are only present in modern western toponymy. This has the advantage of being as distinctive as possible, while still sharing enough basic terminology so that it may allow for some comparison with other regions. The guiding principle has been to produce enough specific categories to allow for all toponyms, while not making overlapping categories. In making this typology it became evident that treating individual lexemes within toponyms gave much more specific results than treating the placename as one semantic unit. This means that the toponomy can treat multi-lexeme names and not ignore the generic term in placenames.

---

35 As is standard in onomastic terminology, terms are formed from Greek words, here from λᾰτόμεῖον ‘stone-quarry’.  
| 1. Physical Geography | 1.1 Geomorphology | Inr.ty ‘The two cliffs’ Gebelein |
| | 1.2 Geomorphological Metaphor | Inb.w-hd ‘White walls’ Memphis |
| | 1.3 Geological/mineralogical | Mfk.t.t ‘Turquoise’ South Sinai |
| | 1.4 Hydrological | T3-š ‘Land of the lake’ Fayum |
| | 1.5 Cosmic | Wbn.t ‘The place of rising’ Orient (the solar east) |
| | 1.6 Faunal | T3-ih.w ‘Land of the cow’ Faafra Oasis |
| | 1.7 Botanical | Pr-nbs ‘House of the christ’s-thorn’ Kerma |

| 2. Human Geography | 2.1 Building | Pr-Itm.w ‘House of Atum’ Pithom |
| | 2.2 Settlement Type | Dmi-Ngs.w ‘Village of cattle’ Old Cairo |
| | 2.3 Areal or Political abstract | Hw.t-wr.t ‘Mansion of the district’ Avaris |

| 3. Relative | 3.1 Cardinal | Niw.t rs.yt ‘The southern city’ Thebes |
| | 3.2 Relative | Rtnw hr.t ‘Upper Retjenu’ Lebanon Range (?) |
| | 3.3 Shift | Ḩr-T3.wy ‘Seizer of the two-lands’ Egyptian name for Rome from earlier Ḩr-T3.wy (near Fayum) |
| | 3.4 Feature shift | Tp-Nḥb ‘head of Nekheb from city Nḥb (El-Kab)’ |

| 4. Evaluative | 4.1 Commendatory | Mr nfr.t ‘the beautiful canal’ |
| | 4.2 Condemnatory | Kṣ ḫṣ.y ‘vile Kush’ (?) |
| | 4.3 Mythic or Cultic | Ḥmn.w ‘The Eight (Ogdoad)’ Ashmunein |

| 5. Activity/Verbal | 5.1 Recurrent activity | Tbr.w ‘to assemble, protect’ Tell Heboua |
| | 5.2 Event/Incident | Ndi.t ‘the falling-place (of Osiris)’ Afterlife Placename |

| 6. Eponym | 6.1 Personal Name | Dmi Tii ‘the village of Tetti’ |
| | 6.2 Royal Name | Tw-Snfr.w ‘Island of Sneferu’ |
| | 6.3 Theophoric Name | Bṣ.t ‘Bast’ Bubastis |
| | 6.4 Ethnic or Social Construct | T3-Tḥn.w ‘The land of the Libyans’ Western Desert |

| | 7.2 Calque | Dw [66] |
| | 7.3 Phono-semantic matching / homophonic translation | Unproven, but perhaps see placenames Nww [75] or Mn.wr [113] |

| 8. Unknown | 8. Unknown etymology | 

---

37. Here it is implied that a placename is bestowed using a word outside the semantic field of topography to define the shape of the physical landscape.

38. This is not a category regularly used in toponymic surveys; it is required here due to the Egyptian nature of using stellar, solar, and other natural phenomena to label placenames; this may refer to the use of celestial, solar or meteorological features in placenames.

39. Egyptian toponyms with botanical terms are noted in N. Baum, Arbres et arbustes de l’Égypte ancienne (Leuven, 1988), 374.

40. It has been suggested that the name ‘White-walls’ actually referred to local limestone cliffs at Memphis, rather than any purported wall-structure, see M. Verner, “Inb.w-hd ‘White wall(s)’: a town or white limestone cliffs?”, ZÄS 139 (2012), 103-104.

41. Calques are attested in the transition from Egyptian to Arabic, for instance Egyptian Inr.ty ‘the two cliffs’ > Arabic Gebelein ‘the two mountains’, see C. Peust, Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten (Göttingen, 2010), 41-42.

42. This is another category that can only be proved with difficulty in ancient texts. It refers to a foreign word which is phonetically matched to a word in another language. The topic has not been specifically discussed in Egyptian toponymy, but has been proposed for a number of names for instance Zwī and Ṣfr, being generally beyond proof, see AOVN, 150, 154. Professor Luc Gabolde at recent paper at the 13th conference of Nubian studies proposed that Nsw-Tḥ.wy ‘Napata’ might stem from a Nilo-Saharan root and was matched to this Egyptian phrase.

43. For this toponym, see [66]. It is possibly a part-calqued placename given the translation between Egyptian ḏw and har in Ṣ Canaanite/Hebrew.
This typology attempts to address the semantic motivation behind a toponym, rather than the referent area. With such a model it is possible to address analytical questions behind the toponym such as:

- What group or person(s) named the toponym?
- What does the name indicate about land use and the local environment?
- How specific or general is the placename?
- Why was the place named?

The application of these categories rests upon etymological analysis of the placename. Most placenames comprise of multiple typological categories, so that a toponym may be for example $1.1 + 1.7 = \text{Ht.yw-\text{nt.yw}}$ ‘The terraces of myrrh (trees)’, Geomorphology + Botanical. This is not a standard practice in toponymic surveys, but is required to establish the motivation behind multi-lexeme placenames.

No linguistic typology that deals with the morphology and syntax of toponyms has been created for Egyptian, or indeed many other languages. The notable exception is Zibelius aforementioned work, and Jacquet-Gordon’s study of domain names in the Old Kingdom. Domain names are inherently suited to grammatical analysis as they are complex and periphrastic grammatical units and thus display many different paradigms. She distinguishes categories divided broadly into nominal and verbal hierarchies.\(^{44}\) In nominal types there are a) independent substantives, b) substantives + adjectives, c)-d) direct and indirect genitives, e) adjectives, and f) active participles + complement. Verbal types include 1) nominal predicate, 2) perfective participle with or without genitives, 3) imperfective participles + direct genitive, and 4) substantive + direct genitive. While it should be considered desirable to group toponyms according to morphology and syntax, this will not be done here due to the difficulty of comparing syntactical and grammatical paradigms over multiple stages of the Egyptian language, in addition to the fact that the grammatical features in this corpus of toponyms are not as complex as those in domain names. As such, finite linguistic features will be described under ‘etymology’ for each toponym, and common features will be dealt with in the analysis (Chapter 9).

Every typological sequence has its pitfalls, mainly due to the process of categorising data into imposed and possibly arbitrary categories which are not explicit in a cultural system. It should be noted that the Egyptians had their own method of categorising space into fields using recognisable

graphemes such as ☂, ☂, or ☂ (see Chapter 2). Nevertheless, it is hoped that this typology can be applied to larger data sets for testing.

1.5 Toponymy, Texts, and Lexicography

Without recourse to interviews, the ancient historians encounter with toponyms is solely through texts and, where the placename by chance survives in contemporary use, its modern reflex (e.g. Z3wt > Asyut). It is thus no surprise that ancient toponymy is the scholarly monopoly of the lexicographer and philologist. Analysis of names and their meaning are ultimately dependent on their identification in texts. Only then can the placename be analysed as an independent unit and compared with names in other texts. The appearance of toponym in a text first and foremost is an attempt by the ancient author to communicate location. It is thus necessary to collect all textual examples of relevant placenames in order to comment on their distribution, meaning, and etymology.

The methods of data collection in ancient toponymy differ appreciably from the modern discipline. Such useful techniques used in modern toponymic research, like ethnographic field surveys and extensive cartographic data, are not applicable in ancient cultures. The data used for this thesis is founded in Egyptian textual sources and thus the translation and analysis of texts is the major avenue for research in ancient Egyptian toponymy. As Quirke puts it, toponymy is ‘a branch of both topography and lexicography’. Placenames that may have existed exclusively in the spoken language are invisible. However, the corpus of texts that mention toponyms is vast and almost all textual genres contain toponyms.

Other written traditions besides Egyptian must, of course, be consulted to aid in toponymic research, especially where Egyptians transcribed foreign placenames into their own script. Where required, sources from later stages of Egyptian history will be consulted, including texts from Ptolemaic Inscriptions, Demotic, Coptic, and Greek texts. Separate investigations are required regarding the transmission of geographical knowledge into later periods, especially from the Persian period and later where there is evidence for the introduction of a new geographic repertoire in Egyptian texts as well as an increasing opacity in the lexical forms of ‘old’ toponyms.


Quirke, DE 21, 65-66.

It is apparent that from the Persian period that the foreign toponymy in Egyptian documents is conflated with Persian and Near Eastern names. See, for instance, the introduction of new names for
1.5.1 Epistemological Issues in Ancient Toponymy

One must note the interpretative problems and limitations in using only written sources, especially in Ancient Egypt. The problem of textual preservation is a significant one, with some scholars suggesting that only one out of every 150,000 papyri has reached the modern scholar. This number does not apply to epigraphic material due to the more durable nature of stone. Nevertheless, one must note the incomplete nature of our record. Presumably many letters, administrative documents, and accounts, all of which may have contained toponyms, have been lost and thus one must be careful when making conclusions based on quantitative data as the extant toponymic corpus may not be representative of Egyptian texts in general.

Due to the fact that texts on stone monuments, i.e. tombs, temples, royal stele are some of the most likely to be preserved, the names available to the modern scholar reveal the preoccupations of particular genres and social groups. It is estimated that only the top echelon of society, perhaps as little as one percent of Egyptians, were literate in the Old Kingdom, with a possible growth of this number in the New Kingdom. Toponyms present in these texts therefore concern the ruling elite. What may be called ‘local’ toponyms, i.e. names of farming villages or desert valleys, are accordingly rare. Indeed, outside the confines of administrative texts and letters, as epitomised in the list of settlements in the taxation assessments of the Wilbour Papyrus, the absence of the names of villages, farms, and communes is conspicuous from Egyptian records. Toponyms in this taxation gazetteer have generally proved impossible to locate with any degree of certainty, due to their absence in any other documents. This also applies to the list of toponyms on the Giza Writing Board from Mastaba G2000, where almost all the toponyms are unknown and have uncertain readings. These developments are related to the source material itself. Local toponyms (so-called ‘microtoponyms’), if written at all, are only likely to occur in administrative texts, on the perishable medium of papyri. Whereas toponyms concerned with royal expeditions, military encounters and religious literature are found on the more durable medium of stone, e.g. stele and

---


51 Locating the majority of these placenames remains impossible, see the analysis in A. Jean-Christophe, ‘The Wilbour papyrus revisited: the land and its localisation. An analysis of the places of measurement’, *SAK* 40 (2011), 9-27.

52 See E. Brovarski, ‘Two Old Kingdom Writing Boards from Giza’, *ASAE* 70 (1987), 49-52.
rock inscriptions. More generally, one must take into account that a significant portion of foreign toponymy would have been unknown to the majority of Egyptians. Individual Egyptians may have had their own repertoire of toponyms, perhaps of a more local, idiomatic, and functional nature.

Even within this small demographic of the literate in ancient Egypt the levels of restricted knowledge which pervades Egyptian written culture should be noted. Baines has investigated this aspect of Egyptian written culture in a series of publications, emphasizing the level of restriction apparent in religious literature and the exclusive ‘closed-access’ nature of Egyptian religious institutions. Tombs, especially burial chambers of the royal elite, contained a series of ‘closed-access’ texts, treatises on the nature of the afterlife and the passage of the king to the next world. While these texts were copied, they had a restricted audience and therefore their specialist geographic vocabulary may also be considered ‘restricted knowledge’, perhaps being known to only a select group in a particular religious institution.

1.5.2 Toponyms and Genre

In a lexicographic study, it is important to note the reasoning for the inclusion of a toponym in each text. This is generally related to the content of the text itself and the related lexemes associated to the operative toponym. So in Expedition Texts, the toponym is usually visited by the king and/or officials in a mining or military activity by the Egyptians. Similarly in Dedication Texts, the toponym is the source of a particular material which was used in a cultic establishment. Expedition Texts are the most instructive genre for toponyms, for their narratives usually communicate some geographic information about the toponym. Other textual contexts where toponymy is frequent, for instance in theophoric epithets, occur freely within many genres. Hymns and religious tracts usually include placenames associated with the myth of the solar cycle, or the cultic association of a particularly deity. ‘Toponomastica’, a term not regularly used in Egyptology, include such texts as the New Kingdom ‘Topographical Lists’, but also other

---

53 The use of the determinatives in Egyptian placenames may have aided in the comprehension of placenames, see Chapter 2.
54 For the idea of ‘decorum’ in Egyptian written culture and the texts (notably in royal stelae, tomb and temple inscriptions), see J. Baines, Visual and Written Culture in Ancient Egypt (Oxford, 2008), 14ff and also J. Baines, ‘Restricted Knowledge, Hierarchy and Decorum: Modern Perceptions and Ancient Institutions’, JARCE 27 (1990), 1-23.
55 For instance, the copying of the solar theological treatise amongst documents from Hatshepsut till the Ptolemaic period; J. Karkowski, Deir el-Bahari VI, The Temple of Hatshepsut: The Solar Complex (Varsovie, 2003), 157-201. Amongst other ‘closed-access’ documents one could count The Book of Nut, found in the tomb of Ramesses IV and the Temple of Seti I at Abydos, being selectively copied until the second century CE on the Carlsberg Papyri, see A. von Lieven, Grundriss des Laufes der Sterne: Das sogenannte Nutbuch (2007), 15-19.
established lists such as the Execration Texts. The large majority of the placenames in these documents are unique to these corpora (onomastic hapax legomena) and are foreign in origin (autonyms). While toponyms in the ‘Northern Lists’ referring to the Levant may be favourably compared with what is known in Semitic documentation in Ugarit or the Hebrew Bible, the African ‘Southern Lists’, which will be dealt with in this thesis, lack this relative abundance of comparative documents.

The issue of genre and the question of the existence of particular genres in ancient Egyptian literature such as the Königsnovelle is a vexed subject. The genres mentioned here are not designed to be formal types, but rather broad and elastic categories in which the textual context of a placename may be understood. Toponyms occurring in toponomastica (Execration Texts, New Kingdom Topographical Lists) or maps (the Turin Map) require discussions of their progression, logic, and purpose before each toponym they contain is analysed. Certain genres of texts of course lend themselves to toponymic study, and these are quite well known in the Egyptological literature. Using these sources, a database, or databank of toponyms will be established. Each entry will have a section devoted to the ‘etymology’ of the toponym, ‘location’ of the place and, where relevant, a ‘discussion’ of any historical or textual issues related to the toponym. This will be followed by its classification of the placename in the semantic typology (Tab. 2).

1.6 Etymological Method: The Linguistics of non-Egyptian placenames

While this thesis is not specifically concerned with reconstructing the phonology of toponyms, phonology has no small part in establishing the etymology of these appellations. This is especially the case in exonyms, where it is assumed that the Egyptian script is attempting to reproduce or approximate the original foreign-language pronunciation of the name. In order to establish the etymology of these foreign-hieroglyphic toponyms, the phonology of Egyptian graphemes must be considered, as well as that of the target language. As will be shown, identifying the linguistic origin of these toponyms is difficult. Most of the languages present in this corpus, particularly on the African continent, lack any contemporary historical texts, making it nearly impossible to establish the original pronunciation of loanwords in periods contemporary to Ancient Egyptian

---

57 For a general treatment on these lists, their interpretational problems and misuse, see K. Kitchen, ‘Egyptian New-Kingdom topographical lists: an historical resource with “literary” histories’, in P. Brand & L. Cooper (eds), Causing his name to live: studies in Egyptian Epigraphy and history in memory of William J. Murnane (Leiden, 2009), 129-135.
58 See Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms in Ancient Egyptian Documents, passim.
civilisation. On this one should note the cautionary remarks of le Page Renouf on the etymologies of the comparative method:

Egyptologists sometimes talk as if it were possible by the Berber of the nineteenth century to explain words found in ancient hieroglyphic texts. It is like trying to interpret the Rig-Veda by Rumanian or Bas-Breton. With philology of this kind we may, to our own satisfaction, prove anything we like.60

However, given the significant gains in Egyptian phonology and the comparative method in Afroasiatic linguistics these remarks should be tempered to a degree. A noteworthy obstacle in the comparative method is establishing equivalences between Egyptian consonantal graphemes and their corresponding phonemes in foreign languages. While these correspondences have been studied at length between Egyptian and other ancient languages that bear textual evidence, it is difficult to predict correspondences based on modern data in languages which have no ancient written traditions. The problem is further exacerbated by a general lack of awareness of the ancient linguistic situation and any unknown events of linguicide and/or migration. As such, constructing the etymology of non-Egyptian toponyms is a difficult task. This is especially the case compared to normal lexical loanwords, where the original meaning is made clear by the the textual context and the determinative. In proper nouns such features are rendered mute. This study attempts to take a positivistic approach, trying to outline possible etymological options for future research.

Due to the difficulty of etymological analysis, a three tiered-approach is used when supplying etymologies for toponyms:61

I. Certain: Etymology based on established and contemporaneous cognates and is semantically suitable.

II. Likely: The etymology has a good basis on both phonetic and semantic grounds.

III. Speculative or uncertain: A possible cognate based on poor linguistic evidence, but semantically possible.

---

60 This quote was used as a caveat against lexical reconstruction of Libyan names in Hieroglyphic Egyptian, see Cooney, Egypt’s encounter with the West: Race, Culture and Identity, 180. The original passage is in P. le Page Renouf, ‘Who were the Libyans’, PSB:13 (1891), 601.

61 Similar to the five-tiered system employed in J. Hoch, Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period (Princeton, 1994), 13.
1.6.1 Semantic Patterns in Marginal Toponymy

This thesis operates under the general assumption that most placenames, especially those in arid regions, are born out of physical geography. In the marginal areas of the Eastern Desert and Red Sea this has shown to be the case to the present day. To draw an analogy from the contemporary inhabitants of the Eastern Desert, Hobbs notes of the pattern of modern bedouin toponymy:\(^{62}\)

*The nomads’ homeland is so vast, and the margin of survivability in it is so narrow, that topographic knowledge must be encyclopaedic. Places either are the resources that allow human life in the desert, or are signposts that lead to resources.*

Such ‘signposts’ usually includes references to notable landmarks in the topography such as mountains, hydrological features (rivers, wells, harbours and so on), as well as geological features. The ‘resources’ referred to by Hobbs would also include ecological terminology and toponyms that remark on the relative abundance of vegetation or animals in the landscape. Such origins of placenames are consistent in marginal landscapes. Bechhaus-Gerst has remarked of modern Beja toponymy that most placenames are formed from topographical landmarks, vegetation, and animals, with a much smaller corpus formed from the built environment, verbal actions, or body-parts used as environmental metaphor.\(^{63}\) While this trend is naturally a generalisation, as toponyms may be derived from a diverse range of ideas, it must be emphasised that the great-majority of placenames created by autochthonous desert dwellers were derived from physical geography.\(^{64}\) The hypothesis of this work is that indigenous placenames in the area will reflect greater ecological and ‘photographic’ content, relative to Egyptian placenames which may be motivated by economic preoccupations. This has important consequences for the etymological investigations for this thesis, as the semantic field of the majority of indigenous (non-Egyptian) toponyms should be sought in geographic vocabulary.

---

\(^{62}\) J. Hobbs, *Bedouin Life in the Egyptian Wilderness* (Cairo, 1989), 82.


\(^{64}\) This might not be purely for desert-dwellers. A toponymic survey in Peru in areas of Spanish-Quecha diglossia reveal that the autochtonous Quecha placenames uniformly give more ecological information than their Spanish counterparts, see K. Rolph, *Ecologically meaningful toponyms: Linking lexical domain to production ecology in the Peruvian Andes* (Stanford University, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, 2006), 234.
1.7 Localisation

The crowning task of the student of ancient geography is to locate the places he finds named in his sources, and where no help is obtainable from tradition, from inscriptions on the site, or from physical features, the difficulties are apt to be insurmountable.\(^{65}\)

Sir Alan Gardiner, in his commentary on the taxation onomastico n of pWilbour, touches upon the key historiographical issue related to placenames, the issue of location. He makes references to some methods that may be used to locate a placename, namely tradition (use of the same name in later Graeco-Roman, Coptic or Arabic written traditions), inscriptions on the site (a site whose inscriptions mention the placename), or physical features (matching the placename to a set of archaeological or topographical features) indicated in the text. If all of these methods fail to indicate any likely location for the placename, then it is indeed almost impossible to locate a toponym.

Searching for toponyms that apply to a finite area in ancient toponymy is no simple task. A rather pragmatic approach has to be undertaken that combines textual and historical analysis with etymological data as well as topographical knowledge. All placenames included in this work are located within the regions of the Eastern Desert, Red Sea, and South Sinai. For reasons of analytical brevity and blurred boundaries, it is necessary for this survey to preclude certain areas, particularly those immediately adjacent to the Nile Valley. Thus quarries and necropolises abutting the Nile escarpment like Gebel Ahmar (Dw-ðšr, Tškw) and Tura (Rš-šw) are excluded, but localities like Hatnub (Hš.t-nbw) or Wadi el-Hudi (Hš.t-hšmn) which are more than a day’s march into the desert are included. Furthermore, these toponyms, as a unit, share the common theme of being located in peripheral areas to the Nile civilisation. They represent a unified corpus in that their inclusion in Egyptian texts was due to sporadic incursions and travels by Egyptians, rather than habitation at settlement sites. As such, this corpus is specifically designed to investigate Egyptian attitudes to peripheral geography and the admixture between foreign and Egyptian placenames.

The localisation of ancient toponyms is generally guided by the methods of topography and lexicography. The text in which a toponym occurs needs to be investigated, which may reveal the route taken to get to the place, the resources obtained at the place, or other geographically salient features. The textual object itself can also be of assistance, especially in rock inscriptions where demonstrative toponyms ‘this/that placename x’ may indicate the exact location of a particular

\(^{65}\) Gardiner, The Wilbour Papyrus, II, 36.
place. From textual analysis it may also be possible to establish some vague ideas on the expanse of the referent topography of the toponym, but this is not always possible. It can be dangerous to speculate on the expanse or specificity of the referent terrain of a toponym without methods such as ethnography or interviews. It is quite clear from the settlement names that such areal shifts occurred, for instance toponyms of the ‘Pr-god x’ variety, such as Pr-ḥs.t(y)t ‘House of Bast’ or Pr-Ḥtm.w ‘House of Atum’, must have referred to the temple structure itself, before its use as a settlement name. Often this method requires matching a placename to an archaeological site in a given area, although this is the exception rather than the rule, especially where toponyms may be used to refer to physical landmarks or large areas. Within the arid regions involved in this toponymic survey, there is little archaeological material is to be expected, and most toponyms refer to landmarks, mines/quarries, and large regions rather than settlements.

Locating toponyms in ancient texts is a difficult task. As the toponymy of Egypt has undergone several drastic changes from Egyptian, to Greek, Coptic, and then Arabic, comparatively few original ancient Egyptian toponyms survive in contemporary Arabic vernaculars. This is unlike, for example, the Levant where ancient Canaanite toponyms often survive to the present day in a recognisable form, i.e. ṭRph > Rafah (near Gaza). Despite exhaustive analysis of maps and gazetteers, no pharaonic Egyptian toponym of the South Sinai or Eastern Desert was identified by the author. Presumably, all were replaced by Arabic toponyms from c. 700 CE onwards. Given these difficulties, the thesis will use a scale (similar to the etymology scale) to rate the certainty of the identification, I (certain), II (likely), III (speculative).

Quirke, *DE* 21, 65-66.

Egyptian toponyms still encountered in contemporary Egyptian Arabic are catalogued in Peust, *Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten*, 10-104. Further etymological notes on these toponyms are given in Å. Engsheden, ‘Review of Carstern Peust, *Die Toponymie vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten*’, LingAeg 19 (2011), 321-326.

Such a system was used effectively in K. Wilson, *The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I into Palestine* (Tübingen, 2005), 101 n. 2.
Chapter 2: Proper Nouns and Placenames in the Egyptian script

2.1 Toponymic Classifiers: Ordering Egyptian Space

The Egyptian hieroglyphic writing system, beyond transcribing phonemes, made use of signs whose value was only visual. These signs, generally called ‘determinatives’, were placed at the end of the word and acted as reading aids. Most commonly, they served to place the preceding lexeme in a semantic field. As such, they are extremely common after substantives (nouns and adjectives), less so after verbs, and rare after prepositions. Toponyms, being nouns or noun phrases, commonly exhibit these signs. Indeed, they are one of the chief ways by which toponyms were marked from general vocabulary.

These visual cues allow an unprecedented insight into the categorisation of space from the view of literate culture. In effect, determinatives had multivalent functions; marking the end of a word, disambiguating similar words, and importantly here placing the preceding lexeme into a semantic field. Instantly recognisable graphemes representing topographical features, such as 𓊒𓊹, serve to render the geographic nature of the preceding lexeme and thus automatically assist in its intelligibility. While the Egyptian toponymic system of classifiers is unique, it is not the only script which visually distinguishes toponyms in texts. The KUR/KI and URU glyphs in Akkadian cuneiform serve to categorise toponyms based on whether they are a city or an areal designation. In Aztec codices, placenames, like many words, could be communicated visually through the rebus principle, so Tenochtitlan ‘near the fruit of the cactus tree’ is depicted in graphic writing by drawing a cactus tree emerging from a rock. While all these systems are based on different principles of categorisation, their function is the same in that they use visual cues in order to assist in the intelligibility of placenames (Tab. 3).

---


70 G. Whittaker, ‘A Study of North Mesamerican Place-Signs’, Indiana 13 (1993), 11-14. Elsewhere in Mesoamerica the Maya ‘Emblem Glyphs’ could involve the rebus principle in writing toponyms, as form as with the name of Aguateca, or could be spelled phonetically as with ‘Yaxha’, see D. Stuart & S. Houston, Classic Maya Place Names (Washington D.C., 1994), 5-12. The authors note that the sign for Aguateca, WITS ‘hill’, was subtly different to the standard wits glyph and thus actually attempted to depict a local feature of the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Glyphic System</strong></th>
<th><strong>Aztec Hieroglyphs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mayan Hieroglyphs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cuneiform</strong></th>
<th><strong>Egyptian Hieroglyphs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing of placename</strong></td>
<td>![ glyph ]</td>
<td>![ glyph ]</td>
<td>![ glyph ]</td>
<td>![ glyph ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placename</strong></td>
<td><em>Tenochtitlan</em></td>
<td><em>Wits</em> (modern Aguateca)</td>
<td><em>KUR</em>RM/HattiRM</td>
<td><em>K38 [HILL-COUNTRY]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graphemic Principle</strong></td>
<td>Rebus writing of ‘Near the fruit of the rock (<em>te</em>)' and cactus (<em>nochtli</em>)'</td>
<td>The WITS-glyph ‘hill’ is drawn idiosyncratically (with phonetic complement) to depict the specific hill at Aguateca.</td>
<td>The determinatives KUR (𒆳) or URU are placed in front of the placename.</td>
<td>Determinative placed after placename ‘Kush’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Toponyms in different graphic scripts

There is now a growing body of literature that has redefined and reinvigorated research into this element of Egyptian lexicography. Since her monograph on the subject of determinatives, Orly Goldwasser has reinterpreted the function of these signs in Egyptian language, redefining these graphemes as ‘classifiers’, favouring this term over the common label of ‘determinative’. For Goldwasser and other linguists, the distinction between these definitions is not insignificant. The connotation and function of a *classifier* allows the sign to function as an integral element of the morphology of the word and allows it to be compared with similar morphs in other *classifier* languages. Such languages have classifier-words as an organic feature of the oral language. Generally these are bound morphemes appended to nouns or verbs that place a lexeme into mutually established classes (gender, number, type, size, animate, inanimate, object types).

While Egyptian ‘classifiers’ are not strictly ‘oral classifiers’, and thus are not identical with their counterparts in classifier languages, they do share many of the functions of oral classifiers in that they reveal a productive linguistic system that changes the meaning of similar words in differing contexts.

---


73 The types of classification present in such languages are extensive. For the often complex and ambiguous definitions of classifiers see, A. Aikhenvald, *Classifiers: A Typology of Noun Categorization Devices* (Oxford, 2000), 13-16.
However, the objection must be stated that since the classifier is not a true phonetic morpheme, but rather an unpronounced grapheme, it represents a language only accessible to the literate. As literacy was an elite prerogative in Egypt, this visual language cannot have been in the repertoire of the majority of Egyptian speakers. The word *diglossia* (in the social sense) is commonly used to characterise the Egyptian linguistic community due to the coexistence of multiple and seemingly opposing registers of speech. The speech patterns and vocabulary of the illiterate is axiomatically largely unknown, but their language surely was divorced from the registers that used classifiers. Inasmuch as classifiers are only present in texts, this classificatory linguistic system is perhaps confined to the Egyptian elite literate culture and not pervasive at all levels of society. This criticism aside, Goldwasser’s arguments which place greater emphasis on the linguistic study of determinatives/classifiers, unlock new fields of inquiry in lexical semantics and cognitive aspects of Egyptian literacy. These signs are productive and variable elements in Egyptian words, and the fact that they are often interchangeable in identical lexemes means that they can adapt the meaning of a word dependent on context and the manner in which the scribe has understood the lexeme. To go as far as Goldwasser has, and label Egyptian as a *classifier language*, is perhaps extending the linguistic definition too far (unless we apply it only to written language).

It is the classifiers effect on meaning that is relevant to toponyms. The disambiguating use of the determinative is well known in Egyptian Hieroglyphs. In Mayan Hieroglyphs, Mora-Morin has made the subtle distinction between ‘semantic determinatives’ and ‘semantic classifiers’ to denote the ‘reading-tool/homophonic disambiguator’ vs ‘semantic categoriser’ function of classifiers. Similar distinctions are also echoed in the conclusions of Lincke, where the role of the classifier as a disambiguator of polysemic words as well as a semantic classifier, is stressed. In toponyms, most classifiers are examples of what Lincke and Kammerzell call ‘referent classifiers’, where the classifier is contextually sensitive to the referent of the word, and could change if the same word had a different meaning in a different text. Toponyms, as proper nouns, are separated from

74 This precise dilemma is treated in E.-S. Lincke & F. Kammerzell, ‘Egyptian classifiers at the interface of lexical semantics and pragmatics’, in Grossman, Polis & Winand (eds), *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian*, 61-62, 66.
76 For the ongoing debate concerning Egyptian determinatives vs. classifiers, consult the bibliography present in E.-S., Lincke, *Die Prinzipien der Klassifizierung im Altegyptischen* (Wiesbaden, 2011), 9-12.
79 Lincke & Kammerzell, ‘Egyptian classifiers at the interface of lexical semantics and pragmatics’, in Grossman, Polis & Winand (eds.), *Lexical Semantics in Ancient Egyptian*, 55-112. The other category is ‘lexical classifiers’, i.e. where the classifier relates more generally to the root or phrase.
general vocabulary by the placement of a sign afterwards indicating its status as a placename. That is, because the etymology of the placename now has no inherent meaning when it is used in a proper noun, it may be given a different classifier. But the same toponym could have different classifiers dependent on a host of variables, some of which would have been referent specific. Or, in other words, however a scribe understood the placename affected the classifiers they chose to append to the toponym.

These unpronounced graphemes are important for an understanding not only the larger principles of the Egyptian labelling processes but also, pertinently to this thesis, for demonstrating the Egyptian efforts to categorise geography by using certain classifiers. This process of classifying places reveals how scribes ordered places and accordingly how Egyptian elite culture conceived of their world spatially. Conversely, these signs may also reveal different scribal traditions and palaeographic tendencies rather than having any inherent effect on the meaning of the lexeme.

2.2 Classifier Mechanics

It is well known that most Egyptian ‘classifiers’, graphemes without any phonetic content, could function independently as phonetic ideograms, generally appended with the ideographic stroke (Gardiner Z1). Such signs as ẖiš.t, niw.t, and mw could function as individual ideograms delineating the lexemes of ‘hill-country’, ‘town’, and ‘water’ respectively. It follows that these phonetic ideograms have some bearing on the semantic value of these signs when used as classifiers. However, the primary significance of these signs in this thesis is their use as classifiers. This is where a particular toponym is grouped with one or more of these signs in order to demonstrate the category of space in which the particular place name belonged. According to Goldwasser, these classifiers could function in the following ways:⁸⁰

1. A tautological repeater: the grapheme more or less depicts exactly the meaning of the preceding lexeme
2. A taxonomic indicator: the grapheme indicates a generic category in which the preceding lexeme can be placed.

---

3. A metonym: a classifier is used for words where there is an association between the word and the classifier.

4. A metaphor: the classifier acts as a metaphor, particularly for conceptual verbs, where the classifier may indicate a metaphoric relationship, e.g. mni ‘to moor’ written with the horizontal mummy as a metaphor for death.

In toponymy, the classifier generally falls into taxonomic use. Evidently, and acted as established categories in which a placename could be positioned. This has clear interpretational advantages, as the toponym’s meaning and location may be unknown to the reader, but the classifier assists in its comprehension. The graphemes themselves are also metonyms, indicating a connection between the image and the word through association rather than visual repetition of the lexeme. The grapheme for instance, visually communicates [HILLS] but has become a metonym, or archetypal schematic for [FOREIGN-LAND] due to the Egyptian experience of almost all rugged terrain occurring in foreign territory outside their Nile Valley home. Thus the use of the classifier in toponyms was a functional process of categorisation, an attempt to order the world in a set of established and mutually intelligible taxograms which distinguished different classes of space. Such glyphs may represent prototypes, or cognitive reference points, anchoring the preceding lexeme to mutually intelligible geographic categories.

2.3 The Toponymic Classifier Signs

While particular toponyms regularly employed the same classifier, the classifier for a single toponym was subject to change due to a variety of complex considerations including textual medium (papyrus or monumental inscription), date, locality of inscription, and what may be considered as ‘scribal preference’. Recent research by Loprieno and Spalinger has shown the complexities and major developments in the use of these signs in toponyms. These developments concern both orthographic changes as well as ideological changes, where the same toponym may be written with different classifiers due to changes in contemporary geo-political situations.

---

82 Goldwasser, Icon to Metaphor, 82-83.
In understanding such systems, one can gain an insight into changing conceptions of conceptualising topography. Not only could different signs be used for the same toponym, but multiple classifiers could be present on a single toponym, accentuating the semantic complexities inherent in categorising a place. As Spalinger notes, the system of using different classifiers for the same toponym is nuanced and it is dangerous to make sweeping conclusions without addressing the individual context (medium, genre, date) of the particular text in which a placename is written.

Despite these individual complexities, one can observe a general preponderance in the texts, especially in formal texts of decorum, for a standardised orthography. It is not yet clear in what manner toponyms are copied from one text to another. Hasel has conducted such a study on the Kadesh Bulletin and Poem and notes the consistency in the classifiers of toponyms across all the copies of these texts. Such conclusions question the dichotomy of scribal copying versus active scribal interpretation in the writing of determinatives. The caveat in interpreting the meaning of a classifier is that the use of different classifiers may not necessarily demonstrate a changing semantic character of the toponym, but rather may reflect orthographic norms and/or copying.

There are only a limited number of classifiers which could be used to classify toponyms, most of them in the Gardiner ‘N’ series, a set of graphemes that depict physical elements and features of the universe. But, a rather small series of classifiers were used in the toponyms under discussion. N25 and O49 were used for most toponyms. The throw-stick classifier, T14, while initially used for foreign ethnic groups, evolved to classify any substantive that had a foreign element. Outside this chief set of classifiers, a handful of other topographic signs were used, but these defined a much smaller set of lexemes and are not standard features of toponyms.

---

84 In the examples given by these authors, the focus is on toponyms on the periphery of Egypt, which could change from an ‘Egyptian’ toponym, to a ‘foreign’ toponym and thus require different classifiers; see Spalinger, *JEA* 94, 139-164; Loprieno, *Le pensée et l’écriture*, 51ff and A. Loprieno, ‘Travel and fiction in Egyptian Literature’, in D. O’Connor & S. Quirke (eds), *Mysterious Lands* (London, 2003), 31-51.

85 These writings only become commonplace in the early Ramesside period, see Spalinger, *JEA* 94, 141, 150.


87 For these glyphs, see A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (Oxford, 1994), 485-492. This categorisation of hieroglyphic graphemes does not seem to have been observed by Egyptian scribes. For Egyptian attempts to systematize and define hieroglyphic signs, see E. Iversen, *Papyrus Carlsberg Nr. VII. Fragments of a Hieroglyphic Dictionary* (København, 1958), 1-30.
2.3.1 N25 [HILLS] [FOREIGN-LAND]

The [HILLS] classifier is the most prevalent classifier in the toponyms under consideration in this corpus. The sign depicts three hills between two valleys and thus visually communicates the idea of rugged terrain. Within this schema the palaeography of the sign varies little, with some exceptions. Some examples illustrate a colour palette, with the base of the sign showing a green line below yellow hills, presumably denoting the Nile below the adjacent desert escarpment. The earliest attestations of these signs are in two labels from the Predynastic tomb U-j, where an Elephant-glyph is drawn above N25, probably being used as a classifier for the toponym ḏbw ‘Elephantine’. In the First Dynasty the sign is used more regularly, and is attested as a classifier for toponyms. Thus, this sign from the very earliest examples of hieroglyphic writing was used to classify toponyms.

As a phonetic ideogram, the grapheme often stands alone or in the combination N25-X1-Z1 to indicate the word hîst ‘hill-country’. If the phonetic meaning(s) of the glyph has any bearing on its graphemic meaning, the classifier when used with toponyms would seem to chiefly indicate the ‘hilly’ nature of the preceding place. This can be confirmed by its use as a phonetic ideogram, hîst, with a likely meaning of ‘mountain’. This meaning of N25 as [HILLS], more pedantically as [HILL-COUNTRY], in Egyptian can be supported by its opposition to other basic designators of physical landscapes such as tī ‘flat land’ and an etymological connection of hîst to a root meaning of ‘mountain’.

There are occasions where N25 could be used to classify physical landforms of the [HILL-COUNTRY] as opposed to toponyms. For example, the classifier is used to determine such general

---

88 A variant writing of the Early Dynastic period seems to have four peaks instead of the usual three; see P. Kaplony, Die Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit (Wiesbaden, 1963), I, 391. Some of the early writings seem to have rounded peaks, or pointed summits, compare for example figs 83 and 182 with fig. 493 in Kaplony, Die Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit, III, pl. 30, 49, 104.

89 See P. Newberry, Beni Hasan (London, 1893), I, pl. 28 and E. Edel, K.-J. Seyfrie &. G. Vieler, Felsgräbernekropole der Qubbet el-Hawa bei Assuan (Pardeborn, 2008), I, III, pl. 66, with pl. 50-51. The striations can also be seen in a number of Old Kingdom inscriptions, see the texts listed in H. Fischer, Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C. (New York, 1968), 24 n. 98.

90 J. Kahl, ‘Hieroglyphic Writing During the Fourth Millennium BC: an Analysis of Systems’, Archéo-Nil 11 (2001), 118. See also L. Morenz, Bild-Buchstaben und symbolischche Zeichen (Fribourg, 2004), 75-76.

91 It is also used in Early Dynastic inscriptions to classify Wn.t, Mffk.t, Nw, and Șî.t, see J. Kahl, Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift in der 0.-3. Dynastie (Wiesbaden, 1994), 599-600.

92 Wb. 3, 234

93 See V. Orel & E. Stolbova, Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary: Materials for a Reconstruction (Leiden, 1995), 297. The roots constructed in this work should be treated with some caution, for which see H. Satzinger, ‘An Egyptologist’s perusal of the Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary’, LingAeg 15 (2007), 143-160. However, this word has good North West Semitic cognates in hbrsh ‘mountain, wood’.
words as \( \text{my} \text{nt} \) ‘valley’ and \( \text{zm.yt} \) ‘desert, necropolis’. In these lexemes, the classifier is used as an archetype or prototype for landforms occurring in the hilly terrain outside the Nile Valley and thus demonstrates their meaning as a unit of the [HILL-COUNTRY] class. It can hardly be argued that landforms such as \( \text{zm.yt} \) ‘desert’ are foreign from Egypt in a political sense. However, such a meaning of [HILL] is perhaps overlooking the contextual and multi-purpose meaning of N25, which may also communicate the idea of [FOREIGN-LAND]. Here the classifier is used in opposition to O49, and there are cases where toponyms on Egypt’s frontiers alternate classifiers between N25 and O49 due to political allegiance. This meaning of [FOREIGN-LAND] is also consistent with its use as a phonetic ideogram. In this form it was possible and common to use the phonetic ideogram in a genitival construction with a toponym or ethnonym, for instance, H3s.t-5m.w or H3s.t-n.t-Nhrn. As a classifying taxogram for toponyms, N25 seems to be chiefly used in the latter context of [FOREIGN-PLACE], especially in contrast to O49 [CITY] or [EGYPTIAN-PLACE]. One can cite numerous examples where this classifier is used even when the locality is topographically level. The Egyptian name for the Mesopotamian city of ‘Babylon’ Sngr \( \text{tn} \text{my} \) still retains the N25 classifier despite it being located on the exceptionally level alluvium of the Tigris-Euphrates valley. However, N25 could also classify large expanses of land, as in the Egyptian designation of ‘Lower-Nubia’ W\( \text{tw} \text{lt} \) or ‘Upper-Nubia’ KS \( \text{ty} \text{nt} \). Thus, the definition of [FOREIGN-SPACE] for N25 may be more applicable, where one commonly finds [FOREIGN-LAND] as the cited graphemic reading. Despite the polyvalent meaning of the sign, the emphasis in toponyms is not on a geographic expanse, but on specifically foreign geography in a topographic, not political, sense. This foreign sense is echoed in the hieroglyph N77 \( \text{my} \), commonly employed in the New Kingdom and later, which similarly classifies foreign toponyms, combining N25 with the T14 throw stick. Even in Old Kingdom inscriptions, one finds N25 written with A77 (\( \text{my} \text{ty} \)) to

---

94 Wb. 1, 93; 1, 347; 3, 444-445.
95 Urk. I, 134; N. Davies, The Tomb of Ken-Aman at Thebes (New York, 1930), pl. 22.
96 For this toponym see AEO I, 209.
97 W\( \text{tw} \text{lt} \) and KS are toponyms which approximately correspond to ‘Lower’ and ‘Upper’ Nubia respectively; W\( \text{tw} \text{lt} \) seems to always designate the border regions between Aswan (First Cataract) and southwards. In the New Kingdom Kush seems to have been used as a general designation for Nubia, commonly in opposition to \( \text{Hbrw} \) ‘Syria’, especially when used in the phrase \( \text{in.w n(w)} \) \( \text{Hbrw} \) KS. See HWb, 1323, 1394; AEO I, 74-75, 180-181.
98 Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar, 33 gives the reading “desert, foreign country”. There is also “Desert, Foreign Land” in J. Allen, Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of hieroglyphs (Cambridge, 2010), 438; Hannig gives ‘Wüste, Fremdländ’ in HWb, 1065.
99 See D. Kurth, Einführung ins Ptolemäische: eine Grammatik mit Zeichenliste und Übungsstücken (Hützel, 2007), II, 323, 334 n. 269. This writing seems to have been standardised in orthography by the early Ramesside period, see for example, KRI II 180.3, 317.3-4.
classify appellations that are clearly toponymic rather than ethnic designations. However, before the New Kingdom, this ‘stacking’ of signs with N25 is certainly the exception rather than the rule.

At least from a taxonomic perspective, the inclusion of this classifier after these toponyms suggests that the scribal tradition was primarily concerned with indicating a place or area as being topographically foreign or domestic rather than describing any internal details about the toponym. From an ideological and political viewpoint this is an important distinction; it is well known that Egyptians had a dichotomous understanding of Egypt and foreign, both in a political sense, but also in a religious-cosmographic conception of the universe. It is telling that the mythical Jenseitsttopoi could take this classifier, perhaps positioning these places as part of the same sphere as foreign places outside the Nile from the viewpoint of the scribe or theologian responsible for the text.

2.3.2 O49 [EGYPTIAN-PLACE]

The classifier O49 is generally agreed to represent two diagonal crossroads, and thus depicts a town or urban establishment, although van Lepp has questioned this assumption, citing the absence of circular settlements in Egypt and the resemblance of the sign to water motifs present on Predynastic pottery. As van Lepp has shown, the internal details of the sign in decorated hieroglyphs could be blue or occasionally green. A Fourth Dynasty relief fragment from Giza shows the diagonal crossroads with internal cross-hatching, which could hardly represent a road, but is more suitable for a canal or aquatic feature. Accordingly, van Lepp sees the sign as representing intersecting canals, thus emphasizing the ‘raison d’être’ for the basic settlement in early Egypt as an agricultural conglomerate based on a canal. In her recent palaeographical study, Regulski challenges this view, finding evidence for circular enclosure walls in some Predynastic settlements. However, her arguments do not address the blue-colour of some painted writings, or the variant cross-hatched glyphs of O49, which could only with difficulty be interpreted as

---

100 For instance in the biography of Harkhuf where it occasionally classifies Tshm and Wiwit, see Edel, Seyfried & Vieler, Felsgräbernekropole der Qubbet el-Hawa bei Assuan, I, III, pl. 27.
102 J. van Lepp, ‘Is the hieroglyphic sign niwt a village with Cross-Roads?’, GM 158 (1997), 91-100. This argument could also be bolstered by the phonetic similarity between niwt/t.h.t ‘city’ and n.t ‘flood’ or ntw.y ‘water’, see Wb. 2, 198, 215, 274. He is not alone in this reinterpretation of the sign, see also K. Kuhlmann, ‘Die Stadt als Sinnbild der Nachbarschaft’, MDAIK 47 (1991), 217-226 where the sign is cited as a circular dam protecting an urban conglomerate.
103 van Lepp, GM 158, 96.
104 Fischer, Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C., 24.
105 I. Regulski, A Paleographic Study of Early Egyptian Writing (Leuven, 2010), 162-163.
roads or paths. Therefore, even though its visual character may be read as [CANAL], one can attribute, without any leap of logic or imagination, the classifiers meaning as [SETTLEMENT] or more pedantically [FLOODPLAIN-SETTLEMENT] through a process of metonymy.

The first attestation for the use of this grapheme as a classifier for toponyms is in the First Dynasty, where it was used for various settlements within the Nile Valley. As a phonetic ideogram with O49-X1-Z1, the group may be read as niw.t or alternatively n.t meaning ‘city’, ‘town’, or ‘village’. The use of O49 as a classifier is more complex than merely denoting [SETTLEMENT]. The classifier is used sparingly for any urban establishments outside Egypt and has therefore been used primarily to designate [EGYPTIAN-SETTLEMENT]. Furthermore, it classifies such terms as Šm.r.w ‘Upper-Egypt’, Tš-nmr ‘The Cultivated Land (Egypt)’, and Km.t ‘The black land (Egypt)’ indicating that like , does not communicate an expanse of area, but rather the relative position of the placename.

In placenames, O49 principally acts as a metonym for [EGYPTIAN SPACE]. It is uncommon to find this classifier used for cities outside Egypt, although there are notable exceptions. The toponyms Tbrw and Tkw in the Sinai borderlands are sometimes written interchangeably with O49 or N25. Tunip on the Orontes river is written on at least one occasion in this manner, as was Kpny. However, these deviant writings are present only in the Ramesside and later texts, where there was a scribal tendency to combine O49 and N25 together for some foreign toponyms. Before this development, its use for Egyptian toponyms is sharply distinguished. Berlev and Spalinger have noted the change from N25 to O49 for @w.t-war.t ‘Avaris’, the seat of the Hyksos in the North-East Delta, which can be explained by the shifting allegiance of this locality from the ‘foreign’ Hyksos to Egyptians in the Seventeenth Dynasty. As such, foreign locations were denied the privilege of being classified with O49 even if they were urban centres along the Nile. To circumvent this ideological problem, genitive constructions using generic nouns for settlements like dmi or wh.yt plus toponym were used to designate foreign urban or nomadic

---

106 See the examples in Regulski, A Paleographic Study of Early Egyptian Writing, 566-568, nos. 0938, 2084, 2913 and 3518.
108 See Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar, 498; Allen, Middle Egyptian, 491; this group was also used to designate Thebes, literally ‘the city’.
109 See Spalinger, JEA 94, 144ff.
111 These writings occur both in the Story of Wenamun and the Tale of Woe, see Loprieno, ‘Travel and Fiction in Egyptian Literature’, in O’Connor & Quirke (eds), Mysterious Lands, 42-49.
settlements, thus disassociating O49 altogether from foreign placenames. But this system of denying O49 to foreign establishments broke down in the Ramesside period. For instance, the wh.yt-settlements of Asiatic Retjenu could be classified with ḫ. Similarly, T14 could appear with O49 ḫ in toponyms that are Egyptian. Therefore, despite some occasional discrepancies which can be explained through changing orthographic practices, the evidence points to the use of O49 as a classifier for ‘Egyptian’ toponyms in the Nile floodplain.

The idea has been posited that the O49 classifier may refer to urban as opposed to semi-urban or nomadic structured communities, particularly when appended to the end of terms like wh.yt ‘settlement’ or dmi ‘village’. In texts predating the Ramesside period, when the stacking of classifiers becomes endemic, this seems to be distinct from the use of T14 which was commonly used to denote semi-nomadic ethnic groups. This meaning is an extension of an Egyptian ideological principal in which Egyptians considered themselves as ‘urbanised’ and ‘ordered’, while foreigners were treated as ‘nomadic’ and ‘chaotic’. Given this idiom, rather than reflecting any real demographic situation about a toponym, the use of O49 classifiers in toponyms demonstrates Egyptian attempts to integrate places into an ideologically charged hierarchy of space.

2.3.3 T14/T15 [FOREIGN] [FOREIGNER]

The throw stick sign is one of the more enigmatic classifiers. There is not always a clear connection between the staff or throw-stick and the ideas it classifies. When used in words such as ḫ ‘to throw’, kmi ‘to create’, and ḫ: ‘throw-stick’ it is a phonetic ideogram. When used phonetically, it has the values of kmi, ḫm, and tn. In respect to geography, the glyph could be used as a phonetic ideogram in ethnic appellations such as ḫn.w ‘Libyan’, ṯmhw ‘Libyan’, and ḫm ‘Asiatic’. These examples, where the sign was used in the writings of semi-nomadic ethnic groups, probably directly led to its later use as a classifier for

113 See, for example, in the Beth-Shan stele of Seti I (KRI I, 12) where there is the dmi of Hamath (line 15), Beth-Shan (line 16) and Yenoam (line 20) where dmi is not classified. For the individual toponyms, see RITA I, 9-10. For the meaning and use of wh.yt ‘Großfamilie’ or ‘Clan’ see D. Franke, Altegägyptische Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen im Mittleren Reich (Hamburg, 1983), 204-210 and also Spalinger, JEA 94, 154-157.


115 Spalinger, JEA 94, 154-157 relates this process to a shift in the demographic make up of a settlement, where it develops from a rural village ruled by a family to an urban unit. A good example of this classifier use is given by Spalinger in ḫ Nṣi ‘village of Neshi’, see KRI III, 425.7.

116 The wh.yt with Egyptian populations are classified with ḫ, whereas foreign wh.yt are given ḫ or a combination of the three, see Spalinger, JEA 94, 153-163.

117 D. O’Connor & S. Quirke, ‘Mapping the Unknown in Ancient Egypt’, in O’Connor & Quirke (eds), Mysterious Lands, 12-13.

118 Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar, 513.

119 Kahl, Das System der ägyptischen hieroglyphenschrift in der 0.-3. Dynastie, 730; Wb. 1, 68; 5, 368, 394.
foreign toponyms. In papyri of the Middle Kingdom, there are examples of RTnw with a throw stick, but generally speaking it is exceptional for this glyph to classify toponyms, as opposed to ethnonyms. Here one can point to a more definite use of this classifier in ethnic appellations such as the phrase nmi.w-Sa ‘traverser of the sand’ and the label NhS.y ‘Nubian’, which could both be classified with T14. Spalinger cites such a use for the classifier in delineating the idea of semi-nomadic inhabitants, thus believing the classifier to communicate [NOMAD]. As an argument against such a definition, in words like sbi there is no clear semantic connection between [NOMAD] and ‘rebels’. It may be that, from an Egyptian worldview, a value closer to [FOREIGN-PEOPLE] would be more appropriate.

The expanded classifier orthography of the New Kingdom witnesses the ambiguous use of T14, where it could also be used metatextually, to classify words themselves as foreign. The throw-stick could classify foreign personal-names and could also be appended to a range of words under the semantic categories of ‘enemy’ or ‘rebels’. This is also consistent with its use in words such as wh.yt ‘settlement’, which could also include the throw-stick sign when specifically describing foreign settlements. Thus any previous meaning of T14 as [NOMAD] in the New Kingdom may no longer be tenable as it was used for toponyms and anything distinctly foreign. It still retained its ability to classify ethnic groups, and was almost obligatorily used for ethnica such as Medjay, Meshwesh, or the famous Israel, Ysrl.

The use of T14 in the Ramesside texts, where it is consistently drawn together with N25, reveals that the values [FOREIGN-PEOPLE] and [FOREIGN-PLACE] had merged to become almost indifferent. This process began in the dynamic hieratic script which, by the New Kingdom, had allowed classifiers to be stacked, thereby conflating their meanings. As such, in the Twenty-
First Dynasty, N25 could only apply to physical geography and ethnonyms, while T14 could classify anything under the semantic field of ‘foreign’. The usage of O49 and T14 together to classify single toponyms in the later New Kingdom is at least partially influenced by the collapse of orthographic norms.

2.3.4 N35a ⲡⲃⲧ [WATER] and N36 ⲡ

This sign, three water ripples, could ideographically reproduce mw ‘water’, but is often used as a classifier for hydronyms. As a classifier for hydronyms, it is metonymic with terms like mw and thus used with generic terms like wḏ-wr ‘ocean/sea’, nnw/nwn ‘sea, abyss’, and ḫmnt ‘well’.

The size or nature of the body of water is not relevant and ⲡⲃⲧ could classify canals, lakes, rivers, oceans, or regions in the sky. In compound placenames, N35a is used only on the generic term and does occur as a phrase classifier, as in Pˁ-ym-n(y)-Hfr.w ‘Great Sea of Syria’ where ⲡⲃⲧ classifies only Pˁ-ym. To an extent, the glyph ⲡⲃ ⲡ (often ⲡⲃ ⲡ i) seems to be in free variation with N35a. By the Ramesside period the familiar habit of ‘stacking’ classifiers is at play and both are used side-by-side for instance in wḏ-wr ⲡⲃ ⲡ ⲡ ⲡ ⲡ ⲡ l.

2.4 Multiple Determinatives O49, N25, and T14

The study of Spalinger focused on the writing of classifiers throughout the New Kingdom and emphasised the influence of hieratic orthography on the writing of toponyms with two or more classifiers. In toponyms, the throw-stick is particularly illustrative of this development. However, there are earlier developments in the classifier repertoire which illustrate divergent ideas of what foreign meant. These signs were first and foremost markers bounded in physical geography. That is, they began their life-cycle in Egyptian script as symbols which visually marked different kinds of topographic space. For Ⲥⲧ as the decorated examples showing a strip of green cultivation at their base reveal, this was the rugged terrain adjacent to the Nile Valley.

A political foreignness, a feature that has forced translators to render ḫš.t as ‘foreign-country’ instead of the visually suggested ‘hill-country’, is a different kind of foreign. Before the New Kingdom there are no examples of Ⲥ Ⲥ being used for a locality outside the Nile Valley, albeit with the oases being a somewhat complex exception to this process. In the New Kingdom and after,

\footnote{Wh. 1, 269; 2, 214; 3, 382.}
\footnote{For the orthographies, see L. Lesko, A Dictionary of Late Egyptian (Providence, 2002), I, 91.}
\footnote{The only certain exception I can find to this rule is Ⲥ Ⲥ Ⲥ Ⲥ from an Eleventh Dynasty inscription from Ballas, see H. Fischer, Inscriptions of the Coptite Nome (Rome, 1964), 112-118. Another possibility is the settlement ṭwD.t Ⲥ Ⲥ Ⲥ Ⲥ from the Dakhla epistolary archive, see L. Pantalacci, ‘La documentation épistolaire du palais des gouverneurs à Balat-‘Ayn Asil’, BIFAO 98 (1998), 307. The Ballas inscription is certainly politically motivated, for which see the geographic interpretation of J.
toponyms which were on the Nubian Nile and were controlled by Egyptians, could be classified with $\Theta$, such as Nubian forts like Buhen (Bhn) and Aniba (Mi$\tilde{m}$). The important distinction here is that this only extended to foreign places on the Nile, in Lower Nubia – it would take another developmental shift in the Ramesside period for $\Theta$ to apply to non-Nile settlements. Therefore, the original system signalled a toponym as being either within or outside the Nile Valley, that is topographically, not politically, foreign. This system evolved as a response to historical developments. With increasing Egyptian interests beyond Egypt in Lower Nubia and the Levant, it became ever more apparent that places outside the Nile Valley could be ‘Egyptian’ in politico-cultural affiliation. Before the New Kingdom, classifiers were still chiefly topographic markers, based on the distinction between a placename in or outside the Nile Valley. Hence places like Kbh.w ‘First Cataract’, 3bw ‘Elephantine’, Rl-3w ‘Tura’, which were topographically ambiguous, situated between the topography of $\Theta$ or $\Theta$, could be written interchangeably with either N25 or O49. Such interchangeability is probably attributable to the difficulty the scribe had in placing the toponym either inside or outside the Nile Valley, a process which can also be observed in the Jenseitstopoi which may be written with either classifier. Here, the confusion was due to the very nature of the unobserved environment of the netherworld, making it difficult for the scribe (or author) to know which classifier was appropriate.

Darnell, ‘The route of Eleventh Dynasty expansion into Nubia’, ZÄS 131 (2004), 24-30 who cites good evidence for the operative Wh$t.t referring to the small southerly oases of Kurkur or Dunqul (not the usual Kharga and Dakhla). The fact that these toponyms are all Western Desert oases may suggest that O49 had already obtained an ideological character by the First Intermediate Period. The oasis toponyms of Wh$t.t, Wh$t.t rs.y, Wh$t.t mh.tyt, Dds, Knn.t, and Ti-ih.w do not normally show $\Theta$ until the Twenty-First Dynasty, see Giddy, Egyptian Oases, 140-153, tables I-V.

Zibelius, AOVN, 70. The spelling of Buhen with $\Theta$ is only attested from the Eighteenth Dynasty, see H. Smith, The Fortress of Buhen: The inscriptions (London, 1976), 88-90. On the eastern frontier some placenames such as Mgd$\ell$ are classified with $\Theta$, A. Al-Ayedi, The Inscriptions of the Ways of Horus (Ismailia, 2006), 87.

Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches, 3-4, 135, 240.

This topic requires further research, but consult Irw, P$\tilde{d}$w-$\Theta$, Nd$t.t$, and Ghs.$\tilde{t}$y in Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches, 46, 87, 134, 250.
In the Ramesside Period this system, being clearly influenced by an increase in the use of л, became semantically vague. Multiple apparently contradictory determinatives became common in single placenames. Spalinger and Gardiner showed that these writings were palaeographic tendencies and thus had little meaning.\textsuperscript{134} In hieratic, л often replaced the independent ч, thus the throw-stick lost some of its semantic function. The writing л also became commonplace for foreign toponyms only from the late Eighteenth Dynasty. Likewise, ч began to be employed for foreign localities. By the Twenty-First Dynasty, the widespread use of ч, by itself or with a triad of glyphs, had eliminated the nuances in the earlier system of topographic distinctions. Thus, in later texts л was allowable. This spatial categorizing system seems to have weakened by the New Kingdom, but its distinctions were not altogether lost.

\textbf{2.5 Conclusion}

In using classifiers with their geographic vocabulary, the Egyptian scribe could employ a variety of signs to help the reader understand the particular toponym and place it in conceptual space. The

\textsuperscript{134} Spalinger, \textit{JEA} 94, 153-154, who followed the remark in A. Gardiner, ‘Ramesside Texts relating to the Taxation and Transport of Corn’, \textit{JEA} 4 (1941), 57 n. 3.
use of these classifiers in toponyms changed drastically over time, with the most accentuated changes being apparent in the New Kingdom, when the scribal tendencies of ‘stacking’ classifiers affected not only hieratic papyri but monumental inscriptions. Furthermore, individual signs, most notably those, seem to have changed their meaning and the sign became much less specific and was semantically amalgamated with others. It is proposed here that the original system was based on topographic binaries, indicating a place being within or outside the Nile Valley, ±[NILE-PLACE]/[HILL-PLACE]. The system only later took undertones of political alterity, [EGYPTIAN-PLACE]/[FOREIGN-PLACE]. The study of these classifiers in geographical terminology is paramount to the conception of toponyms from an Egyptian’s perspective; irrespective of whether the classifier was inputted deliberately or as a result of rote copying. The use of classifier was sensitive to the geographic position of the placename, but this did not mean that every placename was written consistently. The use of these originally ideographic signs as categorical classificatory prototypes tends to support some tenants of the so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, that language can affect thought and cognition.
Chapter 3: The Historic, Geographic, and Archaeological Context

3.1 Egyptians outside Egypt: The historical and archaeological context

While this thesis is devoted to textual evidence of placenames, it follows that a toponym’s existence is predicated by Egyptian presence in the region. Local archaeological material and inscriptions suggest a greater familiarity and awareness of the local geography, which ideally should be reflected in the toponymic record. No attempt will be given here to provide a historical narrative of the regions under discussion, as this has been performed by several works most notably Sidebotham’s *The Red Land* and the studies of Banard and Duistermaat, as well as Manzo.135 Beyond mines and quarries themselves, the main archaeological legacy of Egyptian expeditions are the rock inscriptions left by Egyptian officials. These are common in the wadis of the Eastern Desert, Sinai, and Nubia and indicate the presence of Egyptian officials en-route to quarries or trading expeditions.136 While many of these texts are little more than short prosopographical notes, giving the name and title of an Egyptian official, their mere presence indicates firsthand knowledge of the desert regions as well as the routes taken by literate or semi-literate Egyptians. This is especially beneficial as other archaeological material, such as ceramics and quarrying remains, could indicate activity by non-Egyptians. A summary of the archaeological and epigraphic evidence can provide a framework and context for the Egyptian toponymy of these regions.

3.2 Zone 1: The Eastern Desert

Egyptian interest in the Eastern Desert is generally centred on the exploitation of its geological wealth, although the area was also used for trade routes and presumably hunting.137 The geology

---


137 While mining and trading may easily be inferred from archaeological data, hunting, as an archaeological activity, is difficult to identify. For petroglyphs depicting hunting in the northern Eastern Desert in the late Predynastic, see J. Hobbs, ‘Leopard-Hunting Scenes in Dated Rock Paintings from the Northern Eastern Desert of Egypt’, *Sahara* 7 (1995), 7-16. The title im.y-rA nw.w ‘overseer of scouts/hunters’ may also refer to personages involved in desert hunting. As an occupation, and its association with the activities of Medjay, see K. Liszka, ‘Medjay (no. 188) in the Onomasticon
of the Eastern Desert provided many opportunities for the mining and quarrying of various stones and minerals. It is this geological wealth to which one can ascribe the majority of Egyptian activity in the Eastern Desert, as attested in the local epigraphic record which makes frequent reference to officials involved in quarrying and prospecting.

As early as the Predynastic, there is evidence that Egyptians exploited the mineral wealth of the Eastern Desert. Klemm, Klemm, and Murr have identified several Predynastic and Early Dynastic gold mines throughout the region, characterised by the smooth walls of the mining trenches. Surprisingly, the earliest documented gold mining site is far from the Nile, at Umm Eleiga, in the vicinity of the Red Sea, where surface gold in the form of nuggets could have been freely obtained without subterranean mining or extensive panning. An Early Dynastic locus of copper mining occurred in the Eastern Desert near Middle Egypt, at Wadi Dara, Wadi Umm Balad, and Gebel el-Urf. Rock art throughout the Eastern Desert often shares motifs present on Naqada decorated ware (D-Ware) and may be some of the earliest evidence of Nile Valley dwellers foraying into the Desert. A lone hut at Wadi Umm Sidrah contains Early Dynastic ceramics, a testament to some interest in the further Eastern Desert of Middle Egypt. Other Predynastic quarries and mines are known in the region of Wadi Hammamat, Wadi Umm Balad, and other sites. From this evidence, it is clear that mining in the Eastern Desert by Nile Valley dwellers is as old as the Egyptian state itself.

---


141 At Wadi Umm Balad there is a serekh of a Protodynastic King @w.t-@r.w, see G. Castel, C. Köhler, B. Mathieu, G. Pouit, ‘Les mines du Ouadi Um Balad (désert oriental)’, *BIFAO* 98 (1998), 57-87.


This mining activity continued in the Eastern Desert in almost all subsequent periods and by the New Kingdom had expanded from the central gold nodes of the Eastern Desert east of Coptos and Edfu to the Nubian Desert as far south as Port Sudan (Fig. 5).\textsuperscript{145} Mining aimed at the excavation of stone is well known throughout the Eastern Desert at various sites, most notably at Hatnub (calcite) and Wadi Hammamat (greywacke, siltstone, breccia verde) (Fig. 6). The spatial and chronological distribution of Egyptian stone-mining in the Eastern Desert has been collated by Harrell and Stormeyr and others, so there is now a fairly thorough picture of geological exploitation in the Eastern Desert, both in terms of spatial and geological diversity. With the addition of the gold-mining surveys of Rosemarie and Dietrich Klemm, one can appreciate the full extent of Egyptian geological interest in the Eastern Desert, much of it being pharaonic in date.

Figure 5: Ancient goldmines of the Eastern Desert, from Klemm & Klemm, *Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia*, 52.
The difficulty of dating archaeological material in the Eastern Desert that is not associated with ceramic assemblages has led to the use of local rock art and lapidary inscriptions to explain the history of Egyptian activity in the area. These are most prevalent and well documented in east-west valleys such as Wadi Hammamat, and several other associated wadis to the south (Wadi

---

Isa, Wadi Meniah, Wadi Qash),\(^{147}\) but are also found in a myriad of other sites including Wadi Sanur,\(^{148}\) Gebel Ahmar,\(^{149}\) Wadi el-Anqabiya el-Rawayan,\(^{150}\) Wadi Barramiya (and associated wadis),\(^{151}\) Wadi Kanais (Wadi Mia),\(^{152}\) Wadi el-Hudi,\(^{153}\) Wadi Allaqi,\(^{154}\) the ‘Korosko Road’,\(^{155}\) Abrak,\(^{156}\) Wadi Alam,\(^{157}\) Gebel el-Zeit,\(^{158}\) and Hatnub.\(^{159}\) Many pharaonic mines and quarries at sites such as Wadi Arabah (Abu el-Maysa),\(^{160}\) Wadi Umm Balad, Gebel el-Urf, and Gebel Manzal as-Seyl are known through extensive archaeological remains, but lack any hieroglyphic rock inscriptions. Together, the mines and inscriptions paint a picture of extensive use of most parts of the desert, and a continued presence throughout the pharaonic era. Some wadis such as Wadi


\(^{149}\) There is no dedicated publication for the quartzite quarries at Gebel el-Ahmar; for summary notes see B. Aston, J. Harrell & I. Shaw ‘Stone’, in P. Nicholson & I. Shaw, \textit{Ancient Egyptian materials and Technology} (Cambridge, 2009), 53-54.

\(^{150}\) T. Townsend, ‘A XIIth Dynasty Inscription near the Cairo-Suez Road’, \textit{ASAE} 33 (1933), 1-5.


\(^{152}\) H. Gauthier, ‘Le temple de l’Ouâdi Miyah (El Knaïs)’, \textit{BIFAO} 17 (1920), 1-38; see also KRI I, 65-73.


\(^{159}\) R. Anthes, \textit{Die Felsinschriften von Hatnub} (Leipzig, 1928).

\(^{160}\) Note there are two ‘Wadi Arabah’s’ mentioned in this thesis, one in the Eastern Desert, the other in Edom. The notable pharaonic material includes Old and Middle Kingdom mining camps as well as the vestiges of desert tracks and cairns, see Y. Tristant, ‘Nouvelles découvertes dans le désert Oriental. Le ouadi Araba de la préhistoire à l’époque copte’ \textit{BSFE} 182 (2012), 41-45. On this mine, see also G. Murray, ‘A New Empire (?) Copper Mine in the Wadi’Araba’, \textit{JAE} 51 (1951), 217-18.
Arabah, Wadi Saqi, Wadi Hammamat, and perhaps Wadi Barramiya may have acted as thoroughfares to the Red Sea coast.

It is difficult to speak of the southern reaches of the Eastern Desert, the Atbai, archaeologically, without considering Nubian Nile. At various points throughout pharaonic history, the Egyptian state expanded its boundaries into Lower and Upper Nubia, establishing a local administration based on the Nile. Control of Nubia was particularly strong in periods of political stability (Old, Middle and New Kingdoms) and correspondingly weak in the Intermediate Periods. The Egyptian boundary reached its southern zenith at Kurgus in the middle of the New Kingdom, allowing Egypt to control and monopolise the peripheral goldmining areas of the Atbai. Whatever their motivations, be they ideological, economic, or pure opportunism, at least part of Egypt’s expansion was probably stimulated and motivated by a desire for gold in the Nubian Eastern Desert. Controlling the confluences to these wadis on the Nile, chiefly Wadi Allaqi, allowed the Egyptians to exploit the large gold deposits in the Nubian Eastern Desert. This was made possible by a series of large mud brick ‘forts’ established along the Nile at sites like Buhen, Semna, and Aniba. Their function, as emphasised by many authorities, was equally defensive and economic, allowing Egyptians to control traffic along the Nile and defend Egyptian economic interests.

The Eastern Desert can be best termed as a ‘hinterland’ of the pharaonic state, subject to semi-regular expeditions by Egyptians. There are no indications that the Eastern Desert was considered an inalienable part of Egypt, nor was it ever completely subjugated, even in the Graeco-Roman Period. However, as the pharaonic state had a virtual monopoly on the exploitation of this region (at least north of Nubia), most of the geographic vocabulary is likely to be Egyptian. But in the southern reaches of the Eastern Desert, especially nearing the coast, Egyptian activity is likely to have been ephemeral, with very few inscriptions or archaeological material indicating a regular presence.

3.2.1 The Inhabitants of the Eastern Desert

Some scholars have proposed the existence of an indigenous Eastern Desert culture contemporary to the pharaonic period. However, there is very little data to suggest permanent habitation after


\[162\] For a summary of the Nubian forts and their function, consult L. Török, *Between Two Worlds: the frontier region between Nubia and Egypt* (Leiden, 2009), 84-92, 182-196.

the prehistoric periods. There have been a few systematic surveys in the region, and these have generally not been able to identify incontestable remains of a local population in the second millennium BCE. There is, however, some archaeological data in the southern regions of the desert, the Atbai, for indigenous occupation. Throughout the pharaonic period various ‘foreign’ archaeological cultures have been identified in Nubia and Egypt, particularly the C-Group (2300-1500 BC), the Pan-Grave Culture (roughly contemporary with the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period), and the Gash Group further south in Kassala. It has been assumed especially of the Pan-Grave and C-Group cultures that at least some of their population lived and/or originated in the Eastern Desert. As Bintliff and Barnard emphasise, research conducted in the Eastern Desert is not geared to understanding its indigenous inhabitants:

Archaeological evidence on the dwellers of the desert is equally scarce. The emphasis of research has been on the more visible and easier-to-interpret remains of the mines, quarries, trade routes, and inscriptions left by outsiders. It has only recently been appreciated that sufficient archaeological remains may be present to allow conclusions on the lifestyle and culture of the native dwellers of the desert.

Verifiable depictions of the indigenous groups in Egyptian artistic representation are also lacking. Chassinat considered the depiction of an emaciated cattle-herder with ‘fuzzy’ hair in the tomb of Senbi at Meir as belonging to a Beja nomad, but there is no supporting inscription that can prove this identification. Indeed, the individual could be just as convincingly be interpreted as an itinerant Egyptian. Another relief of emaciated individuals on the causeway of Unas has been

164 See M. Hoffman, *Egypt before the Pharaohs* (London, 1980), 247. There were people hunting in the Gebel Galala contemporary with the Predynastic, see Hobbs, *Sahara* 7, 7-16. A. Bonmann, ‘Wadi Abu Had-Wadi Dib, Eastern Desert’, *JEA* 81 (1994), 14-16 reports material from Dynasty 0 to the Old Kingdom in the deserts east of Middle Egypt.


interpreted as depicting Beja herders, but Vercoutter has rightly rejected this overtly simplistic equation between an image and distinct ethno-linguistic groups.\textsuperscript{169}

The Blemmyes, an Eastern Desert culture of classical and late antiquity, have been associated with Eastern Desert Ware (Fourth-Seventh Centuries CE), a local ceramic culture found in the Eastern Desert south of Wadi Hammamat.\textsuperscript{170} This culture is thus the first easily materially identifiable inhabitants of the region after the Neolithic. In the relevant scholarship, the Pan-Grave assemblages are usually mentioned as representing the indigenous inhabitants of the Eastern Desert, but even here the great majority of sites are located on the Nile, not in the desert. This archaeological culture, quite distinct from Egyptian material culture, is marked by its distinctive shallow graves and pottery.\textsuperscript{171} As the majority of Pan-Grave sites are found in the Nile Valley between the Second Cataract and Middle Egypt, the issue has been raised by a number of scholars as to whether Pan-Grave people are actually connected at all to the Eastern Desert.\textsuperscript{172} Isolated finds of second millennium ceramics (Kerma, C-Group, Pan-Grave) are known throughout the Eastern Desert, especially at Mersa Gawasis and in the bend of the Nile (the Korosko Road).\textsuperscript{173} Sites further afield in Khor Ariab, Erkowit, and Khor Arbaat also have purported third or second millennium ceramic remains, but very little is known of their cultural affiliation and date.\textsuperscript{174} Further north, in the Eastern Desert of Lower Egypt, it appears there is little data for permanent habitation in this period. The Old Kingdom inscription of Pepinakht and a Ramesside stele found at Wadi Sannur may indicate that the desert east of Middle and Lower Egypt may have been inhabited by foreign nomads.\textsuperscript{175} But not until the Byzantine and Coptic


\textsuperscript{170} For the present picture of Blemmyean material culture, see G. Lassányi, ‘Tumulus Burials and the Nomadic Population of the Eastern Desert in Late Antiquity’, in W. Godlewski & A. Latjar (eds), Between the Cataracts: proceedings of the 11th Conference for Nubian studies, Warsaw University, 27 August-2 September 2006 (Warsaw, 2010), 595-602.

\textsuperscript{171} For the latest distribution of Pan-Grave sites, see K. Liszka, A Study of the Medjay and Pangrave as an Ethnic group and as Mercenaries, (University of Pennsylvania, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, 2012), 556-558.


\textsuperscript{175} For the inscription of Pepinakht, see the interpretation in section 4.2.3. The Ramesside stele of Wadi Sannur depicts foreigners in a smiting scene, for which see Barta, \textit{MDAIK} 20, 98-101. While this may
periods is there incontestable evidence for foreigners in this region, where nomadic ‘Saracens’ are documented in the environs of the monasteries of Saint Anthony and Saint Paul.176

3.3 Zone 2: The South Sinai, Edom, and Midian

This study will not deal with the northern regions of the Sinai – the Mediterranean Coast, El-Arish, and the ancient ‘Ways of Horus’. While this area is worthy of a toponymic study, it has been the subject of considerable investigation and the historical geography of the area has been satisfactorily reconstructed.177 The north Sinai, being the major route between Egypt and the Near East, has much more in common with Levantine geography. Egyptian sources agree with this equation, where the bureaucratic titles such as ‘overseer of the door of the northern foreign countries’ and ‘overseer of northern foreign countries’ apply to individuals who operated in the Northern Sinai.178 Furthermore, Egyptian geographic thinking certainly groups the South Sinai area under the umbrella of ‘East’, with inscriptions from Serabit el-Khadim and Wadi Maghara indicating that the region of the southern Sinai was the domain of Sopdu, lord of the east (nb-ỉỉb.t). Understandably, some Egyptian terminology will overlap between North and South Sinai, especially in regards to ethnica.

Like the Eastern Desert, the Sinai was inhabited by semi-nomadic pastoralists who were in the area from at least the Neolithic Period, being strongly associated materially with the occupants in the nearby Negev Desert.179 The interaction of the Egyptians with local inhabitants, probably speakers of a Semitic language, can be attested from a variety of sources, most notably the inscriptions at Serabit el-Khadim and Wadi Maghara. Even in the Early Dynastic period the area must have been the locus of significant exchange between Asiatics and Egyptians, and by the Middle Kingdom Asiatics are explicitly listed as members of Egyptian mining expeditions.180 Furthermore, the occurrence of the so-called Proto-Sinaitic or Proto-Canaanite script, an alphabet based on hieroglyphic signs used to write an early form of the Canaanite Language at Serabit el-

178 Especially when overseers in the South Sinai are merely given the title ‘overseer of foreign lands’, see W. Murnane, ‘Overseer of the Northern Foreign Countries: Reflections on the Upper Administration of Egypt's Empire in Western Asia’, in J. Van Dijk (ed.), Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Hermann te Velde (Groningen, 1997), 251-258.
Khadem, are a testament to cross-cultural exchange between Egyptians and Semitic speakers in the area.181

The southern part of the peninsula, like the Eastern Desert, was exploited by Nile Valley dwellers for its geological wealth. Its proximity to Egypt meant that the Egyptians were able to directly exploit much of this material, most notably turquoise, malachite, and copper, through state run expeditions. However, the archaeological surveys suggest that only a small part of the Sinai was regularly visited by Egyptians. An Old Kingdom fort or waystation has been identified by Mumford at Tell Ras Budran station (site 345) on the El Markha plain on the coast, which may have been the access point for ships plying across the Gulf of Suez.182 The major focus of Egyptian activity was east of this site in the hills where there were local deposits of malachite, copper and turquoise. The inscriptions at Wadi Maghara show Egyptian activity from as early as the First Dynasty, while the mining settlement and temple at Serabit el-Khadem was constructed in the Middle Kingdom. Inscriptions at Wadi Kharig, Wadi Ahmar (site 702B), and Rod el-Air and Gebel Hazbar show that many of the hills east of the El-Markha plain were explored and mined by Nile Valley Egyptians.183 Recent epigraphic discoveries by Tallet in Wadi ᶜAmeyra and Wadi el-Humur in the reign of Den and Iry-Hor date Egyptian activity in this region as early as Dynasty 0.184

The majority of Egyptian activity in the South Sinai is located around the Gulf of Suez. However, there are many other ancient copper mining sites throughout the peninsula which bear no specific archaeological remains of Egyptian activity.185 The remains of the extensive copper mines at Timna, including an ‘Egyptianizing’ Hathor temple, reveal pharaonic presence at the head of the


Gulf of Aqaba. The earliest inscriptive material is dated to the reign of Seti I and there is little evidence for occupation before the Ramesside Period.\textsuperscript{186} The isle of Geziret Faraʿun near the head of the Gulf of Aqaba may have acted as a staging post for Egyptian expeditions to Timna and the Gulf of Aqaba, but the earliest material identified in Rothenberg’s survey was Iron Age Qurayya and Negev ware. Consequently, all that can be said vis-à-vis Egyptian interests is that the island was probably occupied by a local population in the Ramesside period.\textsuperscript{187} As such, most of pharaonic activity in the Sinai was centred on the south western part of the peninsula, but it is nevertheless possible that Egyptians were aware of a large part of the Sinai, especially given the mining opportunities on the other side of the peninsula at Timna. To access these areas the Egyptians must have passed overland in the Tih Plateau and central Sinai, or sailed in the Gulf of Aqaba, circumnavigating most of the southern half of the peninsula.\textsuperscript{188} It can be assumed with some confidence, therefore, that at least by the Ramesside period Egyptians were well versed in the geography of the Sinai Peninsula, a result of both mineral exploitation and constant interaction with its inhabitants.

\subsection{3.3.1 The Sinai Nomads}

Textual sources indicate that the Sinai was not uninhabited when Egyptians began their mining expeditions. These groups are usually called \textit{MnTw} in Old Kingdom sources, while in later sources groups such as \textit{ṣm.w} (from the late Old Kingdom and onwards) and \textit{Ṣṣs.w} (New Kingdom) are also connected with the Sinai Peninsula. Archaeologically, many small settlements have been found in the Sinai dating to EB II (c. 3000-2700 BCE), all of which are materially Canaanite and have been compared with sites in the Negev and particularly Arad further north.\textsuperscript{189} A notable feature present at many of the sites is copper objects, explaining the raison d’être for these sites as mining and smelting establishments.\textsuperscript{190} The paucity of Egyptian pottery at these sites seems to suggest that Egyptians had little contact with the Southern Sinai. Yet, we know from local rock inscriptions in the Sinai and commemorative tablets that Egyptians had been militarily involved in


\textsuperscript{187} A. Flinder, ‘The island of Jezirat Faraʿun’, \textit{The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration} (1977), 127-139; B. Rothenberg, \textit{God’s Wilderness} (London, 1965), 91 n. 2. Despite Rothenberg’s comments, Flinder doubts the need for an Egyptian harbour in the area. Only further fieldwork on the isle and the surrounding littoral of the Gulf of Aqaba (including Tiran and Saudi Arabia) will reveal the extent of Egyptian expeditions into this area.

\textsuperscript{188} For a discussion of these routes see \textsuperscript{54}.


\textsuperscript{190} K. Sowada, \textit{Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom: An Archaeological Perspective} (Göttingen, 2009), 46-47.
the Sinai as early as King Den in the First Dynasty. The abandonment of many of the EB II sites in the South Sinai has been attributed to Egyptian military activity in the area, a development which is certainly witnessed by local Egyptian rock inscriptions. The last indigenous settlements in the Southern Sinai disappear in EB IV (~Eleventh Dynasty), suggesting that after the Middle Kingdom, Egyptians had driven the indigenous inhabitants from the region. Asiatics ("šm.w) still occur in the inscriptions at Serabit, and the local Canaanite ‘Proto-Sinaitic’ script is a testament to the continued interest of foreigners in the Sinai Peninsula.

3.3.2 Midian and the Hejaz

There is little direct evidence for Egyptian links with the area of Midian and the contiguous Arabian Peninsula. The only direct evidence of contacts comes in the form of a cartouche of Ramesses III in Tayma, which bears stylistic similarities to other inscribed cartouches in the Sinai, leading Somaglino and Tallet to posit a direct trade route from the head of the Gulf of Suez to Timna and thence to Midian and the Tayma Oasis (Fig. 7). Parr proposed the existence of an Egyptian maritime route to Al-Sharmah (near Aynunah) and thence overland to Tayma. The issue of second millennium BCE Egyptian influence in Midian was the subject of research by Sperveslage and Eichmann, but they were unable to point to much more than seals and Egyptianizing objects in the occupation strata at Tayma for trade between Egypt and north Arabia. Given the contemporary remains at Timna it is likely that this Arabian route and connection was only present in the Ramesside period.

192 See Sowada, Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean During the Old Kingdom, 47.
Other arguments based on circumstantial evidence have been made for Egyptian contact with North Arabia. The placename *Kwsyw* of Sinuhe’s travels has been equated with the Cush and Midian of Biblical literature, but this equation is conjecture.\(^{197}\) Parr, in his assessment of Qurayya ware (also known as ‘Midianite ware’), compares its decorative style with Egyptian motifs, and postulates direct trade routes linking Egypt and Midian.\(^{198}\) But even then, this supposed connection would only date to the late Ramesside period. At the Hathor Temple site in Timna, up to a quarter of the ceramics are Qurayya-ware, thus suggesting some sort of local cooperation in copper mining in the Arabah.

\(^{197}\) For this argument, see G. Posener, *Princes et pays d’Asie et Nubie* (Brussels, 1940), 88-89.

3.4 Zone 3: The Southern Atbai and further Red Sea

In the terms of this study, the Red Sea is a geographically ambiguous area. It applies here to the body of water itself, as well as all regions bordering the Red Sea and their littorals: the coasts of Sudan, Eritrea, Djibouti, Yemen, and Saudi Arabia. This treatise will evaluate pharaonic evidence for usage of the Red Sea, as well as possibilities for Egyptian long distance trade and awareness with more distant regions on the Arabian and Eritrean shores of the Red Sea. The dominant features of this area are the coastal littorals, on the Arabian side there is the Tihama, a desolate coast stretching from Yemen to Saudi Arabia, while, on the African coast, an arid desert dominates the landscape from Egypt to the Danakil Desert of Eritrea and Djibouti.

In the last decade, knowledge of pharaonic Egypt’s involvement in the Red Sea has been revolutionised by a series of research projects and archaeological discoveries. Excavations at Mersa Gawasis have shown that Egypt was involved in maritime trade routes on the Red Sea. Furthermore, work in the Atbai and Kassala regions of Sudan have contextualised Egypt’s situation at the periphery of the trade routes of the Afro-Arabian Circuit, a trade network that was capable of shifting goods between Arabia, the Horn of Africa, and the Nile Valley. The exchange between the Nile Valley and the Red Sea is the subject of Andrea Manzo’s Échanges et contacts le long du Nil et de la Mer Rouge dans l’époque protohistorique, which has compiled much of the relevant archaeological data on the subject.

From these works, it is clear that trade networks between the Nile Valley and the Red Sea have been securely dated to the prehistoric period, even if there is little direct evidence for this trade. Imported objects like Red Sea shells have been found in Predynastic graves in the Nile Valley, and obsidian was traded throughout the Red Sea to Egypt from sources in Eritrea and perhaps Yemen. Egyptian texts of the historic periods state that aromatics, gold, ebony, and many other

---


200 Manzo, Échanges et contacts le long du Nil et de la Mer Rouge dans l’époque protohistorique, 40-63.

goods hailed from Punt. But few archaeological identifiable goods can be attributed with certainty to Red Sea trade.

Until the 1970’s, the only ancient ports along the Red Sea coast of Egypt and Sudan were Graeco-Roman establishments such as Myos Hormos (Quseir), Nechesia (Marsa Nakari) and Berenike as well as the more distant Ptolemais Theron and Adulis (modern Zula). Such ports were well known through the Greek gazetteer of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* and/or archaeological excavation.\(^{202}\) The existence of a Red-Sea canal in the pharaonic period is a vexed issue, but it is certain that by the time of Darius I (522-486 BCE) a canal of some proportions linked the Nile with the Red Sea through Wadi Tumilat.\(^{203}\) The stele erected by Darius to celebrate this canal made reference to a toponym hitherto unknown in Egyptian texts, $\text{Ṣḥib}(t)$, which possibly refers to Saba in Yemen.\(^{204}\) There is a classical tradition of an earlier canal from Herodotus,\(^{205}\) although this is likely a product of conflated traditions. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that there was a demand for such a canal when ships in the pharaonic period could be easily disassembled and transported overland, as was most likely the case on several expeditions to Punt.\(^{206}\)

### 3.4.1 Egypt’s Gateway to the Red Sea: Harbour sites in the Eastern Desert

The only substantial pharaonic remains found on the Red Sea which indicate pharaonic Egyptian trade are the sites of Ayn Soukhna, Wadi el-Jarf, and Mersa Gawasis and to a lesser extent Clyisma. At Ayn Soukhna, local epigraphic evidence demonstrates the use of the port to facilitate expeditions between Egypt and the turquoise and copper mines in the Sinai.\(^{207}\) Not far to the south, near the monastery of Saint Paul, more pharaonic port facilities have been discovered at Wadi el-

---


\(^{204}\) E. Uphill, ‘An ancient maritime link with Arabia’, *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 18 (1988), 166-167. For the text, see G. Posener, *La première domination perse en Égypte* (Le Caire, 1936), 58-59. Schiaparelli, *La geografia dell’Africa orientale*, 266-267 references the older opinion of Brugsch that equated $\text{Ṣḥib}(t)$ with $\Sigma\upsilon\beta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ of Ptolemy, which would place this name somewhere near Massawa in Eritrea.


\(^{206}\) For this practice, see P. Creasman & N. Doyle, ‘Overland Boat Transportation during the Pharaonic Period: Archaeology and Iconography’, *JAEI* 2 (2010), 14-30.

Jarf. This port, in addition to galleries for storing boats, also preserves a breakwall to shield ships from the ocean currents. Within this artificial harbour, the first in-situ pharaonic anchors were found. All these facilities are characterised by galleries cut into the coastal hills in which goods and nautical equipment could be stored. According to Tallet, while Wadi el-Jarf was the earliest port established on the Red Sea, it was likely abandoned in the Fourth Dynasty, while Ayn Soukhna continued in use until the New Kingdom. While both these sites were used mainly to facilitate transport to and from the Egyptian mines in the Sinai, it seems plausible that Ayn Soukhna at least was also used for commerce to Punt.

It would seem likely that a port existed at the head of the Gulf of Suez (Gr. Clyisma, Arabic Al-Qulzum) at least in the late New Kingdom. However, the Ramesside site was poorly published and inscriptive material is confined to a block with a relief of Ramesses II and enclosure walls. A large permanent settlement in the area is not to be expected, as there is little in the way of local water sources, the nearest well being several miles to the southeast at Ayn Musa. The proximity of Clyisma to Ayn Soukhna may also have meant that there was little advantage in establishing port facilities further north until the abandonment of Ayn Soukhna at some point in the transition between the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties.

Mersa Gawasis, a port discovered by Abdel Monem Sayed in the late 1970’s, illustrated that pharaonic Egypt launched maritime voyages on the Red Sea. Ongoing excavations directed by Rodolfo Fattovich and Kathryn Bard have conclusively shown the site to be a transit port for products bound from the Egyptian land of Pwnt and Bil-Pwnt. The site has completely revolutionised the evidence for Egyptian activity on the Red Sea and thrown new light on the Egyptians’ seafaring ability, with ship timbers, anchors, and ropes demonstrating the maritime

210 Obsidian fragments were recently unearthed in Old Kingdom remains at Ayn Soukhna, reported briefly in P. Tallet, ‘Deux notes sur les Expéditions au Pays de Pount’, *RdÉ* 64 (2013), 191 n. 13. This is clinching evidence for Puntite trade, given that this East African import is also encountered at Mersa Gawasis, Professor Pierre Tallet (Personal Communication).
purpose of the site. Furthermore, at Mersa Gawasis, a considerable number of texts (ostraca and stele) confirm its use as a transit port for Punt (see toponyms [82] and [85]), making it the only site which can be definitively connected with Puntite commerce. The identification of foreign Nubian and Southern Red Sea ceramics (both African and Arabian) suggests the inclusion of this site in trade networks that encompassed both sides of the Red Sea. Mahfouz has suggested the port was also used for expeditions to the Sinai, but the textual evidence is somewhat circumstantial on this matter. The excavators have been able to find only a handful of questionable early New Kingdom ceramics at the site, thus raising the issue of whether there is another harbour site with New Kingdom material to be discovered nearby on the Quseir-Safaga coast.

3.4.2 Egyptians and the Red Sea

Egyptian sources themselves do not specifically depict or describe any of the ethnic groups that occupied these regions, apart from the Pwnt.yw ‘Puntites’. Saleh also considered the Gnbtw mentioned in the annals of Thutmose III as referring to the occupant of the South Arabian Qataban Kingdom. Outside textual sources, Puntites are depicted in a number of representations. The most famous and informative are the inscriptions from the Middle Terrace at Deir el-Bahri, where the Puntites are depicted in the context of Hatshepsut’s expeditionary narrative to obtain myrrh. These reliefs have been the subject of an almost encyclopaedic volume of literature. Earlier reliefs in Sahure’s funerary complex may depict Puntites, and a number of New Kingdom Tombs (TT39, TT89, TT100, TT143, and the Amarna tomb of Meryre) depict Puntites bringing tribute for the tomb owner. Bearded Puntites were also depicted on a scene at Karnak under Horemheb. It is well known that Egyptians constructed archetypal images of foreigners, and thus the gap between accurate rendition and stereotype should not be underestimated. In this context, the Puntites seem to have a similar short cap-like or shoulder length hair, often decorated with a fillet, with the images at Deir el-Bahri showing the Puntite ruler, Pirhw, with a short chin-

---


218 See E. Naville, Deir el-Bahari (London, 1898), III, pl. 69-83.


220 See W. Wreszinski, Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte (Leipzig, 1923), II, pl. 60.
beard, and the Puntite Queen as an obese woman. This ethnic information is insufficient to identify who the Puntites were, but their forms are at least distinct enough to differentiate them from Nubians and Asians.

Scholarship remains divided as to the extent of the Egyptians’ exploration, awareness and knowledge of the Red Sea in the third and second millennium BCE. Despite the proximity of Egypt to Arabia, the first clear words in Egyptian documents that designate the inhabitants of the Arabian peninsula are from Demotic documents of the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty and later, šrby and Hgr. A Demotic mythological cycle of the First-Second Centuries CE mentions a specific North Arabian Kingdom, Liyana (Lhyny). But no Arabian terminology is present in earlier documentation. Sayed produces strong arguments for no direct contact between Egypt and Arabia before the Ptolemaic period. Uphill essentially maintained the same thesis, but pushed this date back to Persian period. Kitchen also maintains a minimal model, where Egyptian interactions were confined to the African shores of the Red Sea, with cross Red Sea trade being conducted by local groups present on the African and Arabian shores. Most scholars conclude that pre-Ptolemaic Arabian-Egyptian trade took place via the inland route along the Arabian Peninsula and thence to Gaza and Egypt. This leaves open the possibility of Arabian trade conducted by intermediaries in Palestine without the requirement for direct maritime routes between Egypt and Arabia. Too little is known about the local archaeology at coastal sites, both in Africa and Arabia, to construct any solid model for trading interactions. At the very minimum, Egyptian vessels must have semi-frequently plied the waters between Egypt, the Sinai, and the southern Sudan and thus participated in extensive trade networks that encompassed East Africa and perhaps Arabia.

---

221 The different images of Puntites are catalogued in A. Espinel, Abriendo los caminos de Punt: contactos entre Egipto y el ámbito afroárabe durante la Edad del Bronce (ca. 3000 a.C.-1065 a.C.) (Barcelona, 2011), 450. For the Queen specifically, see P. Scholz, ‘Fürstin Iti - “Schönheit” aus Punt’, SAK 11 (1984), 529-556, who relates the representation to themes of fertility in Hathor and typically African representations of Queens and mothers. The appearance of cuffs on the Queen can also be related to a Pan-East African ornamental tradition, for which see S. Wenig, ‘Die ‘Stulpen’, in Kusch und äthiopische Unterarmmanschetten: Ein Zusammenhang’, Der Antike Sudan 23 (2012), 91-104.


223 K. Ryholt, Narrative literature from the Tebtunis Temple Library (Copenhagen, 2012), 57-58.


3.4.3 The Archaeology of the Southern Red Sea: The Atbai, Eritrea, and Tihama

Archaeological survey on the Red Sea shores is in its infancy, and barely any second millennium BCE sites have been identified on the African coast. The most significant centres excavated thus far are inland sites near Kassala and the Gash River, which have christened the eponymous Gash Group (c. 2700-1500BC).\(^{228}\) This material culture dominated the Kassala area of Eastern Sudan and the lowlands of Eritrea, while the distinctive funerary stele common in Gash Group graves bear a superficial resemblance to similar monuments at Aqiq on the Red Sea coast.\(^{229}\) Surveys in the southern Atbai have exposed sporadic Egyptian finds such as those at Mahal Teglinos and Jebel Mokram.\(^{230}\) Supposed ‘Pan-Grave’ ceramics are frequently mentioned in archaeological reports at sites like Erkowit and Agordat, but their relation to the actual ‘Pan-Grave’ culture that flourished on the Egyptian and Nubian Nile is presently unknown.\(^{231}\) Agordat is a good example of the trade networks that flourished in East Africa at the time. A cave shelter at the site has purportedly revealed Gash Group, Pan-Grave/Gebel Mokram, C-Group, and Pre-Aksumite ceramics in differing contexts.\(^{232}\)

Further south and east, the archaeological cultures on the African Red Sea coast are difficult to fit into any established cultural group, and Fattovich describes their ceramics as influenced by both Arabian Tihama (Sabir culture) and the Nile Valley (Kerma culture).\(^{233}\) However, indigenous developments also need to be stressed. The sedentary Ona Group flourished around Asmara in the

---


late second and first millennium BCE, although recent $^{14}$C dates would suggest this group probably emerged in the early first millennium BCE. The best known port in the region was the later Aksumite site of Adulis/Zula, well attested in classical sources as the chief trade port of the region and a gateway to the Ethiopian Highlands and Aksum. Manzo and Zazzaro have recently designated some of the older pre-Aksumite ceramics at Adulis as an indigenous ‘Adulitan ware’, cautiously dating some of this material to the second millennium BCE. This ware occurs in the lowest level of Adulis and is considered to represent a local coastal tradition which stretches to Djibouti. There are, however, no imported Egyptian objects among current surveys that would suggest recurrent Egyptian contact with these groups. It has been assumed that in the area of the Eritrean/Ethiopian highlands that a polity, identified in local inscriptions as $D^\text{cmt}$, arose in the pre-Aksumite period (c. 800BCE), but recent interpretations question any political unity in Ethiopia-Eritrea during this period. The origins of this culture are often stated to be South Arabian, but this early Ethiopic syncretic culture is more likely derived from elite emulation rather than wholesale colonisation or migration.

On the Arabian Tihama coast, archaeologists have been able to identify the ceramic traditions of the Sabir and Ma’layba cultures, coastal cultures which encompassed the Red Sea littoral from Aden as far north as the Farasan Islands in Saudi Arabia. More relevantly, ceramics from these assemblages have been identified at Mersa Gawasis on the Red Sea shore of Egypt. This coastal culture contrasts with that of the Yemeni highlands in the interior, which were occupied by agricultural Bronze Age cultures who constructed complex irrigation systems. Sites such as Marib and Saba have occupational strata dating back as early as 2500BC, with literate civilisation emerging in these kingdoms by the end of the second millennium BCE as is evidenced by the

---

234 The earliest $^{14}$C dates attributable to an Ona site is c. 1200 BCE at Mai Chiot, but the vast majority are from the early first millennium BCE: P. Schmidt, M. Curtis & Z. Teka, ‘The Ancient Ona Communities of the First Millennium BCE: Urban Precursors and Independent Development on the Asmara Plateau’, in Schmidt, Curtis & Teka (eds), The Archaeology of Ancient Eritrea, 143. For the Ona Culture more generally, see P. Schmidt, Historical Archaeology in Africa: representation, social memory and oral traditions (Lanham, 2006), 278-279.


237 M. Curtis, ‘New Perspectives for examining change and complexity in the northern horn of African during the 1st Millennium BCE’, in P. Schmidt, M. Curtis & Z. Teka (eds), The Archaeology of Ancient Eritrea, 340-345 stresses the use of South Arabian material culture and literary terms for purposes of legitimation and to ‘facilitate interregional interaction’.

Epigraphic South Arabian script.\textsuperscript{239} This script is also found on the African side of the Red Sea at Akkele Guzay in Eritrea, demonstrating the strong interactions between Africa and Arabia.\textsuperscript{240} There is little archaeological evidence in the Arabian Peninsula to suggest connections with Egypt in the third and second millennium BCE, apart from sporadic finds such as seals which might demonstrate emulation of Egyptian forms and motifs.\textsuperscript{241} Egyptian artefacts become much more prevalent in Arabia in the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty and the Graeco-Roman period, where seals, figurines, and other ‘Egyptianizing’ artefacts have been found.\textsuperscript{242} Egyptian activity in the Red Sea peaks from the reign of the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty King Necho II, after which regular trade continues into the Persian and Graeco-Roman periods.\textsuperscript{243} There is thus little to no archaeological evidence for direct contact between Egyptians and local cultures of Eritrea or Arabia. Any contact presumably took place on the littoral or the riverine corridors of the Atbara and Gash-Baraka where future surveys may reveal the possibilities of such interactions.

3.5 Conclusion

The archaeological and epigraphic material suggests that Egyptians had an intimate and continued knowledge of the Eastern Desert and South Sinai, with limited but important ventures on the Red Sea. However, survey work is still in its infancy in most of the areas under investigation. The Eastern Desert north of Wadi Hammamat has received little attention, the only extensive field surveys taking place in Wadi Arabah and Wadi Abu Had. Recent surveys and explorations in the Sinai are still discovering new pharaonic inscriptions. The situation is worse in the Sudanese and Eritrean coasts, with little excavation or survey being conducted outside the Kassala Region or the port of Adulis.\textsuperscript{244} Much of the Red Sea littoral has not been explored and archaeological work in these areas, both on the Arabian and African coast, could still yield relevant data on Egyptian contacts in the region. There are many significant sites in the area which, if surveyed, have the potential to fundamentally change our knowledge of Egyptians in the region. This is particularly true of areas around the Halaib triangle, the Tokar Delta, Adulis, and the Hejazi coast.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{239} These dates are given in K. Kitchen, \textit{Documentation for Ancient Arabia: Chronological Framework & Historical Sources} (Liverpool, 1994), 120-138.


\textsuperscript{242} Uphill, \textit{Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies} 18, 163.


\textsuperscript{244} The most comprehensive work on this region is Hinkel, \textit{The Archaeological Map of the Sudan VI: The Area of the Red Sea Coast and Northern Ethiopian Frontier}, 151-349. Lack of follow-up excavation at these sites has meant little to no traces of second millennium BCE inhabitants have been identified.
\end{footnotesize}
Chapter 4: Foreigners on the Periphery: the language and phonology of foreign names

4.1 Foreign ethnica

While this thesis is not devoted to ideas of identity and ethnicity as revealed in Egyptian sources, it is necessary to investigate the words that Egyptians used to denote inhabitants of the Eastern Desert and Red Sea, and how this interacted with their toponymic lexicon. As active units of historical geography, the names of different ethnic groups are important to any toponymic survey, and they are included mainly because of the assistance they provide in locating and grouping placenames. Individual ethnicities such as the Mḏ3.y, Nhš.y, and Ṣhs.w, as well as the older Twn.tyw and Mnt.w, have been the subject of extensive monographs, and they will be treated here only insofar as they can offer data on the location and language of these groups.

4.1.1 Eastern Desert Dwellers (Nhš.y, Mḏ3.y)

There is no all-encompassing term for inhabitants of the Eastern Desert in Egyptian sources. The word Nhš.y, while more commonly employed for ‘Nubians’ and ‘southerners’ in general, could be used for the inhabitants of the Eastern Desert (Medja-land). This impression is given by the autobiography of Weni, where all southern peoples, except the western Tmh.w, are identified as Nhš.y:²⁴⁶

\[ \text{iri.n hm}}} m\text{ Nhš.y Mḏ3 Nhšy } \text{Im3 Nhšy } m \text{ Ww3t Nhš.y } m \text{ K3w Nhš.y} \]
\[ \text{Tmh.w} \]

His majesty made an army... from Irtjet-Nehesy, Medjay-Nehesy, Yam-Nehesy, (and) from Wawat-Nehesy, from Kaau-Nehesy, and Tjemehu-Libyans.

From a study of the Semna Dispatches, Posener differentiated the Nhš.y from their neighbours in the Eastern Desert, the Medjay, and showed that at least in some documentary texts of the early Middle Kingdom (Semna Dispatches), the Nhš.y refers to Nubians on the Nile Valley.²⁴⁷ Rilly,


²⁴⁷ Uruk, I, 101.10-16.
²⁴⁸ G. Posener, ‘\( ^{248} \text{ZÄS} 83 \), 38-43.
concurring with this assessment, identifies Posener’s ‘true Nehesy’ in the Execration Texts as Nilo-Saharan Meroitic speakers, based on the phonological repertoire present in these onomastica.\(^{248}\) While this distinction may be maintained in these textual corpora, the same conclusion cannot hold for all texts, and, generally speaking when \(Nhs.y\) is used it is in such a flexible manner that it is best to simply translate it as ‘southerners’ or ‘Nubians’. Indeed, one can point to Egyptian conflicts in the Eastern Desert where the term \(Nhs.y\) is used of its inhabitants,\(^ {249}\) and thus in Egyptian texts the inhabitants of riverine Nubia were not always differentiated from desert-dwellers of the Atbai. Jiménez-Serrano has advanced a thesis that \(Nhs\) was originally a toponym in the Kerma region, based on a reading of an entry on the Palermo Stone as \(T3-nhs.\)\(^ {250}\)

While the orthography agrees with such an interpretation, it creates difficulties. If \(Nhs\) designated a region we would expect a simpler independent toponym \(Nhs\) (without \(t\)). Furthermore, if \(Nhs\) was a toponym, there would have been no reason to invent the very common expression \(T3-nhs.y\). The generic \(t\) is most commonly coupled with ethnica in Egyptian placenames.\(^ {251}\) Indeed linguists have generally preferred identifying the word \(Nhs.y\) with a moribund colour root for dark or brown, thus referring to any personage of marginally darker skin-tone than Egyptians.\(^ {252}\)

The ethnic-group Medjay (\(Mdj.y\)) are encountered in Middle Kingdom sources and onwards. The word is to be understood simply as the nisbe adjective of the toponym \(Mdj\), which is invariably located east of Lower Nubia (see entry [24]). The occurrence of Medjay in these texts is usually in the context of actions in Lower Nubia and their desert origin is explicit in the Middle Kingdom Semna Dispatches.\(^ {253}\) Alan Gardiner first surmised that, by the New Kingdom, the term no longer referred to a distinct ethnic group in Nubia, but an occupation relatable to desert patrols.\(^ {254}\) Significant debate continues as to whether this ethnic term is to be equated with the archaeological Pan-Grave culture.\(^ {255}\) In later texts the Medjay are specifically said to be from the \(h3s.t-13b.t\) ‘eastern hill-country’,\(^ {256}\) so even after the New Kingdom, when the Medjay are found throughout Egypt, there is still a cultural legacy that these nomads came from the east. No text before the New Kingdom unequivocally locates these peoples in the Eastern Desert of Upper or Lower Egypt, but rather in the deserts of Nubia, so it is not known if these peoples extended

---

\(^{248}\) C. Rilly, ‘Le nom de Saï et ses occurrences dans le textes meroïtiques’, \textit{CRIPEL} 26 (2006-2007), 305. On these distinctions see also K. Ryholt, \textit{The Political Situation in the Second Intermediate Period} (Copenhagen, 1997), 178-180

\(^{249}\) \textit{Urk. IV}, 1659; \textit{KRI VI}, 353.5.


\(^{251}\) For \(T3\)-placenames, see \textit{HWb}, 1400.

\(^{252}\) See the discussion in Zibelius, \textit{AOVN}, 141.

\(^{253}\) See the interpretation in K. Liszka, *“We have come from the well of Ibhet”: Ethnogenesis of the Medjay*, \textit{JEH} 4 (2011), 158.

\(^{254}\) \textit{AEO I}, 74ff.

\(^{255}\) These arguments are comprehensively discussed and problematized in Liszka, \textit{A Study of the Medjay and Pangrave as an ethnic group and as Mercenaries}, passim.

\(^{256}\) É. Chassinat, \textit{Le mystère d’Osiris au mois de Khoiak II} (Le Caire, 1968), 676-680.
northwards towards the deserts of Upper and Lower Egypt. An unpublished relief from the First Intermediate Period tomb of Shemai at Kom el-Koffar (near Coptos) depicts Medjay peoples, so it may be that this indicates some Medjay presence in the deserts east of Coptos.

4.1.2 Asiatics of the Sinai and Edom (*Iwn.tyw, MnT.yw, ₣3m.w, Š3s.w*)

Texts of the Old Kingdom have a variety of terms for the inhabitants of Sinai and the Levant, and it is quite difficult to draw distinctions between these peoples. Early inscriptions in the Sinai refer to the local enemies of Egyptians as the *MnT.yw* or *Iwn.tyw*. These groups are frequently encountered in the textual record and do not seem to be geographically anchored to any one location. *MnT.yw* are found in the Sinai and Libya, while *Iwn.tyw* are encountered in Nubia and Asia, including Sinai. In a later mythological text, there is even mention of the *Iwn.tyw* of the *w3ḏ-wr*, which might refer to local Red Sea pastoralists. They are also encountered in rock inscriptions at Wadi Hammamat. They are more regularly found in Nubia as the *Iwn.tyw T3-sty*, ‘the Iuntiu of the Bowland’, referring to foreigners in Egypt’s southern frontier around Aswan and beyond. The rather vague and geographically disparate use of these terms suggests that they were understood as general groups of aligned ethnica, perhaps to be conceived as ‘barbarians’, ‘nomads’, ‘bowmen’, and the like.

The ₣3m.w, as Redford maintains, was the general term for ‘Asiatic’, that is, dwellers of Canaan and the Levant. This group is encountered from the Sixth Dynasty onwards, in the context of the Eastern Delta, the Gulf of Suez, the South Sinai, and Canaan. A caveat with localising this group is that they seem to be highly mobile, being found in Egypt by the Middle

257 The relief is to be published by Dr Laila Azzam. A short note on this relief is also mentioned in D. Michaux-Colombot, ‘Pitfall concepts in the Round of ‘Nubia’: Ta-Sety, Nehesy, Medja, Maga and Punt Revisited’, in J. Anderson & D. Welsby (eds), *The Fourth Cataract and Beyond* (Leuven, 2014), 509.

258 A. Gardiner, T. Peet & J. Černý, *The Inscriptions of the Sinai* (London, 1952), I, no. 8, 10, 16, 112, 412. *MnT.yw* has been related to the verb *mnT* ‘winnow’, but this is a rather non-sensical meaning for a nomadic desert population. Takács (*EDE* III, 338) relates it to the Afroasiatic root *mlk* ‘stranger’, which may be a better fit semantically. Egyptian *n* for /l/ and *t* for /k/ are regular correspondences in Afroasiatic roots. *Iwn.tyw* appears to relate to the Egyptian word column, but see the interpretation in *Etnicidad y territorio*, 133.


263 See section 4.2.3.


265 In the Annals of Amenemhat II, ₣3m.w inhabit *Ḥnt.y-S* ‘Lebanon’, see H. Altenmüller & A. Moussa, ‘Die Inschrift Amenemhets II. aus Memphis’, *SAK* 18 (1991), 15.
Kingdom, and thus their presence at Sinai, for example, might not be as indigenes of the area, but rather as travelling expedition members. The *Hṛyw-š*, literally ‘ones-who-are-upon-the-sand’, is a descriptive ethneme referring to inhabitants of Egypt’s neighbouring deserts and does not seem to be used for a specific group. The former expression is well known from the Old Kingdom biographies of Weni and Pepinakht, where it seems to refer to nomads of the Sinai frontier.\(^{266}\) In the biography of Weni, they are qualified as the \(^{∀}m.w\ Hṛyw-š\), which could be a genitive or a conjunctive expression, and are given their own land *Tj-Hṛyw-š*.\(^{267}\)

By the New Kingdom the ethnic terminology had shifted and a new term, *Ṣṣs.w*, is found for Egypt’s Sinai and Asiatic neighbours. Much has been written about this group in both Egyptological and Near Eastern literature, especially in regards to their relationship to the Proto-Israelites of Hebrew traditions. The first attestation of this group is from the biography of Ahmose-Pen-Nekhbet, where they are mentioned as captives, a theme that endures throughout many New Kingdom texts.\(^{268}\) It thus appears that *Ṣṣs.w*, along with the more northerly \(^{∀}pr.w\), were part of the Egyptians’ new ethnic vocabulary of the New Kingdom to refer to nomads encountered in the Levant, updating, but not completely replacing, the older term \(^{∀}m.w\). From onomastic data, it is certain that the Shasu were Semitic speakers who in Egyptian sources almost certainly roamed through the Sinai, Edom, and Syria-Palestine, although there is some debate as how far they extended north into Syria-Palestine.\(^{269}\) Helck suggested that the *Ṣṣs.w* were the southerly nomads, located in Sinai and Transjordan, while the term \(^{∀}pr.w\) was used for nomads further north in Syria-Palestine.\(^{270}\) One papyrus even mentions *Ṣṣs.w* in the context of the Red Sea, although this text has provided problems in geographic interpretation.\(^{271}\) Indeed, the likely etymology of these nomads is a nominalised form of the verb \(Ṣṣ\) ‘to wander, roam’, somewhat debasing the idea that they should be confined to a particular region.\(^{272}\) Ward and Goedicke take a very different approach, suggesting that \(Ṣṣs.w\) might be connected to \(ṢṢ\) ‘bubalis antelope’, as an emblematic animal of nomads.\(^{273}\) This interpretation in itself is problematic, not only on orthographic differences between the writing \(Ṣṣs.w\) and \(ṢṢ\), but the fact that very few texts

\(^{266}\) *Urk.* I, 101. 9; 103. 7, 10; 104.7, 14.

\(^{267}\) That is, ‘Asiatics of the sand-dwellers’ or ‘Asiatics and sand-dwellers’.

\(^{268}\) *Urk.* IV, 36; Giveon, *Les bédouins shosou des documents égyptiens*, 9-10. Here the phrase is spelt as if it were a toponym, ṢṢ. However, the textual context suggests interpreting this word as an ethnic group.


\(^{271}\) W. Helck, ‘Eine Briefsammlung aus der Verwaltung des Amuntempels’, *JARCE* 6 (1967), 141.

\(^{272}\) Wb. IV, 412; Redford, *The Wars in Syria and Palestine of Thutmosis III*, 91-92.

mention the šš-t-antelope in the context of an ethnic group.274 Almost all textual indications locate these nomads in the Sinai, Seir (Edom), and Transjordan.

Some documents in the Ramesside period and later show that the Shasu had spread from their homeland and some members of this group had established themselves in settlements in Egypt.275 By this point, it is possible that in some contexts, Shasu had lost its geographically bound meaning, which is revealed by Demotic šš and Coptic ḥw, both meaning ‘shepherd’.276 Archaeologically, there is no specific culture that has been identified with the Shasu, but remains of Negevite and Edomite pastoralists in the Early Iron Age seem to match with the little that is known about the Shasu from Egyptian sources.277 Indeed, the known textual contexts of Shasu in Edom, Sinai, and Seir more or less correlate with the distribution of Qurayya-ware pottery over southern Palestine, Jordan, and North Arabia, but there is no reason to suggest that this pottery type was used specifically by Shasu-nomads vis-à-vis other groups in North Arabia and Edom.

4.1.3 People of the Red Sea (Gnbtw, Pwnt.yw)

The only undisputed term for people of the southern Red Sea is Pwnt.yw ‘ones-of-Punt’, which occurs in very few texts. The term is a nisbe-adjective of the placename Punt. It would seem unlikely that there was any ethno-linguistic unity in what was designated by this term, other than it labelling any group Egyptians encountered in the southern Red Sea. In the Hatshepsut expedition, it occurs in the expression Pwnt.yw hm(w) rmt ‘the Puntites who were ignorant of people (=Egyptians)’ and to label a product as ’m.w n.w Pwnt.yw ‘throwsticks of the Puntites’.278 An ‘enigmatic-script’ text at Aksha also mentions Puntites in a similar expedition context, ini n=f Pwnt.yw ‘the Puntites brought to him...’.279 In a hymn from Medinet Habu, the Puntites are called Nhš.y, thus broadly aligning them with Nubians and southerners.280 A much discussed ethneme connected with Puntites is the term ḥbz.tw, which, in this period, is found only in the Punt Expedition of Hatshepsut and a hymn to Hathor at Medamud. The word

---

276 J. Černý, Coptic Etymological Dictionary (Cambridge, 1976), 252; CDD Š, 10.12, 208
278 Urk. IV, 335. 6; 345. 15.
280 The Epigraphic Survey, Medinet Habu IV: Festival Scenes of Ramses III (Chicago, 1940), 213, line 37: mdw.t dd.tw nhš.y n(y) Pwnt ḥr-kšt ntr pn ‘words which the Nehesy of Punt said before this god’.
has usually been translated as ‘bearded-ones’, from the Egyptian word ḫbzw.t ‘divine beard’. In later Ptolemaic temple inscriptions, the term is also found, confirming the longevity of the tradition connecting the ḫbs.tw and Punt. The Hatshepsut Punt Expedition text reads:

\[(15)... Pwnt.yw ḫm ṭmḥ ḫbs.tw n.w Tȝ-nḥr
simx.n(=) st n mrw.t(=) dl(=)n n(=) (16) ḫw mi nḥr\]

\[(15)... The Puntites who are ignorant of Egyptians, the bearded-ones of God’s Land, I have made them well-disposed for your sake, so that they may give (16) praise to you like a god.\]

In the Medamud hymn to Hathor, the ḫbs.tw are not located specifically, but are performers in a rite with Nubians. Glaser in 1895 pointed to a connection between this hieroglyphic ethneme and the Ethiosemitic and Semitic geographic term ḥbšt, used to refer to the Ethiosemitic inhabitants of Eritrea and Ethiopia. Since then, this equation has been espoused in a number of works. Semiticists are by no means unanimous on the original location of this tribe or nation, nor from which language the word ḥbšt originated, with some data pointing to an earlier Habashat-tribe in coastal Yemen rather than Africa. Consequently if the word ḫbs.tw was related to the Habashat ethneme, in the time of Hatshepsut this Habashat may well have been Arabian rather than African. Wilson instead considered a connection to ḥbs ‘to dig’ and related it to the myrrh harvesting of the Puntite population. The reverse etymology has been proposed, i.e.

---

281 For this definition, see CDME, 187; HWb, 592. The meaning of the word is enigmatic – the Wörterbuch has ḫbzw.t ‘beard’ and ḫbst ‘tail’. Gardiner, AEO II, 238-39 notes the occurrence of this root to refer to part of an ox, but refrains from either of the Wörterbuch’s definitions. But, there are mythological references to this term in the context of beards, see for instance Osiris as qAi ḫbzt.wt ‘with a long beard’ and references in J. Borghouts, The Magical Texts of Papyrus Leiden I 348 (Leiden, 1971), 118.


284 wsd n ḫbs.tw ‘the bearded-ones, greet you’; see J. Darnell ‘Hathor returns to Medamud’ SAK 22 (1995), 64.


286 W. Müller, Ḥabashāt’, in Uhlig (ed.), Encyclopaedia Aethiopica II, 948-949 summarises the epigraphic evidence from Aksum and Arabia, pointing to historical Ḥabashāt people in coastal Yemen, which then migrated to Ethiopia. Thereafter, the sources exclusively locate the Ḥabashāt in Africa and equate it with ‘Ethiopia’. This is based on the earlier theories of C. Conti-Rossini, Storia d’Etiopia (Milano, 1928), 91-108. See also the summary of the scholarship in Durrani, The Tihamah Coastal Plain of South-West Arabia in its Regional Context c. 6000 BC – AD 600, 120-122.

287 P. Wilson, A Ptolemaic Lexikon: a Lexicographical study of the texts in the temple of Edfu (Leuven, 1997), 718. The term is also used of the placename ḥms.t ‘Gum-Land’ and on one occasion seems to appear as a toponym •F23,259, but the textual context suits an ethneme rather than a placename.
that the Egyptian word ḫb.ꜣ.t is the origin of the Ethiosemitic ḫbš.t. If this were correct, one then has to explain why peoples of the southern Red Sea would use an originally Egyptian term for a local population when the Egyptians never exercised any hegemony this far south until the Ptolemaic period – and here one would expect Greek rather than Egyptian vocabulary to be the norm. The lexical status of ḫb.ꜣ.tw as an established ethneme in Egyptian vocabulary for ‘Ethiopians’ is therefore in doubt, and it is likely a descriptor of the appearance of Puntites and other similar peoples as ‘bearded-ones’, and probably not connected to the term ḫbš.t from South Arabian inscriptions. The fact that the Puntites in Hatshepsut reliefs do indeed possess pointed beards indicates that a meaning of ‘bearded-ones’ would be an apt descriptor for this group. Indeed, one relief block even communicates this fascination by showing the Puntites stroking their beards (Fig. 8). Another, completely untestable possibility, is that there was some lexical confusion between these terms, and that, upon meeting a ḫbš.t-tribe, Egyptians equated them with a pre-existing word for ‘beard’.

Even more enigmatic are the Gnbtw. This ethneme is only mentioned in two New Kingdom sources, one in the reign of Thutmosis III and a passing reference in a Topographical List caption.

---

of Ramesses II. Their location in the greater Red Sea region seems likely due to the ‘nt.y-resin, a resource otherwise known to originate in Punt:290

\[ \text{spr hm[f]} r T3-mri iwi.t wwp.ty n.w Gnbtw hr in.w=n m ‘nt.yw k3[y]/\]

His majesty’s arriving to Egypt, the coming of the messengers of the Genebtiu bearing their produce in myrrh and ka[y]-resin (?) ///

At Abydos, a caption for a list of the emblematic ‘nine-bows’ reads:291

\[ t3.w nh.w h3s.wt nb.w H3.w-nb.w t3.w ph.w Gnbtw \]

All flat-lands and hill-countries, the Aegean and the hinter lands of the Genebtiu.

Their infrequent mention in Egyptians sources also seems to accord well with a distant location on the Red Sea. Saleh demonstrated the possibility of locating this tribe in Arabia, in contrast to Breasted, who had taken the long list of African products (notably ebony) that follow to refer to Gnbtw, when the intervening lacuna includes the Nubian K3ś.292 The bearded nature of the Gnbtw who visited Egypt was noted by the Egyptians who wrote two classifiers to indicate this. This bearded trait that may be favourably compared to other southern Red Sea ethnemes like hbz.tyw and Pwnt.yw in which \( \tilde{\beta} \) (A40) was also used as a classifier.

Due to their association with aromatics, efforts have been made to associate the Gnbtw with an Arabian tribe, notably the Gebbanitae mentioned in Pliny’s Natural History.293 Some scholars have assumed that the Gebbanitae are the same as the Kingdom of Qataban in South Arabia, based on the fact that both these groups are said to occupy the city of Thomna.294 This equation, at least on etymological grounds, has been questioned due to the requirement of two metatheses.295 The ambiguity of the Gebbanitae partly stems from their infrequent mention in classical sources, but, as Beeston notes, Qataban is also mentioned in Pliny, and thus it is unlikely that the Gebbanitae and Qataban refer to the same people or polities. A more plausible solution is that the Gebbanitae are to be identified with the Gb’n of ESA inscriptions. Indeed, Beeston’s reading of Pliny’s account in tandem with South Arabian epigraphic records has suggested that the

290 Urk. IV 695.5-7.
291 KRI II, 192.6.
292 Saleh, BIFAO 72, 246-47. His interpretation is followed in Zibelius-Chen, Die ägyptische Expansion nach Nubien, 96.
293 Saleh, BIFAO 72, 246-47; A. Saleh, ‘Some problems relating to the Punt reliefs at Deir el-Bahari’, JEA 58 (1972), 140; Espinel, Abriendo los caminos de Punt, 440-441. Kitchen, RITANC I, 105.
Gb’n/Gebbanitae were a merchant group who lived within the South Arabian Minaean Kingdom. To outsiders, they were likely to be glossed as Minaeans, thus explaining the relative paucity of evidence for the Gebbanitae in classical sources. For our purposes, Pliny’s account of the Gebbanitae accords somewhat well with the very little that is known about Egyptian Gnbtw. The Gebbanitae are described as a group who were involved in the myrrh trade, in both Africa and Arabia down to the straits of the Bab el-Mandeb. But, given the millennia that separate the two terms, the Gnbtw may have little to do with Gb’n. Furthermore, it is plausible that the Gnbtw designate a people on the African coast of the Red Sea, but the weight of evidence allows for open discussion of an Arabian location.

Lexically, it seems reasonable to suggest that Gnbtw can be analysed as a feminine plural nisbe Egyptian ending (y)w, ‘ones-of-Gnb’, and, as such, Gnb could be the name of a territory. The root gnb was reckoned by Brugsch to be related to Arabic ġanub ‘south’, but this was quickly rejected by le Page Renouf, who pointed out the unlikelihood of a people calling themselves ‘southerners’, and the fact that there is no root gnb in Egyptian. Despite this earlier rejection, this solution has much to recommend it when one considers that the semantics of the root gnb encompassed not only ‘south’, but also ‘coast’ or ‘side’, a suitable descriptor for a group of aromatic merchants who may have dwelt on the Arabian Tihama coast. Gnbtw would thus be the ‘ones-of-the-coast’. Furthermore, the root gnb only exists with the medial –n- in South Semitic languages, while in Ethiosemitic and Cushitic languages there is no nasal consonant. It is tempting to connect it to the Beja word gwineb ‘land east of the red sea hills’, but this word is probably a relatively modern loan from Arabic. Another point favouring a south-eastern location is the Abydos text, where the Gnbtw are coupled with the Hi.w-nb.w(t), with the latter term generally given to refer to the Aegean. Thus, like the opening clause which has an oppositional couplet of t beetle and his.t, the Aegean (northwest) is juxtaposed with its polar opposite to the southeast of Egypt, presumably a people who occupied Arabia.

296 Beeston, Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies 2, 4-8.
300 Orel & Stolbova, Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary, 193.
Table 4: Ethnica to Egypt’s east

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic term</th>
<th>Referent Geography</th>
<th>Early Dyn.</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>MK-SIP</th>
<th>NK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twnt.yw</td>
<td>Eastern Desert, Sinai, Nubia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnt.yw</td>
<td>Sinai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m.w</td>
<td>Canaan, Sinai, Gulf of Suez (later in Egypt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šs.w</td>
<td>Canaan, Edom, Sinai, Gulf of Suez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md3.y</td>
<td>Eastern Desert, Atbai (later in Egypt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nhs.y</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pwnt.yw</td>
<td>Southern Atbai, Eritrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnbtw</td>
<td>Arabia (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥbz.tyw</td>
<td>Southern Atbai, Eritrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 The Linguistic Map of the Red Sea

What languages did foreign groups on Egypt’s periphery speak? It is often difficult, especially in Africa, to accurately establish what languages were spoken where in the period contemporary to
the Egyptian civilisation of the third and second millennium BCE. As the cultures of the Red Sea lacked historical inscriptions until about 1000 BC in South Arabia, 800 BCE in Eritrea, and perhaps 1200 BCE in the Sinai in the case of Proto-Sinaitic, one must generalise from this meagre inscripional data. Furthermore, these inscriptions do not record the languages of nomads, but those of settled agricultural communities in Yemen, North Arabian oases, and the Ethiopian Highlands. The nomads who roamed the Eastern Desert are silent textually until modernity. Knowledge of the ancient languages in this region is necessary for any etymological study of foreign toponyms in this corpus. As placenames, unlike personal-names, are anchored to a particular location, it may demonstrate precise areas where a foreign language was spoken. This section will assess the possible options for languages spoken in the region contemporary to pharaonic Egypt, and the phonological issues in representing foreign sounds in the Egyptian script.

Languages on the west coast of the Red Sea, all of which lack inscripational records, can be mainly grouped into the Cushitic phylum. This language family encompasses most of the Horn of Africa, with its northernmost extension in the Eastern Desert of Upper Egypt. While some linguists have termed Cushitic as a Sprachbund rather than a nuclear family, recent research suggests great affinities between diverse Cushitic languages. Among its more well-known members on the Red Sea littoral are Beja (North Cushitic), the Saho-Afar languages in Eritrea, Agaw in Ethiopia, and Somali in Djibouti and Somalia (together comprising Lowland East-Cushitic along with Oromo). Cushitic languages, particularly Agaw, may have historically covered much of the Ethiopian Highlands before the migration of Ethiosemitic speakers. The earliest mention of Agaw is as the Atagaw in Ezana’s fourth century vocalised Ge’ez inscription, and they are also found as the Ἀθαγαοὺς in a Greek inscription copied by Kosmas Indikopleustes in the sixth century CE.

Epigraphic South Arabian inscriptions occur in Eritrea in the early first millennium BCE, confirming the presence of Semitic languages in the Horn of Africa by at least this date. Among these inscriptions are some texts which have been analysed as displaying qualities that relate to proto-Ge’ez. The modern day distribution of Ethiosemitic languages is now confined largely to Eritrea and Ethiopia, with the most widely spoken being Amharic, Tigre, and Tigrinya. Even a cursory glance at the distribution of these Ethiosemitic languages shows an intrusive ‘finger’ in the Cushitic dominated Horn of Africa. These languages displaced Cushitic languages in Ethiopia and Eritrea, as the Ethiosemitic languages display a significant Cushitic substratum, particularly

---

303 See RIE 187.7. For the Agaw in Aksumite history, consult G. Hatke, Aksum and Nubia (New York, 2013), 54.
304 Phillipson, African Archaeological Review 26, 266-69.
305 Phillipson, African Archaeological Review 26, 265.
from the Agaw language.\textsuperscript{306} Unfortunately, there is much uncertainty and debate as to the antiquity, distribution and manner by which Ethiosemitic came into Africa. One finds in the literature the repeated notion that a simple migration or invasion from South Arabian Kingdoms at the beginning of the first millennium BCE resulted in the spread of Ethiosemitic languages throughout Eritrea and Ethiopia. This thesis largely rests upon the earliest Epigraphic South Arabian inscriptions in Akkele Guzay, dated to c. 800 BCE, with contemporary South Arabian traits witnessed in the local archaeological record.\textsuperscript{307} Recent research has rejected this simplistic migration model for Ethiosemitic in the Horn of Africa, instead suggesting elite emulation as a much more suitable development for the emergence and pre-eminence of Arabian culture in the Horn of Africa.\textsuperscript{308} Indeed, linguists have long hypothesised, based on the antiquity of the common Semitic lexicon in Ethiosemitic, that these languages are much earlier migrants to Africa.\textsuperscript{309} Marrassini in particular is a strong proponent of at least two Semitic migrations to Africa. He posits the first ‘Ethiosemitic’ migration as early as the second millennium BCE, with a later historical ‘South Arabian’ migration in the early first millennium BCE.\textsuperscript{310} Such an early migration remains to be tested against onomastic data, for which the only contemporary texts are from Egyptian sources.

In South Arabia, the inscriptional record begins in about 1000 BCE. The languages of these inscriptions - Sabaean (or Sabaic), Minaean, Qatabanian, and Hadramautic - are collectively

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[306] D. Appleyard, \textit{A Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages} (Köln, 2006), 1.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
referred to as Epigraphic South Arabian, a group of South Semitic languages.\textsuperscript{311} The Arabic languages further north, so-called ‘North Arabian’, include such epigraphic traditions as Safaitic, Thamudic and Lihiyanite. These languages are only known from brief inscriptions beginning in the fifth century BCE.\textsuperscript{312} In northwest Arabia, the area occupied by Nabateans and in the oasis of Tayma, there are sufficient numbers of Aramaic inscriptions to suggest that this language was spoken by at least some of the population. Again, this data is not contemporary with the Second and third millennium BCE, so exactly what language was spoken in North Arabia in this period is difficult to determine. The Arabic spoken in the central Hejaz and Nejd, the predecessor of Quranic Arabic, was spoken by at least the fifth century BCE.\textsuperscript{313} There is little reason to suggest that Arabic dialects displaced any language in the area, and one may suggest that from Edom to Yemen, South Semitic languages dominated from at least the second millennium BCE. Yet, there is an unproven and speculative hypothesis amongst linguists that Cushitic was once spoken in the peninsula, being displaced by Semitic languages at an unknown date.\textsuperscript{314} The general lack of linguistic data makes it difficult to speculate on the linguistic situation on the Arabian coast of the Red Sea before the first millennium BCE, but it would be surprising if anything other than a Semitic language was spoken in the area.

4.2.1 Eastern Sudanic Languages, Meroitic, and Nile Cushitic

The only non-Afroasiatic language (apart from hypothetical extinct language isolates) that could have been a source for Eastern Desert toponymy are the Eastern Sudanic family of Nilo-Saharan languages, including Meroitic, Old Nubian, and Nara. The exact place of Meroitic, the language of the Kingdom of Meroë, in this genetic language family was historically unknown, with many works labelling it the ancestor of Old Nubian.\textsuperscript{315} In several publications, Rilly has produced extensive data which persuasively argues for placing Meroitic in the North East Sudanic family of Nilo-Saharan.\textsuperscript{316} The Meroitic \textit{Urheimat} was to the west of the Middle Nile, and thus Meroitic speakers were immigrants to the Nile Valley, with the earliest evidence of lexical contact with

\textsuperscript{311} Lipinski, \textit{Semitic: Outline of a Comparative Grammar}, 78ff.
\textsuperscript{312} Akkadian texts make reference to an indigenous script at Tayma Oasis as early as the eighth century BCE, see M. MacDonald, ‘Reflections on the linguistic map of pre-Islamic Arabia’, \textit{Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy} 11 (2000), 43-44.
\textsuperscript{313} Lipinski, \textit{Semitic: Outline of a Comparative Grammar}, 70-77.
\textsuperscript{315} R. Blench, \textit{Archaeology, Language and the African Past} (Maryland, 2006), 101.
Egyptians in the Middle Kingdom onomasticon of pMoscow 314.³¹⁷ The date of the entrance of Old Nubian to the Nile Valley is generally considered much later than Meroitic.³¹⁸ However, there is some good evidence presented by Schneider, Zibelius-Chen and Breyer for the existence of Proto-Old Nubian words and names in the Egyptian onomastica of the Middle and New Kingdoms.³¹⁹ Thus it is difficult to be sure of the location of this branch of the Eastern Sudanic languages in this period.

It is unclear to what extent these languages encroached into the Atbai and Eastern Desert, or what exact language(s) they replaced in the Middle Nile. An as yet unidentified Cushitic language is the general consensus position, given the apparent language contact between Cushitic and Eastern Sudanic languages.³²⁰ Haaland has advanced a rather complex thesis which equates Nilo-Saharan speakers with the Neolithic occupants of the Khartoum area, only to be replaced by Cushitic who pushed them into the Sudd of South Sudan (and presumably counter-replaced by Nilo-Saharan Meroitic speakers).³²¹ Through phonological analysis of the onomastic material of the Middle Kingdom Exeoration Texts, Rilly revealed that the Nilotic Nhš.y - ‘les vrais Nehesyou’ - were Nilo-Saharan speakers.³²² But, the language(s) spoken in Lower Nubia are probably not of the same affiliation, as most of its toponyms are phonologically closer to Afroasiatic than Nilo-Saharan languages.³²³

---


³¹⁸ An early date for the arrival of Proto-Nobiin in the Nile Valley c. 1500 BCE is preferred in M. Bechhaus-Gerst ‘Linguistic evidence for the prehistory of livestock in Sudan’, in R. Blench & C. MacDonald (eds), The Origins and Development of African Livestock (London, 2000), 450-453; Bechhaus-Gerst, Sprachwandel durch Sprachkontakt am Beispiel des Nubischen im Niltal (Köln, 1995), 147, but see C. Rilly, ‘Enemy brothers. Kinship and relationship between Meroites and Nubians (Noba)’, in Godlewski & Łatjar (eds), Between the Cataracts, 220, where the migration is dated to a much later period.


³²³ Indigenous toponyms of Lower Nubia include ṭbšk, ṭkn, ṭbš, ṭhn, Mfrn, Mḥš, Ḥḥ, Tḥṭ, Tst (see Zibelius, AOFN, 74, 94, 109, 111, 120, 126, 180-181; El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmliger Lehnschutz, 164, 191, 202, 209, 235). While these placenames do not necessarily belong to the same linguistic group, the presence of ṭ, k, h and ḥ would be somewhat confusing for a Nilo-Saharan
A number of scholars have equated the spread of the C-Group material culture in the Atbai with the Nilo-Saharan linguistic migrations, which would account for the position of the easternmost languages of this phylum, Nara and Kunama. The migration, according to Rilly, would eventually result in the aesthetically similar Gash Group ceramics of the Kassala region, suggesting that Nara was one of the pre-Meroitic languages of the Nile Valley. Behrens has put forward a theory that Berber came into contact with the Nubian Nile, due to the occurrence of the Berber word *aman* ‘water’ in Old Nubian. In this theory, the Nubian languages (Nobiin, Mahas) replaced Berber on the Nile, with the proto-Berbers being equated with the C-Group and the Libyan *Tmh.w*. While the existence of Berber words in Egyptian is likely, the theory of a Berber occupation specifically in Nubia rests upon too few lexical arguments to be certain and should accordingly be treated as a hypothesis.

A greater understanding of the migrations that introduced Nilo-Saharan languages into Eritrea and Eastern Sudan has the potential to completely change our knowledge of the linguistic geography of the area. The present position of Nara and Kunama in Eritrea makes it problematic to rule out the possibility of Nilo-Saharan speakers in the ancient Atbai. While it is clear that Cushitic and Nilo-Saharan languages were both at various stages spoken on the Middle Nile Valley, seriating

---


325 Rilly, ‘Enemy brothers. Kinship and relationship between Meroites and Nubians (Noba)’, in Godlewski & Latjar (eds), *Between the Cataracts*, 221-223 argues that the pre-Nubian speaking population of Nubia consisted of a substratum of Meroitic and a language ‘closely related to Nara’.


327 See the recent discussion in Breyer, *Einführung in die Meroitistik*, 200-202 who references the lexical identifications of Colin and Schneider.
their spatial and diachronic distribution with corresponding archaeological material remains an elusive problem in the history of the Middle Nile.\textsuperscript{328} Despite the limits to our knowledge, given the medial position of the Middle Nile region between Egypt and the Atbai, it is plausible that at least some Eastern Desert placenames arrived into Egyptian from Meroitic or other related languages.

4.2.2 Beja and the Eastern Desert

While a pre-Meroitic language probably dominated Upper Nubia by at least the second millennium BCE, the nomads of the Eastern Desert and Atbai did not speak this Nilo-Saharan language. The modern inhabitants of this area are the Beja, and it is probable that this group is linguistically related to the ancient inhabitants of the Eastern Desert. Indeed, some authors have gone so far to establish a one-to-one equivalency between this ethnic group and their ancient ancestors of the Medjay.\textsuperscript{329} While some scholars have outlined some problems with this argument,\textsuperscript{330} the only running hypothesis of any worth posits that the ancient groups of the Eastern Desert, the Medjay, were speaking an ancient form of ‘Pre-Beja’ or allied Cushitic language(s).

Beja’s place as a Cushitic language is now generally agreed, despite a now disproven opinion that it was a separate branch of Afroasiatic.\textsuperscript{331} Beja retains many morphological and lexical similarities with Proto-Cushitic and has been called a ‘conservative’ branch of Afroasiatic.\textsuperscript{332} Lexically and morphologically, it may be favourably compared to other Cushitic languages, such as Saho, Afar, and Agaw, although the degree of Beja’s isolation from other Cushitic groupings, particularly Lowland Eastern Cushitic, is debated.\textsuperscript{333} It is possible that the historic distribution of Beja was

\textsuperscript{328} The reach of Nilo-Saharan to the Red Sea coast has been questioned in A. Zaborski, ‘Cushitic and Semitic Peoples of the Red Sea Coasts: A Linguistic Approach to their Prehistory and History’, in J. Starkey (ed.), \textit{People of the Red Sea: Proceedings of the Red Sea Project II}, 137. Wainwright, on the basis of a single toponym, pointed to Nubian speakers on the coast. His idea rested upon the identification of the toponym of Zerberged Island as ‘Topasin’, which was connected with the Old Nubian lexeme ‘to seek’; see G. Wainwright, ‘Zerberged: The Shipwrecked Sailor’s Island’, \textit{JEA} 32 (1946), 32 n. 1. But the corresponding verb in Old Nubian $\text{\texttt{w}}\text{\texttt{t}}\text{\texttt{\textcircled{a}}}\text{\texttt{m}}\text{\texttt{h}}\text{\texttt{m}}\text{\texttt{i}}\text{\texttt{m}}\text{\texttt{b}}$ was considered by Browne as Arabic in origin, see G. Browne, \textit{Old Nubian Dictionary} (Lovanii, 1996), 178.

\textsuperscript{329} This is most comprehensively treated in K. Zibelius-Chen, ‘Die Medja in altägyptischen Quellen’, \textit{SAK} 36 (2007), 391-405; see R. El-Sayed, ‘$\text{\texttt{c}}\text{\texttt{\textcircled{r}}}\text{\texttt{n}}\text{\texttt{M}d:\text{\texttt{i}}\text{\texttt{w}}$ – lingua blemmyica – tu be\texttt{\textcircled{d}}\text{\texttt{w}}\text{\texttt{a}}\text{\texttt{i}}$’, \textit{SAK} 32 (2004), 358-361. See also A. Smith, \textit{African Herders: emergence of pastoral traditions} (Walnut Creek, 2005), 143.


very different to their present distribution. As well as occurring in the Red Sea Hills in Sudan and Eritrea, there is evidence that Beja-speakers occupied the Nubian Nile, and a hypothesis that they once inhabited the desert west of the Nile in the Bayuda and the Ennedi plateau of Chad.\textsuperscript{334} How far north Beja extended into the Eastern Desert can only be guessed, but this language is certainly the best candidate for the ancient nomads who occupied the desert between the Nile and the Red Sea.

Despite the geographic proximity of Beja to Egyptian, Vycichl identified very few Egyptian loanwords in Beja.\textsuperscript{335} That being said, the proximity of the two languages made it quite possible that Beja onomastic material would appear in Egyptian documents. In the Coptic period, a strong case has been made that the Blemmyes (ⲃⲗϩⲙⲛⲗⲏⲥ) spoke an older variant of the modern Beja. The identification of Beja linguistic material in Egyptian documents rests upon the lexical work of Browne and Satzinger.\textsuperscript{336} Here, particular personal names and lexical material found in Coptic and Greek documents were compared favourably to lexical material in the Beja language, chiefly on morphological grounds, thus creating a new phase of the language called ‘Old-Bedauye’. In addition, some common Beja lexemes have been identified in these onomastica, such as \textit{tak} ‘man’ and \textit{kena} ‘owner’. Some Eastern Desert onomastic material has no cognates with Beja, which led Satzinger to suspect that there may have been another related, yet distinct language spoken in the region.\textsuperscript{337}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item For Beja and Nubian contact in the Nile Valley, see M. Bechhaus-Gerst, \textit{Nubier und Kuschiten im Niltal: Sprach und Kulturkontakte im ‘no-man’s land’}, see 119-144. More conjecturally, Lipinski, \textit{Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar}, 32 notes the connection between the Bisharin tribe and the Bisherla tribe of the Ennedi Plateau, suggesting the historic extension of Beja to the Western Desert.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Recent linguistic research by El-Sayed and Zibelius-Chen has shown some convincing examples of Beja lexical material in pharaonic Egyptian documents, thus opening up the possibility of a linguistic continuum between the Medja, the Coptic Blemmys and the modern Beja. Sayed notes phonetic correspondences between a Medja personal name  Kwi, Beja /kʷja/ ‘friend’ and the geographic term  ib, Beja /ʔb/ ‘khor, wadi’. An ox skull from a Pan-Grave burial at Mostagedda (BM EA 63339) is inscribed with what may be a Beja personal name  Kzkant (Fig. 10). El-Sayed convincingly identified the final element as the Beja morph kina ‘owner’, used in Beja names with a possessive meaning ‘owner’. Unfortunately, the reading is not secure and Liszka and Näser (both following suggestions of Zibelius-Chen) have called into question the reading of  in place of . El-Sayed read  as Beja kos ‘horn’ and thus the phrase would logically translate as ‘owner of the horn’, with the –t indicating a definite genitival phrase. Another possibility would be to relate  to a Pan-Cushitic kinship term gos/gas ‘chief’.

338 There is also the personal name  which El-Sayed compares to the Beja personal name gizatek from the Coptic onomastica analysed by Browne; see El-Sayed, SAK 32, 358-360. For Beja lexemes in Egyptian, see also Breyer, Einführung in die Meroitistik, 192-199.


340 Näser, ‘Nomads at the Nile: towards an archaeology of interaction’, in Barnard & Duistermaat (eds), History of the Peoples of the Eastern Desert, 88; Liszka, A Study of the Medjay and Pangrave as an Ethnic group and as Mercenaries, 498 n. 2197. Liszka’s reservations that  would have to be vocalic for this etymology ignores the likelihood of  being a group-writing for /kV/; for which see contemporary examples in El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 90. The final  is a common morph in Beja.

341 L. Reinisch, Wörterbuch der Bedauye-Sprache (Wien, 1895), 148; El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 265.

342 The reflexes are diverse. W. Leslau, Etymological Dictionary of Gurage (Wiesbaden, 1979), III, 298-299 mentions Highland East Cushitic gosa which means ‘clan, tribe’ in Burji (see also, Hudson, Highland East Cushitic, 112). In Somali there is the term Ugas ‘chief’, see E. de Larajasse, Somali-English and English-Somali Dictionary (London, 1897), 135. There is also the Cushitic root gos ‘boy’, reconstructed in G. Hudson, Northeast African Semitic (Wiesbaden, 2013), 159. Whether all these words represent a common Cushitic root requires further research.
El-Sayed noted many Beja etymologies in his catalogue of African loanwords in the Old and Middle Kingdom, mainly from personal names and toponyms, but also some lexical loans. From data provided by Arab geographers, this ethno-linguistic group probably occupied the desert fringes from Egypt to Ethiopia. It is clear that the Eastern Desert failed to be totally pacified by successive Egyptian administrations, as is evidenced by the great efforts that the Ptolemaic and Roman bureaucracies exerted in protecting trade routes in the region from indigenous marauders, particularly the Blemmyes (Gr. Βλέμμιες, Copt. ⲉⲗⲃⲙⲟⲩ), but also other ethnic groups reported

---

343 See El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 118-119 for a summary of Beja loanwords in Egyptian.
345 Zibelius-Chen, Nubische Sprachmaterial, 58.
by classical writers such as Saracens (particular in the north) as well as the Ichthyophagoi and Megabaroi.\textsuperscript{347} It would seem almost certain that the Blemmyes are the same as the modern Beja, as is indicated by the use of ‘the Beja’ (البيجى) in an eighth century Arabic letter to the King of Nubia, where the equivalent in parallel Coptic documents is ‘Blemmye’.\textsuperscript{348} As Barnard has shown in his study of the terms Blemmyes and Beja, all of the textual sources, whether Egyptian, Nubian, Greek, Latin, or Arabic, are fairly consistent in locating these peoples in the Eastern Desert and Atbai.\textsuperscript{349} Periodically, they were capable of extending beyond this heartland and could occupy Lower Nubia and raid places as far away as Kharga Oasis or the Sinai. A pre- or proto-Beja group is thus the best candidate for the identity of the dwellers of the Eastern Desert and Atbai. There is no reason to suspect linguistic unity amongst all Medjay and it is clear that, at least by the New Kingdom, people termed Medj.y could also speak Egyptian. As Liszka emphasises, the Medjay (or the Nehesy) were not a cohesive ethnic group, and the ethnic appellation was used by Egyptians to refer to any nomads of the Eastern Desert and Atbai long before the nomads may have adopted the appellation ‘Medjay’ for themselves.\textsuperscript{350} Nevertheless, the linguistic data, even in isolation, points to the fact that some of these nomads, under whatever ethnic appellation, spoke a ‘Pre-Beja’ type language.

4.2.3 Semitic Languages in the South Sinai and Edom

While one can ascertain from later inscriptive evidence the presence of Semitic languages in the Sinai, Levant, and Arabia, the language(s) spoken by the nomads of the Sinai and Edom in the third and second millennium BCE is ambiguous. Based on the presence of Semitic lexemes in Old Egyptian texts and onomastica like the Execration Texts it can be assumed that Egyptians were in contact with Semitic speakers in Sinai and Canaan as early as the Old Kingdom, if not earlier.\textsuperscript{351}

\textsuperscript{347} Sidebotham, Hense & Nouwens, \textit{The Red Land}, 32.
\textsuperscript{349} The attestations of Blemmyes compiled from the \textit{FHN} are found by H. Barnard, ‘Sire, il n’y a pas de Blemmyes. A Re-Evaluation of Historical and Archaeological Data’, in J. Starkey (ed.), \textit{People of the Red Sea: Proceedings of the Red Sea Project II} (Oxford, 2005), 25-33. The majority of references are from Graeco-Roman period, although there is an occurrence of \textit{Brhw} from the seventh century BCE at the temple of Kawa.
\textsuperscript{350} See Liszka, \textit{JEH} 4, 149-171.
\textsuperscript{351} For Semitic words in the Execration Texts, see Posener, \textit{Princes et Pays}, 62-95; Hoch, \textit{Semitic Words}, 492-494. For the possibility of the Semitic nature of the so-called ‘Serpent spells’, see R. Steiner, \textit{Early Northwest Semitic Serpent Spells in the Pyramid Texts} (Winona Lake, 2011), 28 but see the criticisms of F. Breyer, ‘Zu den angeblich semitischen Schlangensprüchen der Pyramidentexte’, \textit{Orientalistische Literaturzeitung} 107 (2012), 141-146 and J. Quack, ‘Critical Remarks on a Proposed Etymology of Hebrew \textit{nśr} and Aramaic \textit{nqr}\textsuperscript{123}, \textit{JAEI} 5 (2013), 31 n. 12. Egyptian language has many shared features with Semitic and thus may have at times evolved alongside and borrowed from Semitic languages, for which see the discussions in W. Vycichl, ‘Is Egyptian a Semitic Language’, \textit{Kush} 7 (1959), 27-44 and historiographical discussion in M. Bechhaus-Gerst, ‘Old Egyptian and Afroasiatic: The state of the Art’, \textit{Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere} 56 (1998), 115. The presence of a large group of Old Kingdom Semitic toponyms in the Delta is a witness to the early presence of these languages in Egypt; see D. Redford, ‘Some observations on the Northern and Northeastern Delta in
Redford has argued strongly that ‘Am.w designated peoples from the Levant and Canaan, etymologically relating ‘Am to Semitic ġlm ‘boy, youth, young-man’ and therefore denoting Semitic groups of the Levant. A rather different etymology was proposed by Schneider, who, noting the variant Rösslerian realisation of ayin as /d/, suggested Canaanite dm ‘south’ as a descriptor for nomads in the Negev (with respect to Canaan).  

While it is known that this group occupied Canaan, it has also been argued that this group occupied the Eastern Desert as far south as Wadi Hammamat. The relevant documents that gave this impression were expertly reinterpreted by Redford, who showed that the hyperbolic nature of the assertions present in the relevant Egyptian rock inscriptions did not point to local ‘Am.w-Asiatics occupying the Eastern Desert. Yet, there are many difficulties in eliminating an Asiatic presence entirely from the Eastern Desert. The most troublesome text to understand in this light is the inscription of Pepin akht, which seems to suggest that the zone of influence of the ‘Am.w, the His.t-‘Am.w, touched upon the Red Sea. As Redford notes, this episode did not necessarily take place in the Eastern Desert around Quseir, but it must have occurred somewhere on the Red Sea, perhaps in the Gulf of Suez. A closer look at the salient inscription offers some clues that the sphere of nomadic habitation of the ‘Am.w-Asiatics included both sides of the Gulf of Suez:  

\[
\text{iw gr} \ h3b.n \ w(l) h(m.)(y) \ n(b)\equiv \ r \ h\text{is.t} \ \text{‘Am.w} \ r \ ini.t \ n\equiv \ smr \ w\text{.ty} \ N\text{hn} \ K\text{3-‘pr} \ im.y-r\text{; l’}\text{w} \\
\text{‘n-‘nh.t} \ wn \ hr \ sp.t \ kbn.t \ im \ r \ P\text{wnt} \ (12) \ sk \ sm3.n \ sw \ ‘Am.w \ n.w \ hr.(y)w-s‘} \ hn\text{‘.j.t} \ n.t \ m\text{Is’} \\
\text{n.t} \ hn\text{‘}=\]  

Now the majesty of my lord sent me to the hill-country of the Aamu in order to bring for him the sole friend, controller of Nekhen, Kaaper, and the overseer of interpreters, Anankhta, who were assembling a kbenet-ship there to Punt, when the Aamu of the sand-dwellers killed him together with the troop of the expedition which was with him.

\begin{flushright} 
Redford, JARCE 23, 131. 
See J. Kamrin, ‘The Aamu of Shu in the Tomb of Khnumhotep II at Beni Hassan’, JAEI 1 (2009), 24, 28. See also Y. Koenig, ‘Les textes d’envoûtement de Mirgissa’, RâE 41 (1990), 121, 125; Darnell et al., AASOR 59, 88 n. 115. Other scholars who held this view are quoted in Redford, JARCE 23, 127 n. 22. It is possible that Asiatics worked at Gebel el-Zeit in the Eastern Desert, as there is evidence of an Asiatic name Piry occurring amongst the inscriptions at the site. For the stele, see Régén & Soukiassian, Gebel Zeit II: Le matériel inscrit, 35 and the Semitic origin of the name, consult Schneider, Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches, 108. 
Redford, JARCE 23 (1986), 125-143. 
\end{flushright}
The location discussed must be a harbour of some sort, where ships could be (re)assembled for Punt expeditions. While the passage does not specifically locate this harbour, through a process of elimination, Tallet successfully identified the operative port where Kbnḍ-ships were assembled as Ayn Soukhna. Excluding Mersa Gawasis, which lacks extensive Old Kingdom remains, there are only two ports on the Red Sea that may be associated with a Puntite expedition, one at Ayn Soukhna east of Cairo, and at Wadi el-Jarf a little to the south. The port at Wadi el-Jarf was occupied only for a short period of time, probably only the Fourth Dynasty, and is thus unlikely to be the site of Pepinakht’s Sixth Dynasty harbour. This leaves the port of Ayn Soukhna as Pepinakht’s port in the 𓊃𓊲-𓎑𓊫. The fact that Egyptians termed the area around Ayn Soukhna ‘the foreign land of Asiatics’ concords perfectly with what is known of the desert occupants in classical and Coptic sources, who are given the sobriquet Saracens, a people who otherwise occupied the Sinai and Arabia. In summation, the sphere of influence of 𓎑𓊫-Asiatics and hence Semitic speakers may have encompassed the deserts adjacent to the Gulf of Suez and Lower Egypt.

The linguistic data for the Sinai Peninsula in the Old Kingdom is relatively poor. Early Dynastic inscriptions referring to the Sinai mention the local 𓊴𓈖𓊫 nomads, probably to be identified with the settlers of EB II sites throughout the South Sinai, but there is no contemporary local onomastic data from early inscriptions which can be definitively connected to any language. As the EB II sites share common material culture with settlers in Canaan, particularly Arad, the likelihood is that they were Canaanite speakers. In the Middle Kingdom, Semites inscribed the so-called Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions at the Egyptian mines, a script comprised of Egyptian...
hieroglyphs recycled to write a foreign language, probably Canaanite. However, it is not entirely clear whether the authors of these texts were local inhabitants or itinerant Asiatics from Syria-Palestine who were in Egyptian employ. One inscription at Serabit el-Khadem mentions the brother of a hkJ2 Rtw ‘ruler of the Levant’.365 Beit-Arieh suggests that the Asiatics at Serabit were independent artisans and coppersmiths who travelled to the mines, probably from further north in Canaan.366 Goldwasser, while not commenting on the exact social role of Asiatics at Serabit, stresses the parallels that may be drawn between Egyptian hieroglyphs employed on Canaanite seals and inscriptions at Serabit, further suggesting the ‘Canaanite’ origin of the miners at Serabit.367 Both these conclusions point to the likelihood that the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions were inscribed by peoples from further north in Palestine who had, through extended contact, become familiar with the Egyptian script. This ‘travelling Asiatic’ script certainly seems to account for the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions from Wadi el-Hôl, in the Egyptian Western Desert behind Thebes.368 The only other known Proto-Sinaitic inscription is a recently discovered cartouche, possibly a forgery, discovered at Timna.369 It is worth considering that, as an ethnic group, ‘Am.w-Asiatics are found as far apart as Serabit el-Khadim, Lahun, and Wadi el-Hôl, where they are part of Egyptian expeditions.370 That is to say, while they had a homeland in the Levant, their employment as Egyptian functionaries meant that references to Asiatics were not uncommon throughout Egypt.

In the New Kingdom, the nomadic Shasu (ŠJs.w) were certainly Semitic speakers. The fortress-toponyms listed in Seti’s Shasu war and pAnastasi I and V bear some Semitic names such as ‘ynn,371 thus suggesting that the original inhabitants of this area, at least in the New Kingdom, were Semites. Papyrus Anastasi VI makes reference to Shasu nomads of Idm (Edom) in the Delta

---

365 Gardiner, Peet & Černý, The Inscriptions of the Sinai, II, 94.
368 Darnell et al., AASOR 59, 67-115.
371 For the document and the proposed locations of the toponyms, see Al-Ayedi, The Inscriptions of the Ways of Horus, 84-85, 90, 97, 99, 101, 104. For proposed etymologies and locations of these names see D. Redford, ‘Report on the 1993 and 1997 seasons at Tell Qedwa’, JARCE 35 (1998), 46-48 n. 9, 10.
region. Other documents reveal a connection between the Shasu and the Edomite deity Qaws (K3ws) and Yahweh. Among the list of placenames preserved in the taxation gazetteer of pWilbour, there are some toponyms which are Semitic in origin. The geography of the papyrus roughly accords to a large portion of Middle Egypt, an unexpected area for Semitic names to occur. Outside the onomastic sphere, the sheer weight of Semitic loanwords in New Kingdom Egyptian vocabulary paints a clear picture; that Egypt’s immediate neighbours in the northeast spoke a series of Canaanite and/or similar Semitic languages.

There is not enough linguistic data, however, to suggest what precise Semitic language was spoken in the Sinai and Edom. Rainey’s assessment suggests that by the New Kingdom at least, the true ‘Canaanite’ dialects of Ugaritic and Phoenician occupied the coast, while the Iron Age I settlers of Edom, Moab, and Sinai were speakers of what became Hebrew, Aramaic, and Moabite. Hoch concludes that the majority of Semitic loanwords in Egyptian arrived through Semitic speaking bedouin from the Sinai and Levant. Mendenhall even proposes the possibility of North Arabian languages in Edom and in respect to the Semitic inscriptions at Serabit el-Khadem. Ultimately, it is neither profitable nor possible to differentiate these many aligned Semitic languages through loanwords alone, but one can safely conclude that all toponyms in the Sinai and Edom should derive from a Semitic language.

4.2.4 The Language(s) of Punt

Research addressing the identity of the language of the Puntites, and hence the ancient languages of the southern Red Sea, is lacking. The only explicit treatment of the problem is El-Sayed’s work on African loanwords, where a case has been made that Punt is located in Cushitic speaking regions, here identifying the Agaw or the Saho-Afar languages as possible candidates.

---

375 The placenames occur along the Nile roughly between the Fayyum and El-Qis; see Jean-Christophe, *SAK* 40, 19-21.
376 For the corpus of Semitic words in New Kingdom Egyptian, see Hoch, *Semitic Words*, passim.
seems the best possibility, as these languages are considered indigenous to Punt’s likely location in the Red Sea areas of Sudan. Unfortunately, there is little lexical data that can be associated with the language(s) of Punt, and there is no reason to suspect that the area had any linguistic unity. Furthermore, the ancient boundaries between Agaw, the Lowland East Cushitic languages and Beja are unknown. Adding complexity to the argument is the debated date of the arrival of Ethiosemitic languages in East Africa. Morin illustrates from the contemporary toponymy on the Red Sea coast a confusing spread of Beja further south and Saho-Afar further north than their present extensions. This might be used as a caveat against expecting static linguistic boundaries down to the modern period. It is safe to say that there was probably extensive migration, diglossia, and language contact in the Red Sea region.

The only definitively ‘Puntite’ words are the names of the two known individuals encountered in Hatshepsut’s Punt Expedition, PArhw and Ity. Speculatively, I would reconstruct these names as follows:

\[ Prhw \rightarrow \text{ */p\text{\textsubscript{b}}Vr\text{\textsubscript{r}}\text{\textsubscript{u}}/ } \]

It seems likely that Egyptian \(\text{p}\) was aspirated and in many cases could render /\(\phi/\) (cf. Egyptian \(\text{p}\), which is often approximated in Greek as \(\varphi\), i.e. \(P\theta = \varphi\theta\)). Furthermore, a phoneme /\(\text{p}\)/ did exist in Proto-Cushitic, where it later shifts to /\(b/\) or /\(\phi/\). Egyptian \(\text{p}\) did, on occasion, vary with \(b\), e.g. \(K\text{\text{h}}\text{\text{b}}ny/K\text{\text{p}}\text{\text{n}}\text{\text{y}}\) ‘Byblos’. Thus, it appears we are dealing with a tri-radical root, possibly vocalised as /\(b\text{\text{r}}\text{\text{h}}/\) or /\(\phi\text{\text{r}}\text{\text{h}}/\). There are a large number of possibilities in East African languages. Cushitic possibilities could include words such as Afar \(\text{f}\text{\text{y}ro}\) ‘front, head, ruler’, or Beja \(\text{f}\text{\text{e}rak}\) ‘offspring’.

---

383 For the names, see Urk. IV, 324.16-325.1; Zibelius-Chen, Nubisches Sprachmaterial, 91, 123.
384 C. Peust, Egyptian Phonology: An Introduction to the Phonology of a Dead Language (Göttingen, 1999), 133-135. Note the confusion between \(p\) and \(f\) in Hoch, Semitic Words, 483.
386 Hoch, Semitic Words, 402 has four secure examples of Egyptian \(\text{p}\) reproducing Semitic /\(b/\). For variation of /\(b/p/\) in indigenous Egyptian words see the examples in W. Ward, ‘The Biconsonantal root *\(b^3\)* and Remarks on Bilabial Interchange in Egyptian’, ZAS 102 (1975), 60-67.
But as Breyer noted, the most promising cognates come from Ethiopsemitic languages. A connection to the Ethiosemitic root $frh$ ‘fear, revere’, as an etyma of a ‘ruler’, is possible. This root has realisations in Ge’ez in ‘Afroha’ ‘make revere’ or färahe ‘god-fearing’. Also possible is the Ethiopic root $brh$ ‘be bright’. In Ge’ez onomastics, $brh$ is used in the name of the famous Aksumite general Abreha. The root $brh$ was favoured by Breyer in his analysis of the name of the Puntite ruler, but $frh$ also equally satisfies the phonology of the Egyptian transcription.

$Ity$ $\mathcal{L}tj$:

An identical name is also found in Canaanite personal name, the king’s wife $\mathcal{L}tj$ in the royal family of the Fourteenth Dynasty. But, as the Puntite $Ity$ is unlikely to derive from a North-West Semitic language, other possibilities must be entertained. A promising theory is a connection to the Proto-Afroasiatic $\sqrt{ʔdd}$ ‘female relative’ or Semitic $\sqrt{ʔdt}$. Identifying the exact language for this lexeme is difficult, as the root occurs in almost all branches of Afroasiatic. Comparisons can be made with Agaw, Highland East Cushitic and Beja forms, but almost all these languages have a geminating $d$ or an inlaut $n$ and mean ‘(grand)mother’, unlike in Semitic, where it means ‘lady’.

However, there seems to be a separate Ethiosemitic root $\sqrt{ʔtj}$ which occurs specifically as a term of address for ‘noblewomen’ in Ethiosemitic languages. This connection is to be preferred as Egyptian $t$ is more likely to correspond to (Ethio)semitic $t$ than $d$, and also semantically makes sense as this is exactly what would be expected in the context of a formal introduction of an Egyptian ambassador ($wpw.ty$) on an Egyptian expedition. The various forms include Tigre ‘eteye’, Tigrinya $tiyä$ ‘address of respect used for wife of a käntiba or other official’.

---

388 Compare such meanings as Ge’ez ‘afroha’ ‘make revere’ and färahe ‘god-fearing’; W. Leslau Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez (Wiesbaden, 1991), 165-166. The root is recorded as personal names in Amharic; see T. Kane, Tigrinya-English Dictionary (Springfield, 2000), 2274. For the root, see also Hudson, Northeast African Semitic, 248. There is Minaean personal name $frh$ ‘sprightly, agile’; see L. Harding, An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions (Toronto; Buffalo, 1971), 466. G. Takács, ‘Nubian Lexicon in Later Egyptian’, Bibliotheca Orientalis 70 (2013), 575 also recently suggested this root for the Puntite ruler.


391 Ryholt, The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period, 99-100. Schneider, Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches, 48-49 is unsure as to whether some of these names are Egyptian or Semitic. See also H. Ranke, Die ägyptischen Personennamen (Glückstadt, 1935), I, 49.

392 Orel & Stolbova, Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary, 6 glosses the root as ‘female relative’ and identifies reflexes in Cushitic and Chadic languages, also suggesting a relationship to the Semitic root ‘d’t’ ‘lady’.


394 In Hoch’s safe Northwest Semitic correspondences (Semitic Words, 435-437), Egyptian $t$ represents /t/ in 91.8% of cases compared to /d/ in only 4.1%.
Gurage itē ‘King’s-wife’, Amharic ‘ite ‘title for noblewoman’. Unfortunately, this etymology fails on account of all these words being rather modern loans derived from Amharic stoye, which originally derived from common Ethiosemitic ‘ḥet ‘sister’, with the loss of the velar fricative in Amharic. Breyer has overcome this problem by connecting the word to Amharic stöge ‘queen, consort’, proposing a shift from /g/ > /y/. In summation this name is more difficult to match to any known kinship term.

The aromatic substance most frequently associated with Punt, *nt.y, has a number of parallels in Cushitic and Ethiosemitic languages. Banti considered it to be related to the Somali word canāad (Somali c = /ʃ/) ‘best grade frankincense’. Banti also raised the possibilities of comparing *nt.y to Cushitic words for ‘milk’, or to Semitic √ṭn ‘to burn’ and hence ‘incense’. Due to the extreme distance, a Somali loan in Egyptian seems unlikely. Given that the word has a -w or -yw morphological suffix, it is perhaps prudent to favour an inner Egyptian origin, for which there is a favourable option, connecting it to *nt adze (see Excursus I. I). The substance klya ‘gum, incense’, connected with the Gnbtw, is otherwise unattested, and it remains plausible that it is a loanword, although there is no guarantee that it is Puntite.

Another Egyptian word which may be of Puntite origin is d(ʾ)ng ‘pygmy, dwarf’. The word has many possible cognates in Ethiosemitic or Cushitic languages, although linguists have noted its status as a Northeast African Wanderwort. El-Sayed connected it to Agaw deren ‘short’ (his

---


396 For assistance with this lexical problem in Ethiosemitic languages, I must thank Professor David Appleyard (Personal Communication).


399 Banti & Contini, ‘Names of Aromata in Semitic and Cushitic languages’, in Avanzini (ed.), Profumi d’Arabia, 184, where they cite East Cushitic *a(ʾ)n ‘milk’, (Somali caan-ā, Oromo aana). Closer to the supposed Puntite homeland in Africa, one can cite Afar can ‘milk’; see E. Parker, Afar-English Dictionary (Springfield, 2000), 118. For the root √ṭn ‘incense’, see Leslau, Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez, 76. In addition to Leslau’s Soho-Afar examples, there is Highland East Cushitic it’an ‘incense’; see G. Hudson, Highland East Cushitic Dictionary (Hamburg, 1989), 83. El-Sayed leaves open the possibility of an Egyptian origin of *nt.yw, see Afrikanschtsämmniger Lehmvortschatz, 177.

400 For this word see Urk. IV 695.5-7. No one has as yet proffered a botanical or lexical origin for this resin. One can cite Oromo qayya ‘incense’; T. Leus, J. van de Loo & G. Cotter, An Oromo-English Vocabulary (Debre Zeit, 1992), 103 or if ʾ equals a liquid /r/, Agaw qVR ‘smell’; Appleyard, A Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages, 106.

401 El-Sayed leaves open the possibility of an Egyptian origin of *nt.yw, see Afrikanschtsämmniger Lehmvortschatz, 177.
t’erey, contra Appleyard’s reconstruction of dädäŋ), given the regular correspondence of ū for /u/ and the possibility of ūng corresponding to a velar nasal. But, in light of Takács objections, it is difficult to explain the Egyptian form given that the liquid is a secondary feature of the Agaw root, there being no reason to suggest that Agaw ever had emphatics such as [t’]. There are similar Cushitic words for ‘short’, which could cement its place as a word which passed into Egyptian, Ethiosemitic, and Berber from Cushitic. However, this certainly cannot be conclusively proven and an Ethiosemitic origin is prima facie possible. Breyer, in a comprehensive treatment of this lexeme, deemed it as one of the few safe Cushitic loanwords in Egyptian, and outlined the difficulty of using this word to reconstruct any supposed relations between Egyptians and Cushitic speakers. As such, there are too many phonological (chiefly the ū) and pragmatic problems to treat this as a Puntite lexical item, which may be variously vocalised as /dlg/, /drg/ or even /dVŋ/.

The word hbny ‘ebony’, is also considered as a possible Puntite word by El-Sayed, but due to the wide distribution of this tree, it is not a good candidate for a specifically Puntite word. Kitchen has made much of the use of the phoneme /p/ in Pwnt and Pthrhw and the apparent lack of this phoneme in the Semitic languages of Arabia to argue against a Semitic language in Punt. But, most contemporary Cushitic languages, and any language of Northeast Africa in general, also lack this phoneme. This loss is considered to be the product of diffusion (an areal feature), rather than

---

402 El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 305-306; For the Proto-Agaw form, see Appleyard, A Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages, 122; For Sahidic Ⲛⲟ/ⲧⲓ as the velar nasal [ŋ] in auslaut position, see the discussion in Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 91; F. Kammerzell, ‘Old Egyptian and Pre-Old Egyptian: tracing linguistic diversity in Archaic Egypt and the creation of the Egyptian language’, in S. Seidlmayer (ed.), Texte und Denkmäler des ägyptischen Alten Reiches (Berlin, 2005), 177-180; F. Breyer, ‘Zwerg-Wörter und ägyptisch-kuschitischer Sprachkontakt bzw. -vergleich. Zur sprachlichen Situation im mittleren Niltal des 3.-2. Jts. v. Chr’, SAK 41 (2012), 106 n. 29. 403 Takács, Bibliotheca Orientalis 70, 575 n. 25 prefers an Ethiosemitic origin. Takács objections can be tempered somewhat by the fact that the aleph may well encode zero or a vowel in African loans (see section 4.3.1), and that it is certainly not not necessary for Agaw to have a registered word for ‘dwarf/pygmy’ in this root for a sense of ‘short(-person)’ to pass into Egyptian with this meaning.


405 See Leslau, Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez, 137 and Takács, Bibliotheca Orientalis 70, 575.

406 Breyer, SAK 41, 99-112 importantly remarks that the lexeme is also present in Omotic.

407 Hypothetically, one might note that if Satzinger’s thesis of ū being vocalic in the Execration Texts holds true for this loan (section 4.3.1), then the word might be reconstructed as *dVŋ, where ng is attributable to a velar nasal [ŋ]. This fits more closely the Proto-Agaw form dädäŋ. Late Egyptian dnrg is not an instructive parallel as it refers to a ‘fruit’ (Wb. 5, 470).

408 El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 230. For this tree’s distribution, see Wm.t [81].

an inherited feature, and the date of this consonant loss cannot be established with any certainty. Therefore the presence or absence of this phoneme is a poor criterion for establishing the language of Punt. While Egyptian texts make it clear that myrrh and pygmies come from Punt, with the earliest recorded case being a Puntite pygmy from the reign of Djedkare Isesi, it is impossible to verify whether these words originated from a hypothetical Puntite language or some other intermediary language or were both trade-based Wanderwörter. Unfortunately, the current lexical evidence is too poor to identify any of the language(s) that were spoken in Punt, but leaves open the possibility of Cushitic and/or Ethiopic languages. A study of Puntite toponyms may perhaps shed new light on this problem.

4.3 Phono-Graphemic Correspondences

As this thesis’s focus is the subject of toponymy, it must rely on previous linguistic works in order to establish sound rules for the etymological study of foreign toponyms (autonyms). Here, I am indebted to a number of works which establish regular or occasional phonetic correspondences between Egyptian and other languages. Egyptian phonology is riddled with many issues and debates, and the phonetic correspondences between Egyptian and foreign languages are based on many assumptions, made complex by inner Egyptian phonetic shifts, as well as sound shifts in foreign languages. The task is made all the more difficult by the lack of research between Egyptian and African languages, although this is steadily changing, with the etymological work of Takács and the onomastic studies of Schneider, El-Sayed, and Zibelius-Chen. The main problem with such etymological analyses of loanwords is the lack of contemporary lexical material in African languages and the reliance on relatively modern dictionaries for lexical material.

In Egyptian documentation, different corpora of onomastica employ distinct methods to reproduce the sounds in foreign words. The Old and Middle Kingdom Exegesis Texts and the New Kingdom Topographical lists, for instance, employ distinct orthographies to reproduce similar

---

410 This loss of /p/ can be explained as an areal feature, not restricted to one language family; see G. Clements & A. Rialland, ‘Africa as a Phonological Area’, in B. Heine & D. Nurse (eds), A Linguistic Geography of Africa (Cambridge, 2008), 65-67.
411 The references to myrrh from Punt are too numerous to list here, but see the toponym Ht.yw-nt.yw [85]. For the pygmy of Punt, see the Biography of Harkhuf Urk. I, 128.15-17.
sounds. A major innovation in this process is the emergence of digraphs (or polygraphs) to represent single phonemes. This became the norm in the Execration Texts and in the onomastica of pMoscow 314, particularly with groups such as \( \text{£} \) for \([7]\) and \( \text{£} \) for \(/t/\), which could be alternatively expressed as \( \text{£} \) and \( \text{£} \). In general, one can abide by a few principles in phonetic correspondences between Egyptian graphemes and foreign sounds. When hearing a foreign-sound that did not occur in Egyptian, scribes/interpreters could 1) establish digraphs, as in \( \text{£} \) for \([l]\), but could also 2) use the principle of ‘sounds similar to’ and use a single grapheme to reproduce an unknown foreign sound, so \( \text{£} \) for \([l]\) or Meroitic \([d]\) or \( \text{£} \) for Semitic \((t)s'\). When dealing with sounds that freely occurred in Egyptian and the target language, the task is more straightforward, but there is still room for confusion with numerous sound shifts to be taken into account, both in Egyptian and the target languages, and possibilities of not ‘hearing’ the sound correctly in the loaning process. Thus, there is no simple one-to-one correspondence for most Egyptian graphemes and foreign phonemes.

A full treatment of the Egyptian phonological inventory and the many disagreements as to the phonology of Egyptian graphemes would quickly fill a book. The debates concerning Egyptian phonology are complex and differ markedly in the phonological reconstruction of certain graphemes. Thus, a summary of the various phonetic realisations of Egyptian graphemes is given below, combining the data from various schools, but not attempting to comment on their relative merit (Tab. 5).

413 Take for instance the Levantine placename which, in the Middle Kingdom Execration Texts is written \( \text{£} \) Hdw1\( \text{£} \), but in New Kingdom documents is recorded as \( \text{£} \) Hgw\( \text{£} \); see Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms, 116-117.

414 El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnhortschatz, 90.

415 The existence of the retroflex stop in Meroitic \([d]\) is debated. Rilly & Voogt, The Meroitic language and Writing System, 111-112 cite it sounds like \(/r/\) to the untrained ear. El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnhortschatz, 115; R. El-Sayed, ‘Afrikanisches Lehngut in ägyptischen Schriftquellen’, in T. Schneider (ed) Das Ägyptische und die Sprachen Vorderasiens Nordafrikas und der Ägäis (Münster, 2004), 315 states that Egyptian \( r \) could represent this sound. Wedekind, Annali 70, 76 cites an example of Coptic \( p \) for \(/d/\) in the word \( \text{£} \) Saho had'a ‘lord’. K. Rowan, ‘Revising the sound value of Meroitic D: A Phonological Approach’, Beitrage zur Sudanforschung 10 (2009), 103-111 questions the existence of this phoneme in Merotic and suggests that the Merotic graphme \( \text{£} \) was variably interpreted as \( [r] \) intervocalically, but otherwise \( [d] \). C. Peust, ‘Graphem- und Phonemfrequenzen im Meroitischen und mögliche Schlussfolgerungen’, LingAeg 18 (2010), 193-208, based on relative frequency of phonemes in Merotic script, doubts the retroflex value of \( \text{£} \) in place of \( [d] \). For the Semitic phonemic cognates of Egyptian \( d \), see Hoch, Semitic Words, 437.

416 With regards to the consonantal values of Old-Egyptian graphemes and their cognates in Afroasiatic (especially Semitic) languages, there remains lively debate between the school of Otto Rössler ‘neue Kompartment’ and scholars who follow the traditional interpretation of Erman and Edel. See the arguments in EDE I, 333-344 and Schneider, LingAeg 5, 189-209, and the response to Takács in T. Schneider, ‘Etymologische Methode, die Historizität der Phoneme und das ägyptologische Transkriptionsalphabet’, LingAeg 11 (2003), 187-199. The respective reproductions regarding several Egyptian consonants do markedly differ in these approaches, especially concerning \( r \). Another division between the two schools is the debate over the existence of emphatics, with Schenkel & Kammerzell in favour, and Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 81-84 and Allen against the opposition of \( ± \) emphatic in dental stops.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Egyptian &gt; Middle Egyptian</th>
<th>Late Egyptian</th>
<th>New Kingdom Semitic Correspondence (Hoch)(^{417})</th>
<th>Old-Middle Kingdom African Cognates (El-Sayed)(^{418})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\dot{b})</td>
<td>(/\dot{r}, \dot{l}/)</td>
<td>(/r/)</td>
<td>(\emptyset) or vocalic in group-writing</td>
<td>(/\dot{r}, \dot{l}/), in certain corpora /(\emptyset/) (^{419})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>(/i/)</td>
<td>(/\dot{j}/)</td>
<td>(\emptyset) (also with (\emptyset/))</td>
<td>(\emptyset/)/, (\emptyset/)/, (\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(y)</td>
<td>(\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(/\dot{j}/)</td>
<td>(\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ɛ)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/) ~ (/d/)(^{421})</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(\emptyset, \dot{h}, \dot{g})</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/), (\emptyset/), (\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(w)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/) ~ (/u/)(^{422})</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(w)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/) ~ (/\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(p, b)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/) ~ (/\emptyset/)(^{423})</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(p) (very rare)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(m, b)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/) ~ (/\emptyset/)(^{424})</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(n, \emptyset) ~ (\emptyset)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/), (\emptyset/), (\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/) ~ (/\emptyset/)/ (&gt;) (/\emptyset/)(^{425})</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(r, l, n, d)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/), (\emptyset/), (\emptyset/), (\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/), (\emptyset/), (\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s/z)</td>
<td>(s, /s/ and z /\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(\emptyset, /\emptyset/), (\emptyset/)/</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/), (\emptyset/), (\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/) ~ (/\emptyset/)(^{426})</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)</td>
<td>(q, g)</td>
<td>(/\emptyset/)/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{417}\) Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 431-437. While Hoch’s phonetic correspondents are generally useful and authoritative, one should consult the criticisms of A. Rainey ‘Egyptian evidence for semitic linguistics’, *Israel Oriental Studies* 18 (1998), 431-454, particularly regarding his analysis of Semitic sibilants and semantics of some words. In his review of Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period* in *ZDMG* 146 (1995), 508-511, Quack revises some of Hoch’s correspondences. Less critical is G. Rendsburg’s review ‘Semitic Words in Egyptian texts’, *JAOS* 116 (1996), 508-511, but it illustrates that the shifting and merging nature of phonemes in the Canaanite languages makes it difficult to be certain of what exact sound is being represented by the Semitic transliteration. Using correspondents as general evidence for the phonetic value of Egyptian graphemes through the logic *‘Egyptian grapheme X = Semitic consonant Y which in turn has the phonetic value Z’* is thus problematic on Semitic correspondences alone.


\(^{419}\) See section 4.3.1.

\(^{420}\) While in Egyptian words \(i\) seems to be consonantal, in certain corpora it is clear it could also be vocalic (matres lectionis), see the comments of Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 496-498.


\(^{422}\) See Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 496-498.

\(^{423}\) Kammerzell, ‘Old Egyptian and Pre-Old Egyptian: tracing linguistic diversity in Archaic Egypt and the creation of the Egyptian language’, in Seidlmayer (ed.), *Texte und Denkmäler des ägyptischen Alten Reiches*, 177-180 shows some isolated examples of \(n\) for the velar nasal in Egyptian /\(n/\).

\(^{424}\) In some environments, /\(r/\) shifts to /\(\emptyset/\) from Old to Middle Egyptian. Graphically this is reproduced in some words like \(\text{zwr} \rightarrow \text{zwri} \rightarrow \text{zwi} ‘to drink’* (Wb. 3, 428). Egyptian \(r\) was probably a tapped or trilled \([\emptyset]\), explaining its ad hoc use for Semitic \(d\). Schenkel, *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*, 34 suggests a retroflex value.

\(^{425}\) There is some debate between the value of this grapheme as an uvular stop \([q]\) and an emphatic \([k']\) (or both), see Takács, *EDE* I, 273; Schenkel, *Tübinger Einführung in die klassisch-ägyptische Sprache und Schrift*, 35; Kammerzell, ‘Old Egyptian and Pre-Old Egyptian: tracing linguistic diversity in Archaic Egypt and the creation of the Egyptian language’, in Seidlmayer (ed.), *Texte und Denkmäler*
Table 5: Phono-Graphemic correspondences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>/k/</th>
<th>k, g</th>
<th>/k/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>/g&lt;sup&gt;W&lt;/sup&gt;/</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>g, q</td>
<td>/g/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>t, d, ṭ</td>
<td>/t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>/k/ &gt; /c/</td>
<td>/c/ &gt; /t/</td>
<td>s, ṭ</td>
<td>/ʃ/ vb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>/d/ ~ /t/&lt;sup&gt;426&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>/ʃ/ ~ /t'/426</td>
<td>s, z, ṭ, d</td>
<td>/t'/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>/c'/<del>/&lt;t'/427/ʃ'/</del>/&lt;d'/427/&gt;</td>
<td>/ʃ'/</td>
<td>s, z, ṭ, d</td>
<td>/t'/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vocalic system of Egyptian is not treated here, as it mainly rests upon assumptions from Coptic data and vocalised Egyptian words in Akkadian or Ugaritic documents. When reproducing foreign words, some sort of *matres lectionis* is likely, particularly with *w*, *i* and more debatably with *ḥ*. On current evidence, it is not possible (nor profitable) to safely reconstruct vowels in foreign languages, especially African words, due to unknown diachronic vowel shifts and the difficulties in establishing correspondences between the Egyptian and any foreign vocalic system.<sup>428</sup>

4.3.1 The Nature of ḫ in African loanwords before the New Kingdom

One of the most phonetically problematic graphemes in Egyptian is ḫ. It is now argued, due to Afroasiatic correspondences, that Old Egyptian aleph essentially had two distinct values, a glottal stop /ʔ/ and a liquid /r/, after which they presumably merged in some environments, but remained distinct in others.<sup>429</sup> In Egyptian, this phoneme sometimes preserves its liquid nature still in Coptic, but more frequently undergoes a process of ḫ > y.<sup>430</sup> It has been assumed that this liquid-
glottal duality in the phonetic values of $\delta$ could correspond to dialects, although this has not been researched comprehensively.\textsuperscript{431}

Given this duality, it is difficult to adduce the value of $\delta$ in African loanwords. In Semitic loans of the Execration Texts (Middle Kingdom), $\delta$ corresponds universally to a liquid /r/, or less commonly /l/,\textsuperscript{432} while by the New Kingdom orthography it had reduced to zero or a vowel, dependent on the interpretation of Egyptian ‘group-writing’. As $\delta$ clearly was no longer interpreted as a liquid or glottal stop in New Kingdom loans, the problem of its value chiefly concerns its use in Old and Middle Kingdom loans. Satzinger, in a statistical analysis of graphemes in African onomastica of the Execration Texts, points to the high frequency of $\delta$ (16%, on par with w and i which are also presumably vowels), and therefore postulates its vocalic value in this corpus, compared to Semitic loans where it occurs only in 9% of graphemes and thus represents /t/ or /l/.\textsuperscript{433} Evidently, there were two different values for $\delta$ in the Execration Texts of the Middle Kingdom; /t/ in Semitic loans, and /V/ in African loans. This process could perhaps mirror an Upper vs Lower Egyptian dichotomy in pronunciation of $\delta$, whereby northern scribes used $\delta$ to represent /r/, while southern scribes used the same grapheme for /ʔ/, which may have reduced to /V/ in loans. The problem here is that there are not many African loans with secure etymologies upon which to base a phonetic reading of aleph:

**Proposals for Aleph as liquid consonant:**

$\delta app$: Teda dūro bu bu ‘very big snake’.\textsuperscript{434}

$M\delta l$, on the evidence of the village name $P\delta-n(y)-M\delta r.y$ ‘The one of the Medjay’.\textsuperscript{435}

Beja loans listed in Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz.\textsuperscript{436}

\textsuperscript{431} See EDE I, 273-275 for a summary of the problem and literature.

\textsuperscript{432} Hoch, Semitic Words, 492ff. This correspondence is not shown in Egyptian loans in Northwest Semitic, where $\delta$ corresponds to /ʔ/, $\emptyset$ or a vowel, presumably due to the fact that $\delta$ had already shifted to /j/ by the time most of these words arrived in Ugaritic, Hebrew, Aramaic and other Semitic languages; see Muchiki, Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic, 313-14.


\textsuperscript{434} T. Schneider, ‘The west beyond the west: the mysterious “Wernes” of the Egyptian underworld and the Chad palaeolake’, JAEI 2 (2010), 11.

\textsuperscript{435} See Gardiner, The Wilbour Papyrus, I, pl. 50 (B3, line 22). This writing assumes that aleph retained a liquid pronunciation in the New Kingdom, but was augmented with an unetymological r /r/ to show this. For a similar manner of augmenting liquid $\delta$ with r, see the writing of Bīrs.t for Bīs.t ‘Bubastis’; see Peust, Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs in modernen Ägypten, 24. Another example includes wih > wirh ‘be flooded’ (Wb. 1, 252, 259).

\textsuperscript{436} These are listed in El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 118-119. While many of these etymologies are quite likely, it is difficult to feel confident about many of them. Khâbwî from Beja Kurib ‘Elephant’ is one of the more likely loans employing aleph as a liquid.
**Aleph as vowel:**

African names in pMoscow 314.\(^{437}\)

African Execration Texts.\(^{438}\)

**Various interpretations**

Indicative of this problem is where scholars disagree on the etymology of the same words due to the ambiguity of aleph, as with the African dog names on the Stele of Antef:\(^{439}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Berber} & \text{ abaïkour} & \text{‘greyhound’}^{440} \\
\text{Tuareg} & \text{ ibalaggāden} & \text{‘ohne umgelegtes Ohr’}^{441} \\
\text{Ge’ez} & \text{ bḥkw} & \text{‘goat’} \sim \text{ Beja bok} & \text{‘goat’}^{442} \\
\text{Tuareg} & \text{ bu-kukri} & \text{‘mit einer gazelle’}^{443}
\end{align*}
\]

An insight into these differing processes is given in the variant transcriptions of a Kushite ruler, who is transcribed as \textit{Trlhi} in the Execration Texts and as \textit{Trh} in a rock inscription from Umm Nabari.\(^{444}\) The former, \textit{Trlhi /trVhV/}, uses aleph (and yodh) as vowels, otherwise there would be a redundancy in liquids,\(^{445}\) while \textit{Trh} simply uses purely consonantal graphemes to write the same word. The difference in transcription, then, is one of vocalisation vs

\(^{437}\) El-Sayed, \textit{Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz}, 89-90; Rilly, ‘The earliest traces of Meroitic’, in Payne & Reh (eds), \textit{Advances in Nilo-Saharan Linguistics}, 211. Some examples include the sequence C\(\text{\textj}\text{l}\), thus demonstrating the use of aleph as a vowel or zero.


\(^{439}\) For a summary of these identifications, see Breyer, \textit{Einführung in die Meroitistik}, 200-202. It should be noted that a Berberist, Kossmann, found most of the purported Berber dog names unlikely, see Kossmann, ‘The names of King Antef’s dogs’, in Mettouchi (ed.), “Parcours berbères”. \textit{Mélanges offerts à Paullette Galand-Pernet et Lionel Galand pour leur 90e anniversaire}, 79-84.


\(^{441}\) Schneider, ‘Die Hundenamen der Stele Antefs II. Eine neue Deutung’, in Rollinger & Truschnegg (eds), \textit{Alteurop und Mittelmeerraum: die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante; Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag}, 532-33.


\(^{443}\) Schneider, ‘Die Hundenamen der Stele Antefs II. Eine Neue Deutung’, in Rollinger & Truschnegg (eds), \textit{Alteurop und Mittelmeerraum: die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante; Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag}, 532-33.

\(^{444}\) These names were connected in Davies, \textit{Sudan & Nubia} 18, 35-36. For the Execration Text name see El-Sayed, \textit{Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz}, 294, while a photo of the Umm Nabari inscription can be seen in Davies article and A. Castiglioni & A. Castiglioni, ‘Les pistes millénaires du désert oriental de Nubie’, \textit{BSFE} 169-170 (2007), 21.

\(^{445}\) That is, if every sign was consonantal, it would be /trrh?/.
non-vocalisation, with the Execration Texts using ‘vocalic alephs’ in an attempt to phonetically render the name for the purposes of its magical efficacy in the execration ritual. Vocalic rendering was not necessary in the rock inscription, as pronunciation was not considered important for its textual purpose. Thus, one might come to the simple conclusion that, within the Execration Texts, \( \beta = /V/ \), whereas outside these texts aleph may have been used as a liquid consonant.

Why there would be a synchronic difference between the value of \( \beta \) in transcription of loanwords is not clear. As El-Sayed has shown, the scribes of pMoscow 314 employed a distinct method of ‘vocalic alephs’, transliterating African names using \( C\beta \)-groups, completely different to the method in the Execration Texts. Satzinger proved that even in the corpus of Execration Texts there was at least two ‘schools’ of transcription, based on geographic distinction. While the early Meroitic onomastic data from pMoscow 314 and the African Execration Texts demonstrate \( \beta \)’s use as a vowel, there are no guarantees that aleph is used in this manner outside these distinct corpora. Indeed, in the case of \( M\beta \) the liquid reading is assured from the later variant \( M\beta r.y. \).

Given that scribal or dialectal dynamics affected pronunciation, one has to have quite an open mind then as to the pronunciation of aleph in African words of the Old and Middle Kingdom.

---

Chapter 5: Toponymic Databank

This chapter presents the catalogue of toponyms in the form of a numbered databank. The definite articles, *pA, tA, nA* and the genitive particle *n(y)* are ignored in alphabetical listings. Bold numbers in square brackets refer to an attestation of the respective placename in a text documented in the appendix (Volume 2). Roman numerals (I, II, III) next to the etymology and the location reveal the certainty of each.447 Toponyms that are lexically subordinate are given an alphanumerical code, e.g. [50A]. The first toponyms are areal toponyms [1-8], then Zone 1: The Eastern Desert [9-50], Zone 2: The South Sinai and Edom [51-74], Zone 3: The Red Sea and Southern Atbai [75-85], followed by toponyms found only in onomastica [86-133] and the Turin Map [T1-T20]. As the toponym Punt is prominent in Egyptian literature (having more attestations than any other placename in the corpus) and its location is integral to historical geography, a separate excursus deals with some of its archaeological and locational aspects. A synoptic table combining the data of all toponyms appears at the end of the appendix.

5.1 Areal Toponyms [1-9]

In addition to finite plakenames, there was also a stock of areal terms (choronyms) that designated the totality of Egypt’s easterly regions, including areas beyond its boundaries. Placenames that encompassed vast areas in addition to the outer peripheries of the Eastern Desert, Red Sea, and South Sinai are treated here.

447 See section 1.6 and 1.7.
448 Wb. 1, 31.
449 For the gods that have *nb(t)-iAb.t* as an epithet, consult LGG III, 571; IV, 8.
450 A slightly more terrestrial sense is given in the Speos Artemidos inscription where Pakhet ‘strides’ in the *in.wt hr.ywt-ib i3b.t(y)t* ‘the valleys which are in the east’ – perhaps a reference to her local cult on the desert fringe of the Oryx nome.451 A related phrase, *T-3b.ty* ‘Eastern Land’, using *3b.t* as an adjective, occurs in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></th>
<th><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While *3b.t* could abstractly refer to cardinal east, when classified with the hill-country sign as ![Image](image.png), it referred spatially to the lands east of Egypt, also in a cosmic sense as the land of sunrise.448 Lexically, the word is a nominalised nisbe ‘The-one-of-the-east’. The term is usually encountered in religious literature, particular solar tracts, where it is the locus of the rising sun-god or an epithet of a deity connected with these regions.449 In rhetorical texts, it is also used as a statement of Amun’s and Egypt’s universal domination: *di=k hr=3 r 3b.t bi3bi=n k* ‘I (Amun) set my face to the east that I may perform a wonder for you’.450 A slightly more terrestrial sense is given in the Speos Artemidos inscription where Pakhet ‘strides’ in the *in.wt hr.ywt-ib 3b.t(y)t* ‘the valleys which are in the east’ – perhaps a reference to her local cult on the desert fringe of the Oryx nome.451 A related phrase, *T-3b.ty* ‘Eastern Land’, using *3b.t* as an adjective...
opening of a stanza in the Poetical Stele of Thutmosis III after which God’s-Land (T3-ntr) is mentioned.\textsuperscript{452} In locational terms, it could refer to any space east of Egypt, in Nubia, the Eastern Desert and also the Sinai.\textsuperscript{453} The utility of this term is its use for anywhere broadly east of Egypt, including the eastern sky and horizon.

\textbf{Classification:} +Egyptian (3.1)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\hline
\hline
\textbf{[2]} & \hbox{H3s.t-}i3b.t(y)\textit{t} \\
\hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

As the meaning of \textit{h}s\textit{t} was first ‘hill-country’ and only by extension ‘foreign-land’, it could on occasion refer to the most proximal mountains to Egypt, the hills of the Eastern Desert. In some documentary papyri, gold-bearing regions in the Eastern Desert are simply labelled as \textit{h}s\textit{t} ‘hill-country’.\textsuperscript{454} Local rock inscriptions could also simply refer to the Eastern Desert Mountains as an indefinite \textit{h}s\textit{t}.\textsuperscript{455} Thus the word \textit{h}s\textit{t} as the ‘hill-country’ could on occasion specifically refer to these mountainous regions adjacent to Egypt. The \textit{H}s\textit{t}-\textit{i3b.t} seems to be more or less synonymous with the modern expression ‘Eastern Desert’. In a chapel of Montuhotep II from Dendera, the \textit{h}s\textit{wt}-\textit{i3b.wt} are symbolically mentioned as being ‘clubbed’ along with the Medjay.\textsuperscript{456} The Konosso stele of Thutmosis IV refers to the location of a campaign in the desert east of Lower Nubia as \textit{H}s\textit{t}-\textit{i3b.(y)t} ‘Eastern hill-country’.\textsuperscript{457} The ‘Eastern Hill-Country’ recurs in the epithet of Min, \textit{Md3.y nfr n(y) h}s\textit{t}-\textit{i3b.t} ‘Good Medjay of the Eastern Hill-Country’ where it must refer to the Eastern Desert and its hills and the assumed home of the original Medjay.\textsuperscript{458}

\textbf{Classification:} +Egyptian (1.1+3.1)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\hline
\hline
\textbf{[3]} & \hbox{Zmy.(w)t-}i3b.t(yw)t \\
\hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

This phrase mainly occurs in its plural form \textit{Zmy.wt} \textit{i3b.ywt} ‘Eastern Deserts’ in the administrative title ‘overseer of the Eastern Deserts’, particularly in the tombs of officials at Beni Hasan.\textsuperscript{459} The term is employed in a rather vague sense, so it is difficult to know precisely how it

\textsuperscript{452} Urk. IV, 615.10-15.

\textsuperscript{453} In the Sinai inscriptions the epithet of Sopdu as \textit{nb}-\textit{i3b.t} points to the South Sinai directionally being as part of the ‘east’, see Gardiner, Peet & Černý, \textit{The Inscriptions of the Sinai}, II, no. 28, no. 33, no. 35, no. 44, no. 122, no. 124, no. 125. The Levant was technically ‘north’, \textit{mh.ty}, see for example \textit{Urk.} IV, 775.2.

\textsuperscript{454} \textit{KRI} VI, 398-399. For commentary on the text, see Y. Koenig, ‘Livraisons d’or et de galène au trésor du temple d’Amon sous la XXe dynastie’, \textit{BIFAO} 83 (1983), 249-255 who translates \textit{h}s\textit{t} here simply as ‘gebel’.

\textsuperscript{455} No. BR09, BR49 in Rothe, Miller & Rapp, \textit{Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt}, 119, 164.


\textsuperscript{457} \textit{Urk.} IV, 1547.17. The reference to finding his enemies in the \textit{in.wt-}\textit{StA.w} ‘secret valleys’ and Wawat should leave us in no doubt that the wadis east of Lower Nubia are being mentioned.

\textsuperscript{458} Chassinat, \textit{Le mystère d’Osiris au mois de Khoiak II}, 676-680.

\textsuperscript{459} W. Ward, \textit{Index of Egyptian Administrative and Religious Titles of the Middle Kingdom} (Beirut, 1982), 44. More specifically, see S. Aufrère, ‘The deserts and the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Upper Egyptian
differs from \( b\overline{s}.t-\overline{i}b.t \), or if the terms were in free variation. Beyond titles, it is used in the stele of Ichernofret, where \( zm.yt-\overline{i}b.t \) is coupled with \( zm.yt-imn.t \) ‘western desert’.\(^{460}\) It is not demonstrably known if the title referred to duties specifically conducted in the deserts east of the Oryx Nome, or more generally to the whole Eastern Desert. As one holder of this title, Khnumhotep II, is known from Mersa Gawasis, perhaps the title was used elastically for officials involved in expeditions to such places as Gebel el-Zeit, Mersa Gawasis and elsewhere.\(^{461}\) As this expression is mainly attested in the dialect of Beni Hasan tomb texts, one might wonder whether it was simply a synonym of \( b\overline{s}.t-\overline{i}b.t \).

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+3.1)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
4 & T3-ntr \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

This enigmatic term ‘God’s-Land’ could equally refer to the disparate lands in the Eastern Desert, Sinai, Red Sea, Punt, and Lebanon and, as such, had little geographic specificity. The term has been the subject of a number of studies, by Kuentz, Saleh, Goedicke, Nibbi, Nutz, and the present author, and it has been shown to relate generally to eastern regions and the liminal eastern horizon.\(^{462}\) The presence of the term in solar hymns and cosmographies seems to suggest a connection with the the east, and it may be that \( T3-ntr \) designated all those lands from which the ‘(sun)-god’ could rise between the solstice points, i.e. the solar-east.\(^{463}\) In this sense, the word can be compared to other cultural terms for ‘east’ with semantics relating to solar rising (cf. also Egyptian terms like \( \overline{wbn}.t \) such as Greek *Anatolia* and Arabic *Mashreq*. In expedition and dedication texts it vaguely describes the origin of some exotic produce, often glossing the location of Puntite or Levantine goods.\(^{464}\) On occasion, a dual and plural variant of the expression is found. These variations are more difficult to explain, and Bongrani has suggested that the dual may refer

---


463 Cooper, *BACE* 22, 52-54.

464 See Table 1 in Cooper, *BACE* 22, 52-54.
to both sides of the Red Sea,\textsuperscript{465} while the full plural $T3-w-ntr.w$ is found in more generalised contexts where any such land from Punt to Lebanon might be meant.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+6.3)

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{[5]} \\
\text{Hbs.t-}^{c}3m.w/T3-^{c}3m.w
\end{array}\]

The ‘Hill-country of Asiatics’ was a seldom used ethnic-based toponym. It likely included Sinai, the Gulf of Suez, and much of Canaan and anywhere where the $^{c}3m.w$ roamed. It has been argued that in the inscription of Pepinakht the $Hbs.t-^{c}3m.w$ refers to the hills adjacent to the Gulf of Suez.\textsuperscript{466} A damaged biographical text from the tomb of Khnumhotep at Dahshur records $T3-^{c}3m.w$ alongside the $Km-wr$ ‘Bitter Lakes’, suggesting that this toponym included the Sinai corridor to the Levant.\textsuperscript{467} The ‘door of the Land of Asiatics’ is mentioned in Hammamat no. 43, perhaps an allusion to the Ways of Horus and the Sinai route to Canaan.\textsuperscript{468} The expression $T3-n(y)-^{c}3m.w$ occurs for the last time in the Kamose Stele, where it is juxtaposed in an ideological expression against $Km.t$ ‘Egypt’ as the native land of the Hyksos rulers.\textsuperscript{469} It is probable that some of its environs were subsumed by the expression $T3-\dot{S}\dot{s}.w$ in the New Kingdom.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+6.4)

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{[6]} \\
\text{T3-\dot{S}\dot{s}.w}
\end{array}\]

This term emerges in the New Kingdom and it is probable that it designates a similar expanse to $T3-^{c}3m.w$, but perhaps more centrally located in Edom. Like $T3-^{c}3m.w$, this word is a toponym based on an ethneme and thus had rather poorly established boundaries. The placename is found in Topographical Lists,\textsuperscript{470} as a destination for a military official,\textsuperscript{471} and in rhetorical texts at Tanis, Bubastis, Tell er-Retebah, Gebel Shaluf, and Clysma.\textsuperscript{472} While these texts alone do not assist


\textsuperscript{466} See section 4.2.3.

\textsuperscript{467} J. de Morgan, *Fouilles à Dahchour mars-juin 1894* (Wien, 1895), 21. The text is probably read /// $d3.t \ h.w \ w/h \ h r \ T3-^{c}3m.w \ hr \ pg \ T3-^{c}3m.w$ ‘in order to cross the canal, and endure (?) on the land of the Asiatics, being on the battlefield’, see J. Allen, ‘The Historical Inscription of Khnumhotep at Dahshur: Preliminary report’, *BASOR* 352 (2008), 36.

\textsuperscript{468} The passage reads, $z\dot{h} \ nbs.y \ wn \ T3-^{c}3m.w \ ‘…who smote the Nubian, and who opened the door of the Land of the Asiatics’, see Couyat & Montet, *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouadi Hammâmât*, 48.

\textsuperscript{469} For notes and translation, see H. Smith & A. Smith, ‘A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts’, *ZAŠ* 103 (1976), 59ff.

\textsuperscript{470} See Giveon, *Les bédouins Shosou des documents égyptiens*, docs. 4, 5, 5a, 6, 6a, 7, 12, 13, 16a, 20, 20a, 20b, 23, 49. $T3-\dot{S}\dot{s}.w$ is part of a Topographical List on a statue at Memphis (*KRI* II, 194) where it occurs between $kds$ ‘Kadesh’ and $Hrbw$ ‘Aleppo’. This does not necessarily point to its placement in this region, however, as after ‘Aleppo’ is ‘Meshwesh’, a Libyan tribe.

\textsuperscript{471} *KRI* VII, 125.6.

much in localising this placename, the connection with Shasu-nomads in other documentation defines its parameters somewhat. In Seti’s Shasu-wars, the nomads occupy the North Sinai between the Delta and Canaan.\(^\text{473}\) Sub-regions of the \(T^n\-\tilde{s}\-\text{w}\) in the Topographical Lists could be qualified by \(S'r\) ‘Seir’ and \(P\text{wnw}\) ‘Feinan’, toponyms known from southern contexts in Biblical literature and thus more or less equivalent to Edom and the Wadi Arabah.\(^\text{474}\) Despite this evidence, a number of scholars attempted to locate the Shasu further north. A toponym \(\text{yn-}\tilde{s}\-\text{w}\) has been much discussed in this context and is generally located in the Beqa Valley, but Lipinski showed that this was more likely a transcription of a similar sounding Semitic toponym, having no relation to the \(\tilde{s}\-\text{w}\)-nomads.\(^\text{475}\) The evidence suggests then that \(T^n\-\tilde{s}\-\text{w}\) was roughly equivalent to the regions of Southern Palestine, Sinai, Edom, and Transjordan.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+6.4)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
\text{[7]} & T^n\text{-nbw-}\ddot{\text{f}}\text{m} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

This phrase, occurring in only one Old Kingdom temple text, is a simple genitival construction, ‘The land of gold and electrum’.\(^\text{476}\) While the etymology of \(\ddot{\text{f}}\text{m}\) is unclear, its meaning as an auriferous mineral or alloy ‘electrum’ is all but certain.\(^\text{477}\) It has been suggested that the term \(T^n\text{-nbw}\) is the predecessor of ‘Nubia’ because of the oft-mentioned phonetic resemblance between the terms \(\text{nbw}\) and \(\text{Nubia}\).\(^\text{478}\) But a number of authorities have shown this to be a false folk etymology, and the term ‘Nubia’, instead, has its origins in a Meroitic or Eastern Sudanic word for ‘slave’ or ‘peasant’.\(^\text{479}\) The likely etymology for Egyptian \(\text{nbw}\) ‘gold’ is based on the Egyptian verb \(\text{nbi}\) ‘to melt, cast’, with a connection to the methods of gold refinement.\(^\text{480}\) Furthermore, there is no

\(^{473}\) KRI I, 8.8-9.


\(^{475}\) It has been equated with the \(\text{E-ni-ša-si}\) of the Amarna Letters, see Lipinski, *On the Skirts of Canaan*, 362. In a stela from Mit-Rahina, the \(\tilde{s}\text{w}\) are differentiated from the inhabitants of \(\text{Htr.w}\) ‘Syria’, so we can be fairly certain that they were occupying Canaan-Edom rather than Syria, see Givoren, *Les bédouins Shosou des documents égyptiens*, 13-14. In the biography of Ahmose Pen-Nekhbet (*Urk*. IV, 36), they are also differentiated from \(\text{Dîhy}\) ‘Syria’ and \(\text{Nhnr}\) ‘Mitanni’.

\(^{476}\) For the text, see A. Grimm, ‘\(T^n\text{-nbw}\) ‘Goldland’ und ‘Nubien’’, *GM* 106 (1988), 23-27/


\(^{479}\) The word is identified with the Meroitic \(\text{nob}\) referring to ‘slaves, peasants’ or alike, see Rilly, ‘Enemy brothers. Kinship and relationship between Meroites and Nubians (Noba)’, in Godlewski & Łatjar (eds), *Between the Cataracts*, 217-218 and F. Breyer, ‘‘\(\text{Nubien}\) und \(\tilde{\text{g}}\) \(\text{nb.w}\) „Gold“ - eine Gegendarstellung’, *MitSAG* 20 (2009), 173-176. A Berber origin for the name was also proposed in Behchhaus-Gerst & Behrens, *Afrikantische Arbeitspapiere* 4, 67-74.

evidence from Egyptian texts that a phrase such as ‘gold-land’ was ever exclusively applied to Nubia in contradistinction to the Eastern Desert. Old Kingdom mining operations were not as widespread in Nubia in the Old Kingdom compared to later periods, and one can note only a few Old Kingdom sites in Nubia proper such as Marahig (Wadi Allaqi) and Umm Fahm (near Serra), while there were a multitude of Old Kingdom mining sites in the Eastern Desert from Dara in the north to Hamash east of Kom Ombo.  

This term thus may have referred to any gold mining site in the stretch of the Eastern Desert.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+1.3+1.3)

[8] $H3s.wt-nbw$ (Imn.w)

This toponym is probably locationally equivalent with $T3-nbw-dFm$. It is found almost exclusively in titles and probably had little specificity. Mahfouz demonstrated that this title $im.y-r3 H3s.t-nbw$ was a real office, appearing between the reigns of Amenhotep III to Ramesses II, which terminated when Egypt lost access to Nubian goldfields. Thus, there is no reason to suggest it did not extend to all of Egypt’s goldfields, which at least in the New Kingdom would have stretched from the Coptos-Quseir latitude in the north, to the Fourth Cataract in the south. In one instance, the term is found within the gold regions in a rock inscription at Wadi Shalul northeast of Edfu, but here too it is part of a title. This instance alone, however, suggests that $H3s.t-nbw$ did designate Upper Egyptian mines as well as those in Nubia. The toponym could be further qualified with smaller constituent regions [8A] and [8B]. Reisner showed that the overseers of $H3s.t-nbw$ also often had the titles ‘overseer of Kush’ or ‘overseer of southern lands’, suggesting that these lands were all more or less synonymous in bureaucratic parlance. This overlap might mean that the expanse of the $H3s.t-nbw$ did not include the more northerly goldfields near Coptos, but on balance it would be dangerous to exclude any goldfield per se from the boundaries of this placename, especially as there is one official who holds the title $im.y-r3 H3s.wt-nbw-n(wt)-Gbtw$ ‘Overseer of the hill-countries of gold of Coptos’.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+1.3)

[8A] $H3s.wt-nbw-n(wt) Imn.w$

---

481 Klemm & Klemm, *Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia*, 605.
482 For a list of these title-holders, see J. Taylor, *An Index of Male non-Royal Egyptian Titles, Epithets & Phrases of the 18th Dynasty* (London, 2001), 40.
484 For the various sources of gold in the pharaonic period, see the Ramesside mining list, *KRI* II, 617-621.
486 G. Reisner, ‘The Viceroys of Ethiopia (continued)’, *JEA* 6 (1920), 76.
487 *Urk.* IV, 931.13. The fact that this term is found only once, with an indirect genitive, might suggest it was an ad hoc placename.
This term appears only in New Kingdom bureaucratic vernacular. It is perhaps related to Amun’s universal lordship over creation, but the Amun temple did staff its own gold washing teams (f‘i nbw), and thus the goldmines could in reality be institutionally related to Amun’s cult. Like H3s.t-nbw, H3s.t-nbw-n(y)-Imn.w occurs only in titles, and may presumably be the fuller form of im.y-r3 H3s.t-nbw.488 On the stele Louvre C. 279, Nebseny is given the alternative titles im.y-r3 H3s.t-nbw and im.y-r3 H3s.wt-nbw-n(wt)-Imn.w, so one may assume that these titles were in free variation, and thus H3s.t-nbw may always have been an abbreviated form of H3s.t-nbw-n(wt)-Imn.w.489 The im.y-r3 H3s.t-nbw-Imn.w Sennefer left an inscription in Wadi Hammamat, so presumably this region was included within the H3s.t-nbw.490

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+1.3+6.3)

The goldland of Kush (h3s.t nbw Kš) may have included gold mines in the desert east of Kush, but in Upper Nubia there are also many gold sources along the Third and Fourth Cataract and west of the Nile in the Bayuda desert, which meant that Kushite gold did not necessarily originate in the Eastern Desert but also deposits in and around the Nile.492 Thus an inscription at Sai island names an official Ry as the im.y-r3 h3s.t-nbw n(y) Kš.493 Gold deposits at nearby desert sites such as Gebel Nigeim, Umm Nabari or Gebel Komotit were possibly dominated by the Kerma polity and hence could be labelled ‘of Kush’.494

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+1.3+3.4)

+Meroitic (?)

5.2 Zone 1: The Eastern Desert [9-50]

Etymology (III): As a land inhabited by Medjay, the name may be connected to the Beja language. This finds support in the name of 3wšk’s ruler, Kwí, who has a good Beja etymology in kwáaya ‘Freund, Genosse’.495 The biliteral 3w in 3wšk could be interpreted as /ru/ as in

---

488 Helck, JARCE 6, 148, line 44.
492 Klemm & Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 608.
493 Mahfouz, RdÉ 56, 72.
494 A. Castiglioni, A. Castiglioni & C. Bonnet ‘Goldmines of the Kingdom of Kerma’, in Godlewski & Łatjar (eds), Between the Cataracts, 267-268. A Kushite ruler is mentioned at Umm Nabari, see Davies, Sudan & Nubia 18, 35-36.
495 El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 269, 278-279. This is perhaps the same name registered in pMoscow 314 as Kšwi.
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\(\text{AwSaAm} – (U)\text{rushalimum}\), although it is uncertain whether \(\text{Aw}\) in this Semitic word is to be taken as /ru/ or /ʔVru/.\footnote{Posener, 
Princes et pays d’Asie et de Nubie, 86. Hoch, Semitic Words, 493 cites \(\text{Aw}\) as a CVCV group ‘aru’alu. Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms, 130 has \(\text{Aw}\) from the Execration Texts as Lawisi (Laith) and the name \(\text{Aw}\) has been read as Rwr-Hdd ‘Hadad moistens’, in J. Gray, The Legacy of Canaan: The Ras Shamra texts their relevance to the Old Testament (Leiden, 1957), 114 n. 2. Therefore, I find Hoch’s glottalised interpretation /ʔVru/ of this group unlikely.}

In the African section of the Execration Texts, \(\text{Aw}\) could also be vocalic, as shown by Satzinger, and thus one may prefer reproducing \(\text{Aw}\) as /Vw/.\footnote{Satzinger, ‘Das ägyptische «Aleph»-Phonem’, in Bietak et al. (eds), Festschrift Gertrud Thausing, 202-205.}
The uvular or glottal \(\text{k}\) is found in other Middle Kingdom African lexica, but it is rare in New Kingdom African loanwords.\footnote{Listed in El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnhwortschatz; \(\text{Ibikri} (127)\ \text{isnikn} (128 + \text{Yam}), \text{Ikn} (164), \text{Iikri} (165)\ \text{Wihikr} (184).}

There are a number of suitable geographic etymons in Beja, of which El-Sayed suggested the compound \(\text{re} \ ‘\text{well’ and suuga} \ ‘\text{khor between high mountains’}.\footnote{El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnhwortschatz, 162. For these lexemes, see Blažek, Babel und Bibel 3 (2007), 420. But \(\text{suuga}\) has a suggestive Arabic parallel in \(\text{sugqah}\), a word with various geographic meanings, in which case it would be a relatively modern loan into Beja, see N. Groom, A Dictionary of Arabic Topography and Placenames (Beirut, 1983), 271-273.}

As \(\text{Aw}\) is likely to be vocalic, another suggestion for the first part of the placename could be the Beja definite article \(\text{u}\)- or perhaps \(\text{auwi} \ ‘\text{stone’}. Confusing matters are other semantically appropriate Eastern Sudanic lexical material such as Old Nubian \(\text{gHk} \ ‘\text{administrative district’ or Nara} \ \text{šiga} \ ‘\text{wilderness, desert’}.

**Location (III):** As the toponym is known only from the Execration Texts [9.1-9.6] and pBoulaq 18 [9.7], there is little data to assist in locating the placename. In pBoulaq 18, the ruler of \(\text{AwSk}\) is a \text{MDj.y}, which positions \(\text{AwSk}\) somewhere in the Eastern Desert.\footnote{Browne, Old Nubian Dictionary, 186; L. Reinsch, Die Barea-Sprache (Wien, 1874), 151.}

This text twice makes reference to the toponym \text{Tp-rsy} \ ‘the head of the south’, and thus one can assume that the \text{MDj.y} delegation from \(\text{AwSk}\) arrived at Thebes through the Aswan area.\footnote{D. O’Connor, ‘The Locations of Yam and Kush and their Historical Implications’, JARCE 23 (1986), 41; R. Morkot, The Black Pharaohs (London, 2000), 59-60.}

It is impossible on present data to locate this placename more specifically than the Eastern Desert. Speculatively, if \text{Wb-Itspt} [17] is located in the bend of the Nile, \(\text{AwSk}\) might be located in the area east of this, towards Gebel Elba and Abraq.

**Classification:** +Cushitic (7.1)

\[10\] \(\text{Bhtb} / * \text{/?rhtb} / \]

**Etymology (III):** This toponym is not reducible to any Egyptian roots and is spelt completely with unilaterals. Because of this, and the likely location in the Eastern Desert, the toponym is probably Beja in origin. El-Sayed reconstructed this toponym as ‘weiße Weite’ based on the Beja...
lexemes *ela* ‘white’ and *hatei* ‘outside’, also raising the possibility of *ʔare* ‘hill, stones’. The suffix *-b* can be explained as the Beja accusative ending, common in Beja toponyms. However, the etymology of the word is significantly confused by the New Kingdom writing [10.2] from Soleb, a placename which seems to be similar to that of Henu’s inscription [10.1]. If the placename was treated by Egyptians as an Egyptian word, and hence subject to Egyptian phonological shifts, then the later writing can be explained as part of the shift of *ʔ > i* (/t/ > /j/). As such, the older transcription must be viewed as the original, non-Egyptian word, suggesting that some foreign words could be subjected to Egyptian phonological shifts. The alternative is to have *ʔ* reproduce a vowel which then shifted to *v*.

**Location (I):** Due to its position in Henu’s biography [10.1], scholars are in broad agreement in locating this placename on the route between Coptos and Mersa Gawasis on the Red Sea. More specifically, Bradbury opted for a position further north than Wadi Hammamat, correctly reasoning that Henu’s outward and return journeys to the Red Sea used different routes. In his outward journey, Henu went to the Red Sea (*WAd-wr*) via *Idi₃ht* and *T iht*, but returned through the Wadi Hammamat [10.1]. Assuming Henu took a more or less direct route between Coptos and Mersa Gawasis, this would put *T iht* in the area north of Wadi Hammamat but east of *Idi₃ht*. Bradbury proposed matching *T iht* with the modern Arabic name Gebel Agharib, but this placename is completely Arabic in origin. Nevertheless, a location in the general area of Wadi Saqi seems likely. At nearby Abu Gaharish there are two small New Kingdom gold workings with associated outbuildings. It is noteworthy that the area of Gaharish is situated in a sandy plain full of granite outcrops, perhaps echoing the preferred etymology of ‘stone’.

**Discussion:** Like *Idi₃ht*, *T iht* was a site where Henu constructed wells en-route to the Red Sea.

---


504 Bechhaus-Gerst, *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61, 150.

505 Zibelius, *AOVN*, 90. This toponym only seems to be extant on Lepsius’s drawings (*LD* III, 88), see also M. Giorgini, *Soleb I* (Firenze, 1965), doc. 20, fig. 84h.

506 These two graphemes are used interchangeably after their conflation; see Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 129-130, 142. Zibelius (*AOVN*, 90) suggested that the writing may be part of a diphthong.

507 *GDG* I, 20.


510 Klemm & Klemm, *Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia*, 102.
from Coptos. No wells in the area have been identified as pharaonic constructions.\textsuperscript{511} Perhaps further survey work in the area may reveal such structures.

**Classification:** +Cushitic (7.1)

\textbf{Etymology (I):} The orthography, minus the classifier, is identical to (i)\textit{ḥt} ‘to shine’, which with a nominal suffix \textit{ḥт}, has the meaning of \textit{ḥt.t} ‘light-land’ and hence the common translation of ‘horizon’.\textsuperscript{512} This was the sense taken by Zibelius-Chen, where she related the toponym in this inscription to the sun rising in the east, which could refer to the Wadi Hammamat in relation to the Nile Valley.\textsuperscript{513} It seems almost certain that this is the meaning of the placename due to the choice of the verb in the relevant inscription as \textit{sḥbk} ‘to brighten’. The placename’s meaning of ‘horizon’ is perhaps inspired by the entrance to the wadi itself, and its similarity to the \textsuperscript{23}-glyph (Fig. 11). The word \textit{ḥt.t} ‘horizon’ is a common generic in many placenames.\textsuperscript{514}

\begin{figure}[h]
  \centering
  \includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig11.jpg}
  \caption{The entrance to Wadi Hammamat © Google Earth}
\end{figure}

**Location (I):** Given the location of the inscription of Ankhu in the Wadi Hammamat [11.1], it would seem unlikely that \textit{ḥt.t} can refer to anything other than the Wadi Hammamat and its environs. The fact that this placename occurs also in the Topographical List of Thutmose III [11.2] means that it is more specific than the ‘Horizon’. However, the etymology gives significant doubts as to whether the wadi specifically was meant, or if the name was merely a vague term for

\textsuperscript{511} For examples of ancient Egyptian wells, see J. Darnell, ‘Opening the Narrow Doors of the Desert: Discoveries of the Theban Desert Road Survey’, in Friedman (ed.), \textit{Egypt and Nubia. Gifts of the Desert} (London, 2002), 147-149.


\textsuperscript{513} Zibelius, \textit{AOVN}, 91. In this respect following Goyon, \textit{Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi Hammamat}, 13 who interpreted the toponym with the sense of the solar-east, i.e. ‘Levant’.

\textsuperscript{514} See the placenames listed in Al-Ayedi, \textit{Ancient Egyptian Geographic Dictionary}, 18-23.
any easterly region (cf. T3-ntr [4]). Along these lines, Zibelius-Chen compared Tlh.t favourably to the cosmographic sense of Blh.w-mountains as a place of solar birth.515

**Discussion:** The use of the term with the determinative — makes it certain that a topographic meaning is meant; perhaps in a similar process to where cardinals, such as Tlh.t ‘east’, can shift from a directional sense (Ƞ— ‘east’) to a definite topographic-areal sense by the addition of the hill-country classifier (Ƞ << ‘east-[HILL-COUNTRY]'). Goyon suggested that sbk ‘to brighten’ in this text might have a more abstract meaning like ‘enlighten’, so that it could evoke the exploration of the Tlh.t-region.516

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.5)

![Diagram](image)

---

**Etymology (III):** El-Sayed’s analysis of this placename identified the suitable Beja word ʔabba ‘wadi’.517 The assumed second lexeme (h3t) is difficult to reconstruct as the penultimate radical alternates with ṣ ([12.1] Old Kingdom) y ([12.2] Middle Kingdom) or Ø ([12.3-12.6] New Kingdom). This could be explained by an Egyptian phonological process of ṣ > y > Ø (cf. also the foreign-name T3h3b > Tyh3b [10]).518 It is, therefore, difficult to decide whether the latter segment was tri-radical (h-1-t) upon reception into Egyptian, or used vocalic ṣ /hVt/.519 A final t is common in Beja toponyms,520 but the h is difficult to explain. Hess transcribes the Beja word for ‘wadi’ as abah, perhaps reflecting the inconsistent manner in which /h/ is produced in Beja language (and lexicons).521 Thus, the placename may be simply analysed as ‘the Wadi’ with the Beja –Vt prefix common in placenames. As an outside possibility, one may propose a tri-radical Egyptian origin from the root bh3 ‘fan’ or ‘flee’ with an i-prefix and a deverbative suffix -t, which could be analysed as something like ‘the-fleeing-places’.522 This would easily explain the regular Egyptian shift of ṣ > y > Ø, but is semantically dubious and unattested. Earlier authors considered a Semitic origin for the word bht, but this could only apply to the mineral term ibh3.ty, which is more simply understood as a nisbe of the toponym ‘that-of-Ibhat’.523

---

515 Zibelius, *AOVN*, 91 n. 94.
518 See Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 129-130, 142.
522 For the i-prefix, see n. 967.
The placename preserved on the Stockholm Onomasticon [12.7], Pš-Tbḥtḥ, could transcribe the same placename in a contemporary Late Egyptian pronunciation. Especially in group writing, aleph plus yodh (ʾi) can represent ʔ/ḥ, and the loss of final –t is a well-known Late Egyptianism.\(^{524}\) If this is the same placename, the missing t in ḏḥtINCLUDED in a contemporar y Late Egyptian pronunciation. Especially in group writing, aleph plus yodh (iA) can represent ʔ/, and the loss of final –t is a well-known Late Egyptianism.\(^{524}\) If this is the same placename, the missing t in ḏḥt suggests that the different orthography was not based on copying errors, but was a result of a Late Egyptian reproduction of the name. A personal name ḏḥt is found in a tomb at Qubbet el-Hawa.\(^{525}\) The word in its nisbe form ḏḥ(ʾ)t.y occurs in some texts to refer to the ṯḥ(ʾ)t.y-snake and ḏḥt.y-mineral.\(^{526}\) The ṯḥt-mineral ( FixedUpdate ) occurs several times in pBrooklyn 47.218.50, where it is the substance ‘mysterious throne’ \(s.t\ ṯḥ\) of the King.\(^{527}\) The simple and elegant solution in analysing these various lexemes is to treat them all as nisbe derivatives of the placename, ‘that-of-Ibḥat’.

**Location (I):** The toponym, as a location of a particular stone used to make sarcophagi, is invariably located in the desert. Most authors have preferred a general Lower Nubian location, noting that in Weni’s biography [12.1] it is stated that he went to ḏḥt after going to Elephantine.\(^{528}\) Sethe suggested that the area of Abu Simbel might be ḏḥt, where it would serve the Toshka (‘Chepren Gneiss’) Quarries of the Western Desert, while most scholars favoured locating it in an indeterminate spot of the Eastern Desert.\(^{529}\) Wissa studied the geological composition of Merenre’s ḏḥt-sarcophagus mentioned in Weni’s biography, with a view to locating the placename through petrology.\(^{530}\) These studies have determined that the sarcophagi were not the assumed basalt-diorite, but greywacke, a stone well known from the Bekhen Quarries in Wadi Hammamat (see [47]) which led Wissa to locate ḏḥt in this wadi.\(^{531}\) To bolster this argument Wissa calls attention to a newly discovered graffito dating to Merenre’s reign in

---

\(^{524}\) See Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 435 for ʾit as a glottal stop.


\(^{526}\) *Wb.* 1, 64. 1. For the ḏḥt-y-snake, see G. Lapp, ‘Der Sargtextspruch gegen die ḏḥt'-Schlange’, *SAK* 40 (2011), 282 n. 30 where it is treated as belonging to the same root as the toponym and mineral, while S. Grunert, ‘Die Geburtsumstände der ḏḥaty-Schlange: eine Komposition von Sprüchen auf der Totenbahn zur Ehrfürcht vor dem Leichnam’, *SAK* 38 (2009), 102 parses the expression as ḏḥt=w.

\(^{527}\) J.-C. Goyon, *Confirmation du pouvoir royal au nouvel an* [Brooklyn Museum Papyrus 47.218.50] (Le Caire, 1972), 73-74, 117, pl. 12, 15. Goyon notes that its usage in the text may be connected to ‘élément protecteur de stabilité royale’.


Wadi Hammamat. However, few scholars, apart from Meurer and Piotrovski, have given due attention to a much more crucial datum in this argument, notably the rock inscription in Wadi Allaqi which mentions \( r[t(\cdot)-nsw \ im.(y-r)\ i=3 \ Wni \) ‘acquaintance of the king, overseer of interpreters, Weni’.  

A reading of all the texts in unison allows one to safely arrive at the location for \( \text{Ibht} \) east of Lower Nubia. The fact that Semna Dispatch No. 3 \([12.2]\) mentions \( M_{\text{dl}y} \) arriving from the desert from the ‘well of Ibht’, presumably in the area of Mirgissa, suggests a desert location near Lower Nubia. Furthermore, the New Kingdom campaign of Merymose \([12.6]\) to Ibht features a relatively high number of captives (1,052), thus probably excluding unwatered expanses of the Western Desert. The fact that Weni came to Ibht after Elephantine makes much more sense if Ibht was reached through Lower Nubia, rather than Wadi Hammamat. Wissa’s reservations that Merenre’s greywacke sarcophagus can only refer to the Hammamat greywacke quarries is unnecessary, since greywacke can also be found, albeit in smaller deposits, from the Wadi Allaqi area near Umm Garayat and Heimur, not far from Weni’s inscription.\(^533\) Wissa explains that the toponym underwent a ‘geographical extension’ to the latitude of Aswan, an idea also echoed by the Klemms who asserted the possibility of a large areal expanse of Ibht, stretching from Wadi Hammamat to Wadi Allaqi.\(^534\) While an expansive Ibht cannot be disproved, there is no certain evidence favouring it apart from Merenre’s supposed Hammamat-Greywacke sarcophagus. Not one of the many inscriptions in the Wadi Hammamat mention Ibht (unlike \( R[3]-\text{hnw}, \ Dw-Bhn \)), and almost all textual occurrences of Ibht mention the placename in the context of actions in Nubia. Indeed, the Stockholm onomasticon \([12.7]\) mentions ‘Ibhat’ along with other known Nubian placenames like \( K\ell, Trm, \) and \( M\ellw. \)\(^535\)

The inscription of Merymose at Semna \([12.6]\) is important in this context, as it states that the army used against Ibht was gathered from \( B\ellk ‘Kuban’ \) and \( T\ellr, \)\(^536\) the former of which is the outlet of Wadi Allaqi, pointing to a location east of the Nubian Nile. Two inscriptions in the Wadi Allaqi itself mention a certain Merymose, one (no. 84) simply a \( s\ell-nsw \) ‘king’s son’, and the other (no. 74) is a \( s\ell-nsw \ n(y) \ K\ell \ im.(y-r)\ h\ell{s}.w\ell{r}.y \ t\ell-l\ell{w} \ h\ell{r} \ w\ell{n}.y \ nsw \ im.(y-r)\ m\ell{s}\ wr \ n(y) \)

\(^532\) Piotrovsky, ВАДИ АЛЛАКИ, 80; Meurer, \textit{Nubier in Ägypten}, 106 n. 8; K. Zibelius-Chen, ‘Die Kubanstele Ramses’ II. und die nubischen Goldregionen’, in C. Berger et al. (eds), \textit{Hommages à Jean Leclant} (Le Caire, 1994), II, 413; Piacentini, \textit{L’autobiografia di Uni}, 91-93.

\(^533\) M. Wissa, \textit{JEA} 97, 224. A metagreywacke source is also found near the New Kingdom gold mine of Heimur, see Klemm & Klemm, \textit{Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia}, 306-307.

\(^534\) Klemm & Klemm, \textit{Stones and Quarries in Ancient Egypt}, 302.

\(^535\) The position of the name between Trm and the Red Sea (\( Mw-kd \ [77A] \)) in the onomasticon also points to the Eastern Desert, see Zibelius-Chen, ‘Die Kubanstele Ramses’ II. und die nubischen Goldregionen’, in Berger et al. (eds), \textit{Hommages à Jean Leclant}, II, 413.

\(^536\) The location of \( T\ellr \) is unknown, for it’s possibly relationship to the similar sounding Trt, see Zibelius, \textit{AOVN}, 175.
hm(☞) ss-ns 'king’s son of Kush, overseer of southern-foreign-lands, fan-bearer of the right of the king, overseer of the great army of his majesty, royal scribe'. This observation is also made in Zibelius-Chen, ‘Die Kubansteile Ramses’ II. und die nubischen Goldregionen’, in Berger et al. (eds), Hommages à Jean Leclant, II, 413.

The former personage is possibly the same Merymose, while the latter certainly belongs to the same Merymose of the Ibht expedition mentioned at Semna. This data, taken together with the biography of Weni, makes it all but certain from the in-situ rock inscriptions that when Egyptians went to Ibht, they went to Wadi Allaqui. The only divergent possibility is if Ibht designated larger areas of the Eastern Desert in addition to the Allaqui region. Indeed, given that Ibht was used in a nisbe-form to denote minerals, animals, and people it seems likely that it designated a rather vast region, perhaps locationally synonymous with the modern term Atbai.

**Classification:** +Cushitic (7.1)

| [12A] | Hnm.t-Ibhyt | */ʔbhjt/ |

**Etymology (I):** A genitive expression comprised of hnm.t ‘well’ and the toponym Ibhyt. The fact that the toponym was not qualified with either an indirect genitive or preposition (i.e. ‘the well in Ibhat’) suggests that it was a well understood toponym.

**Location (II):** The well must refer to a singular site somewhere within the environs of Ibht (see above). Given the text [12.2] refers to a patrol near Mirgissa (İkn), it is tempting to suggest that the well was a site due east of this region. This would fit Bir Murrat best, a major well in the desert southeast of Mirgissa, which has nearby hieroglyphic rock inscriptions, but only of New Kingdom date. The nearest Middle Kingdom inscription is at Umm Nabari, approximately 60km to the northwest. Traces of a route leading east from the Second Cataract towards Bir Murrat have been discovered. These routes accessed nearby goldfields and were marked by Middle and New Kingdom inscriptions as well as Middle Nubian ceramics. Another possibility is espoused in R. Klemm & D. Klemm, Stein und Steinbrüche im alten Ägypten (Berlin, 1993), 364.
is that the ‘well’ could be identified with a site in Wadi Allaqi, with the only known ancient well-sites being Bir Ungat or Umm Ashira. There are contemporary Middle Kingdom inscriptions at both these sites.545

Classification:+Egyptian (1.4+7.1)  
+Cushitic

![Image](510x203 to 521x213)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Mid-Medical</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ikyt</td>
<td>*/ʔkjt/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Etymology (III): No effort has been made to explain this toponym’s origin, and it is probably a non-Egyptian lexeme. Any connection with Egyptian *ikw* ‘quarry’ seems unlikely on orthographic grounds.546 The initial group  usually corresponds to /ʔ/ in Semitic loans, but its status in African loans is more problematic, it might also mask a front vowel.547 In ‘group-writing’,  seems to correspond to /ku/, possibly delineating the labialised velar [kʷ] present in Beja.548 The medial *y* is omitted in some writings, especially in Topographical Lists [13.1, 13.10-11, 13.13].

Given the Eastern Desert location, one would expect a Beja origin for the toponym. However, there is an abundance of suitable geographic etyma in Beja. A semantically and phonetically attractive suggestion is 1) a connection with Beja *kaiyai(t)* ‘clay, mud’, a lexeme used in modern Beja toponymy, e.g. the placename *Adar-kaiyai* ‘red-earth’.549 Also possible is 2) a lexeme noted by Bechhaus-Gerst as *katʔai* ‘difficult path between hills’ and given by Blažek as *katooy*,550 which would accord not only with the writings that transcribe *Ikti*, but the use of Wadi Allaqi to access

---


546 *Wb.* 1, 139.12. Even though this could be an updated group-writing of an older Egyptian word, there is no way to explain the *y* and *t* in *ikw*, and the related *iky* only applies to ‘stonemason’, not a quarry.

547 While  is invariably /ʔ/ in New Kingdom Semitic loans (Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 490), the value of this grapheme has not been explained in African loanwords. For instance, in the name  from pMoscow 314, to be equated with later Meroitic Abeseye, the group might reproduce a front vowel, see Rilly, ‘The earliest traces of Meroitic’, in Payne & Reh (eds), *Advances in Nilo-Saharan Linguistics*, 212; El-Sayed, *Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnschweizer*, 89, 139. These examples, of which there are many more, lend themselves to two suggestions: 1) that initial  in African loanwords could indicate an initial vowel and/or 2) it could indicate an ephematic or pre-vocalic glottal stop in an African language(s) which otherwise did not treat /ʔ/ as a distinct phoneme. But, the Meroitic sign , the descendent of  , was analysed as being an initial group [ʔa], see K. Rowan, ‘The Meroitic Initial ‘a’ Sign as Griffith’s Initial Aleph’, ZÄS 142 (in press). The example of the Nubian toponym ‘Ashmeik’ as *ISmk* */ʔʃmk/ and *Šmyk* */ʃmjk/ (see Zibelius, *AOVN*, 155-156) perhaps illustrates the alternative orthographic realisations of a placename which probably had an original anlaut vowel, i.e. */NʃmjkJ/.


the hinterland and the Red Sea littoral. Alternatively, if the gold-mining aspect of the wadi is evoked, 3), Beja kuay ‘to sift, sieve’ may refer to the working of gold alluvium in the wadi and surrounding areas, with a nomen actionis ‘sifting’ in kuayti. Only mentioned due to its ubiquity in Beja toponymy is 4) agwet ‘Leptadenia pyrotechnica’, a locally abundant grass. If a Beja origin is excluded, it is plausible that the word came into Egyptian via Merotic (or Nilo-Saharan) occupants of Lower Nubia. Hence, 5) Old Nubian kGR ‘way’ or κΓ ‘rock’, both of which are reflected in related Nara kitta ‘Weg’ or kitte ‘quartz’. In all suggestions one would have to explain the anlaut ꞌ暗示 as a prefix. Solution 3) would seem to be the most likely based on semantic, phonetic and archaeological variables, but a priori none of the above proposals can be excluded.

**Location (I):** The mention of this toponym on a stele from Kuban (GBK) [13.9] points to a region closely associated with this site in Lower Nubia. Inscriptions in the Wadi Allaqi frequently mention Bk in the epithet ‘Horus, lord of Bk’ and thus this centre must have acted as the terminus for expeditions trying to reach the goldfields further up the wadi. In fact, almost all authorities are in agreement that because of this the placename Ikyt must refer to the gold-mining areas of Wadi Allaqi and Wadi Gabgaba. Indeed, there is clinching evidence in the Kuban Stele itself that cements this identification, as the name of the well dug in Ikyt in the Kuban text is called Ti-hnm.t R.w-msi-sw MrI.y-lnn.w-kn /// ‘the well of Ramesses-Meryamun, brave…’, where the same well is referred to on a local stele found in the wadi itself at Umm Ashira as Ti-hnm.t R.w-msi-sw MrI.y-lnn.w-kn-m-n[38].

---

551 Peden, *Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt*, 94 proposes the use of this wadi as a route to the Red Sea, although this is awaiting confirmation through archaeological surveys. The first firm data for this route comes from Arab historians, for which see T. Power, ‘The origin and Development of the Sudanese Ports (‘Aydhab, Bâdi’, Sawâkin) in the early Islamic Period’, *Chroniques Yéménites* 15 (2008), 92-110 and M. Couyat, ‘Les routes d’Aïdhâb’, *BIFAO* 8 (1911), 137ff.


553 For the word in toponyms, see Bechhaus-Gerst, *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61, 158. The United States Geonames database (http://geonames.nga.mil/) lists 13 toponyms with agwet as a formative in the Red Sea province of Sudan.

554 The C-Group were equated with speakers of Nara, see Rilly & de Voogt, *The Meroitic Language and Writing System*, 80, 179.


556 Černý, *JEA* 33, 55; Piotrovsky, ВАДИ АЛЛАКИ, 84.


The question of whether Wadi Gabgaba and the surrounding areas south and east of Wadi Allaqi should be treated as part of Ikyt is yet to be solved. In the inscription of Setau [13.8], mention is made of a campaign against Ikyt and Irm, an enigmatic toponym which is generally located in Upper Nubia, beyond Egyptian control, perhaps in the Fifth Cataract region following the extensive arguments of O’Connor. As well as the inscription at Wadi es-Sebua, Setau is also mentioned in an inscription at Kurgus, near the Fifth Cataract, perhaps indicating that Irm was accessed after travelling through Ikyt. Further data comes from a contemporary of Setau’s, the military official Hornakht, who is recorded on an inscription at Wadi Allaqi and another desert site further south at Umm Nabari. These documents might indicate that Setau’s Ikyt-Irm campaign took officials across the desert from Wadi Allaqi to Umm Nabari and thence to Kurgus. If the action against these two regions was part of one contiguous campaign, which the text seems to allude, then Setau may have taken the so-called Korosko Road cutting across the great bend of the Nile through Wadi Allaqi and Wadi Gabgaba. However, it is questionable whether Egyptians used this route as a thoroughfare to Abu Hamed region in the pharaonic period, or merely used these myriad desert routes to access local goldfields. The location of Irm is also unknown, so the exact route of this campaign must remain moot.

Further east of Allaqi are the goldfields in the Red Sea hills of Onib and Oshib which may have been included within Ikyt. It is worth mentioning here that in the Annals of Thutmose III the yearly income of gold of WAwAt was over 2500 deben, while the maximum income of the gold of Kush was a lowly 300 deben, amounts also witnessed to more generally in New Kingdom gold
imports. Vercoutter took this to mean that the W3w3t fields not only included the Wadi Allaqi, but the larger mining regions of Wadi Gabgaba and Onib. By inference, if the Wawat goldfields were considered one region synonymous with Ikyt, Ikyt may not only have designated Wadi Allaqi, but also the surrounding goldfields to the east and south.

**Discussion:** The most extensive document relating to Ikyt is the parallel text of the Kuban Stele/Aksha inscription [13.9], which narrates the difficulties and success that Seti I and Ramesses II had in digging wells for gold-miners. Ample evidence of this gold-mining activity in the Wadi Allaqi has been documented, revealing the extent of Egyptian interests in the region. New Kingdom mining operations have left many traces in the area, including small settlements. The most notable of these sites is Umm Garaiyat, near the junction with Wadi Gabgaba, where a large enclosure wall was found. Klemm, Klemm, and Murr indicate that Egyptians had difficulty mining gold in this region after the reign of Akhenaton due to weak control of the Nubian deserts by the Egyptian state, a sentiment certainly echoed in documents which speak of military action in Ikyt. Hieroglyphic graffiti in the Wadi Allaqi and its tributaries date to the Old, Middle, and New Kingdoms and connect officials with goldmining operations in the area.

The chronological attestation of this placename is revealing, as it is only found in late New Kingdom documents. This is somewhat unexpected since Old and Middle Kingdom presence in the Wadi Allaqi is well known in the form of rock inscriptions. Earlier activity that occurred in the Wadi Allaqi and the Atbai could also have been encompassed under the geographic terms ‘Gold of Wawat’, Ibh (see [12]), or even Mdjt [24]. This overlap of terms between Ibh and Ikyt was the subject of study by Zibelius-Chen who concluded that they do refer to roughly the same region, with the last mention of Ibh in the late New Kingdom, at the exact point when Ikyt

---

566 Inscriptions in Wadi Allaqi at Umm Ashira (Piotrovsky, ВАДИ АЛЛАКИ, no. 13, 22, 27, 29, 43, 72, 75, 89, 93, 96, 120, 134, 151, 154, 167, 193) mentions officials of W3w3t and B3k (Kuban), suggesting that Lower Nubian officials’ duties took them well up the wadi.
568 Klemm, Klemm & Murr, *African Earth Sciences* 33, 654; Klemm & Klemm, *Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia*, 312-314. Confusion remains as to whether this structure is a settlement enclosure or a modern hafir dam.
569 Klemm & Klemm, *Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia*, 654.
571 Černý, *JEA* 33, 52-57; Piotrovsky, ВАДИ АЛЛАКИ, 67-80.
appears in Egyptian records. Indeed, it is probable that this word came into the Egyptian repertoire under Thutmose IV [13.1] as a result of new campaigning (and goldmining) in the ‘secret valleys’ (in.t štt) of the Eastern Desert (ḥḥs.t-ḥḥb.t) recorded in his Konosso Stele.

The archaeology of the local inhabitants of the area in the second and third millennium BCE is difficult to identify, despite the fact that there is textual evidence of an indigenous Nehesy population [13.4, 13.8]. Surveys in the Wadi Allaqi itself have revealed possible remains of ‘C-Group’ sites and isolated finds of ‘Pan-Grave’ ceramics, but no carbon dates from this period. Further south at Wadi Terfowi, near Wadi Gabgaba, Middle Nubian ceramics have been found.

The letter of Ramessesnakht [13.13] and other New Kingdom expeditions [13.3-4, 13.8] against Nhš.s.y suggests that in the Ramesside period there were still people living in ‘Ikty. Zibelius-Chen analysed the ‘Ikty personal names nyny and Trbd dd [13.13] as Beja in origin, but only the latter name has a plausible Beja origin as terib didi, translated as ‘Holzfäller’.

**Classification:** +Unknown (7.1)

![IdAht/ʔdrht] (14.3)

**Etymology (II):** The word is clearly foreign. Following El-Sayed, it is a perfect match for Beja adar ‘red’. The word ‘red’ is a common element in Beja toponyms, due to the red hues of desert topography. One cannot entirely discount other Beja lexemes such as delaidera ‘Loch,

---


574 *Urk.* IV, 1547.17-20.


577 Zibelius-Chen, *NubischesSprachmaterial*, 101, 270. Takács, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 70, 575 rejects this reconstruction on semantic criteria, as terib means ‘to divide’ rather than cut, but Reinsch, *Wörterbuch der Bedaue-Sprache*, 231 also lists a meaning of ‘spliten’ under this lemma. The word dd could also be interpreted as the mineral haematite didi, see Harris, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, 155ff. Note also a similar name in Libyan onomastica, but at least one Dydy is a Medjay chief, see F. Colin, *Les Libyens en Égypte (XVe s. a.C.- Il e s. p.C.)*. *Onomastique et histoire* (Free University of Brussels, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, 2006), I, 177, II 114-116.


Brunnen’, or *dar* ‘bank of khor, edge’ or if *i* is vocalic *dhiit* ‘narrow-valley’. But, given the ubiquitous nature of *adar* ‘red’ in Beja toponymy this should be treated as the most likely etymology. The final group *ht* could represent a separate lexeme, but it is easier to relate these to the coda-*h* (cf. Hess’s transcription *adahreh*) and then one could analyse the placename as *adar* plus the Beja adjectival morph -*Vt* exhibited in Beja toponymy. Such a toponym can be compared to the modern Beja placename *Adarot*.

**Location (II):** As the outbound journey of Henu [14.1] left Coptos (*Gbtw*) for the Red Sea, *Id3ht* must be located somewhere in the hills east of Coptos. Early authorities located it between Qena and Quseir, but it is unlikely that this toponym lay within the environs of Wadi Hammamat, as it is known that Henu returned to the Nile Valley via this route, but went forth by a different route altogether. The possibility that a reflex of this toponym exists in the contemporary placename Gebel ‘Eredia, to the east of Wadi Hammama, was postulated by Bradbury. Montet considered *Id3ht* ‘three days west of diorite quarries’, but gives little reasoning for this, and does not explain the connection between *Id3ht* and diorite.

Egyptian expeditions must have used this area, as inscriptions have been found in the nearby Wadi Gidami and Wadi Hammama. This includes Old Kingdom graffiti bearing the names of officials, including expeditionary offices of *im.y-rA i* and *im.y-rA pr*, as well as a cartouche of Sahure. There are also ancient gold diggings in the area of Gidami (Sirbakis mines), which Klemm and Klemm suggest could be New Kingdom in date. If this route does lead to Mersa Gawasis, it may not be coincidental that Sahure’s cartouche is inscribed in the area, as it is in his

---


583 *GDG* I, 125; Brugsch, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, 101-102.

584 Bradbury, *JARCE* 25, 137-138. This equation, however, requires far too many phonetic shifts to be plausible.

585 P. Montet, *Everyday life in Egypt in the days of Ramesses the Great* (Pennsylvania, 1958), 134-135. Presumably, the diorite quarries he is referring to are those at Toshka ‘Chepren’s-Quarry’, as he quotes Engelbach’s study of these quarries.


587 Klemm & Klemm, *Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia*, 102. This small settlement at Gidami is late antique in age, see S. Sidebotham, H. Barnard & G. Pyke, ‘Five Enigmatic Late Roman Settlements in the Eastern Desert’, *JEA* 88 (2002), 200-202. It appears that the Klemms’ survey may have been further west along Wadi Gidami than these structures.
reign that the first expedition to Punt is attested. In summary, the toponym must be located in a region along the route between Coptos and Mersa Gawasis, perhaps around the region of Gidami.

**Classification:** +Cushitic (7.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[15]</th>
<th>[A]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Wg &gt; Gw$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Etymology (II):** It is not altogether clear whether this toponym is Egyptian or foreign. Following the other two placenames in the inscription of Henu, $Idhht [13]$ and $Tihthb [10]$, it is possible that the placename is Beja in origin, although one cannot discount a connection with the Egyptian verb $w\text{g} \text{t} \text{.w}$ ‘to provide (for a feast)’ or ‘to cry out’. However, if an Egyptian etymology is chosen, one would expect a deverbal suffix – $t/.w$. Another possibility, although certainly a tentative one, is to take the writing as a corrupted orthography for the verb $g\text{w}/g\text{w}t \text{3} \text{.’to constrict’}. This would simply require the orthographic inversion of $\text{g}$ and $\text{w}$, but is problematic as instances where it is written with $\text{g}$ are rare. Budge associated this placename with $w\text{g}t \text{.’inundation’}$, which seems unlikely in this context.

If it is a foreign word, the Eastern Desert location points to Beja, but suitable etyma are not readily forthcoming. In Middle Kingdom group-writing, $\text{i}$ is somewhat ambiguous and could be a liquid consonant or a vowel. Thus, if the word was rendered as $/wl/ \text{ or } /wr/$ one could suggest Beja $\text{lagi}$ ‘road, pathway’, but the initial $w\text{t}$ is still unexplainable. Beja $\text{luk}$ ‘clay’ (cf. also $\text{alak}$ ‘muddy water’) could also be possible. Also of importance in this discussion is whether a similar word in an inscription from Khor Dihmit in Lower Nubia renders the same placename.

---

589 *Wb.* 1, 262.
590 *Wb.* 5, 151-152 hence meanings like $g\text{w}-\text{w}:t \text{.’Engpass’}$. Note also the expression $r\text{t-t} \text{ g}\text{w} \text{n,(y) } \text{lw}$ ‘the narrow gateway of Elephantine’, in D. Jones, *An Index of Ancient Egyptian Titles, Epithets and Phrases of the Old Kingdom* (Oxford, 2000), no. 2283. Breasted understood the word as meaning ‘[valley]’ in this text although he does not clarify how he came to this inclusion, see Breasted, *ARE*, §428.
591 For this writing see *KRI* II, 248.1-2.
593 Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 488-503. For other examples where $\text{f}$ is $/wl/ \text{ or } /wr/$ in the Exeration Texts, see also El-Sayed, *Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz*, 146, 148, 291.
594 Hudson & Blench, *A Dictionary of Beja*, 99 has leggi; Reinsch, *Wörterbuch der Bedauye-Sprache*, 8 produces $\text{lagi}$. Note that the other Cushitic etymons for this root identified in Blažek, *Babel und Bibel* 3, 405-406 refer to ‘rivers’ and other geomorphological features. The Beja masculine definite article $\text{u}$- could explain Egyptian $w\text{t}$, but $\text{lagi}$ is a feminine word and would require the feminine article $\text{t}$, see Wedekind, Wedekind & Musa, *Learners Grammar of Beja*, 49.
595 Blažek, *Babel und Bibel* 3, 406. A closer match exists in Saho waalika ‘dry clay’, see Vergari & Vergari, *A basic Saho-English-Italian Dictionary*, 82. Browne’s study of Old Bedauye in Coptico documents has shown that the definite article was $\text{i}\text{0}\text{v}$ in nominative and $\text{0}\text{v}\text{0}$ in the accusative, see Browne, *Textus Blennymicus Aetatis Christianae*, 3.
596 El-Sayed, *Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz*, 178 raised doubts on this equation. For the inscription, see G. Roeder, *Debod bis Bab Kalabsche* (Le Caire, 1911), I, 115 and II, pl. 108.
Roeder’s publication transcribes ꜱꜰꜰ, with no extant determinative, and thus produces a different phonetic reproduction like /wrʎg/ or /wrdg/. It is therefore unlikely that this damaged word is related to this placename. On balance the Egyptian explanation of gwꜥ ‘confines’ seems more likely than a foreign word.

**Location (II):** In Henu’s expeditionary text [15.1], Henu sent (sbi) ships to Punt after he arrived at Mersa Gawasis [40], the only known Puntite terminal on the Red Sea. Thus Wꜥg must be a locality between Mersa Gawasis and the Wadi Hammamat, on Henu’s return journey to Egypt. Schiaparelli proposed placing Wꜥg on the Red Sea at Quseir, or in the Wadi Hammamat itself. The likely routes include the arterial wadis of Wadi Saqi and Wadi Atallah, which joins with Wadi Hammamat not far from the Bekhen Quarries (Fig. 12).

![Figure 12: Postulated routes between Coptos and the Red Sea, after Bard, Fattovich, JARCE 47, 115.](image)

This route was preferred by Bradbury, citing a graffito of Senwosret I and Ramesses III in Wadi Atallah and Wadi Saqi as evidence for Egyptian use of this route to access the Red Sea. In Wadi Atallah, there is an Old Kingdom graffito mentioning an ‘expedition leader’ (Ṣḥꜥ.wty-ntr)

---

597 Schiaparelli, *La geografia dell’Africa orientale*, 218. See also Brugsch, *Dictionnaire Géographique*, 172. Gauthier in GDG I, 180 rightly rejects the theory of Chabas equating it with a placename in the Diospolite nome.


599 Bradbury, *JARCE* 25, 133-135; Green, *PSBA* 31, 321-322; *KRI* V, 272.11. This location for Wꜥg is followed by Hannig in *HWb*, 1324. I am in disagreement with Bradbury that Wadi Saga/Saqi is a reflex of Wꜥg (w ≠ /s/). Furthermore, the wadi, given as ‘Wadi Saqa’ on modern maps, has a reasonable Arabic definition as ‘The Valley of the Rivulet’, from the root sqy, see Zammit, *A Comparative Lexical Study of Qur’ānic Arabic*, 224.
Fetetki (Ftkti). At nearby Wadi Isa, Fetekti is given the title ‘Ship’s Captain’ (im.y-ir.ty) suggesting that the individual may have been responsible for nautical matters, perhaps Red Sea voyages. Noting this route, the likelihood is that Henu travelled along Wadi Saqi and Wadi Atallah from Mersa Gawasis and thus, following Bradbury, WAg should designate this area, there being no evidence to suggest that the east-west road between Bir Umm Fawakhir and Quseir was used in this period. The only alternative is to take the placename as referring to a part of the Wadi Hammamat itself (see discussion below).

Discussion: The syntax of this toponym in the Henu text is not straightforward. He states [15.1] h₃₃.n (=) hr WAg R₃-hnw ‘I descended upon the Wag and Ra-Henu’. As there is no lexeme between WAg and R₃-hnw, the relationship of these two toponyms could be one of conjunction, that is, Henu returned to the Nile Valley through WAg, and then R₃-hnw, or apposition, i.e. Wag, Ra-Henu. If WAg is merely a mistake for gw₃ ‘confines’ then a genitival relationship, the ‘WAg of Wadi Hammamat (R₃-hnw)’ might be preferred.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1)

[16]  
Wₐ₉r.t-iₙ.t

Etymology (I): The toponym is a genitive composed of wₐ₉r.t, which has diverse geographic senses such as ‘district, plateau’, and in.t ‘valley’. Tallet notes the use of wₐ₉r.t in similar desert contexts such as the Wₐ₉r.t n.t Hr.w-Nb-M₅₉.t ‘District of Horus; Nebmaat’ (the Horus name of Sneferu) in Weni’s biography, which might also refer to a peripheral region in the desert or

---

600 For Fetekti in other Eastern Desert graffiti at Wadi Isa, see Bell, Johnson & Whitcomb, JNES 43 (1984), 40 and Eichler, Untersuchungen zum Expeditionswesen des ägyptischen Alten Reiches, 85-86.
601 Suggested by Bell, Johnson & Whitcomb, JNES 43, 40, 42. The problem of whether im.y-ir.ty in the Eastern Desert could refer to ship captains bound for Punt has not been solved; see the remarks in Rothe, Miller & Rapp, Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt, 404-405. It should be noted that im.y-ir.ty does not necessarily point to a specifically nautical role, as this title has been found in the waterless Western Desert, see M. Valloggia, ‘Le Amiraux de l’oasis de Dakhleh’, in F. Geus & F. Thill (eds), Mélanges offerts à Jean Vercoutter (Paris, 1985), 355-365.
602 See Peacock & Blue, ‘Discussion and Conclusion’, in Peacock & Blue (ed.) Myos Hormos – Quseir al-Qadim (Oxford, 2006), 174. The only possible pharaonic traces could be two boat petroglyphs in the Wadi Quseir al-Qadim, see W. van Rengen, D. Peacock, D. Murphy & J. Whitewright, ‘Rock art and inscriptions’, in Peacock & Blue (eds), Myos Hormos – Quseir al-Qadim, 22 and a graffito of a Nubian archer at Bir el-Ingliz, see A. Weigall, Travels in the Upper Egyptian Deserts (1909), 60, pl. 10. For pharaonic comparisons to this motif see J. Darnell, ‘A stele of the reign of Tutankhamun from the Region of Kurkur Oasis’, SAK 31 (2003), pl. 2; F. Förster, ‘With donkeys, jars and water bags into the Libyan Desert: the Abu Ballas Trail in the late Old Kingdom/First Intermediate Period’, BMSAES 7 (2007), 24; The Epigraphic Survey, Reliefs and Inscriptions at Luxor Temple – Volume 1: The Festival Procession of Opet in The Colonnade Hall (Chicago, 1994), 35, pl. 91; Fakhry, The Inscriptions of the Amethyst Quarries at Wadi el Hudi, 68, 70, 72, 74. A comprehensive work on this common Egyptian motif is required, given its rather wide distribution chronologically and spatially.
603 For the appositional relationship in toponyms indicating a place subordinate to another place (e.g. Tl-wr sbgw ‘Abydos, Thinite nome’), see A. Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar (Oxford, 1957), 68 and more generally ‘epexegesis’ in Ockinga, A Concise Grammar of Middle Egyptian, 87.
604 Wb. 1, 288; Wb. 1, 93.
adjoining the Delta. The sense given by \( w^r.t \) is often that of an administrative unit rather than a geographic landform.

**Location (I):** This placename is found only as a qualifier (apposition) for \( B\delta.t \), the name for Ayn Soukhna, in a local text at Ayn Soukhna [16.1], and thus designates a region in or around the Gulf of Suez. The most conspicuous ‘valley’ (\( int.t \)) in this region is Wadi Arabah, but Ayn Soukhna is on the northern side of the Galala plateau, and so the valley in question perhaps designates a wadi leading due west of Ayn Soukhna (Wadi Ghweibba, Wadi el-Shuna) towards Memphis. A roughly east-west route from Ayn Soukhna towards Helwan would pass through Wadi el-Garawi, where there are remains of an Old Kingdom dam and calcite quarries. No survey has uncovered any ancient cairns or tracks along this route. An older reconnaissance of Hosni revealed very deep wells in this region, but their date is unknown, as is their exact location.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (2.3+1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ \begin{array}{c} \rlap{\bf Wb\delta.t-sp.t} \end{array} ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Etymology (I):** The toponym appears to comprise two Egyptian lexemes, \( wb\delta.t \) and \( sp.t \), which would give the meaning of ‘the opening of the shore’ or similar. This was the opinion of Posener who translated the appellation as ‘Celle qui perfore la lèvre’. The problem with this analysis is that the Execration Texts do not list any placenames of Egyptian origin (except in Egypt itself), and thus this rendering would be an exception in a list which was specifically designed to render foreign-language locales. With this in mind, El-Sayed considered that these words reproduced a foreign word that sounded very similar to an Egyptian \( wb\delta.t-sp.t /wbrt_spt/ \). He connected the word to two Beja geographical terms, \( bur \) ‘land’ and \( safit \) ‘norden’.

---

605 See P. Tallet, *La zone minière pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï* (Le Caire, 2012), I, no. 249 n. g. A placename \( W\delta^r.t-nb.t M\delta^r.t \) is known is associated with the Necropolis at Meir. For this and other \( w^r.t \) placenames see *HWb*, 1324-1325.

606 Hence the title \( w^r.tw \) ‘administrator’, see Jones, *An Index of Ancient Egyptian Titles, Epithets and Phrases of the Old Kingdom*, no. 694ff.

607 For apposition, see n. 603.

608 See Tallet, *La zone minière pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï*, I, no. 249 n. g.

609 See G. Garbrecht & U. Bertram, *Der Sadd-el-Kafara, die älteste Talsperre der Welt (2600) v.Chr.*) (Braunschweig, 1983).


611 For \( wb\delta.t \) and \( sp.t \) see respectively, see *Wb*. 1, 219; 4. 99.

612 Posener, *Princes et pays d’Asie et de Nubie*, 103; Zibelius, *AOVN*, 104, also translated it as an Egyptian phrase ‘die Lippe öffnet’. Both authorities compared it to other Egyptian-language names in Africa, such as *Hnt-hn-nfr* and *Tī-nfr*.

613 In Coptic, \( sp.t \) becomes \(^{5}\text{Cordh/Cordh} \) ‘edge, margin’, while \( wb\delta.t \) is not attested except as a lexicalised causative verb \(^{9}\text{di.t-wb\δ t} \) ‘teach’, see Černý, *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*, 159, 199.

former is a common Beja word, the latter is not widely attested in Beja (it is only reported in the lexicon of Almkvist), and its etymology is hazy, possibly being an Arabic loan. There are some additional problems with this explanation. Satzinger has shown that aleph in the Execration Texts occurs too frequently to be a consonant in every word, and thus here it may render something like /wbVt/, not /wbrt/, which has no easily identifiable etymon in Beja. There is also the pragmatic issue that $Wb\text{.t-sp.t}$ has a very suitable Egyptian toponymic meaning of ‘opening of the shore’. The verbal root $wb\text{t}$ can have a meaning of ‘gewässer befahren, befahrbar machen’, thus one might opt for translating the name as ‘Passable-place of the shore’ with a nomen loci suffix $-t$. The pertinent question is whether the $sp.t$ refers to the ‘shore’ of the Nile, or plausibly the ‘shore’ of the Red Sea.

**Location (II):** The fact that $Md\text{\text{.y}}$ inhabit $Wb\text{.t-sp.t}$ in the Execration Texts [17.1-2, 17.4] suggests an Eastern Desert location, although it is plausible that some Medjay also occupied a portion of the Nile in Lower Nubia. The only real diagnostic document for the location of this placename is the Annals of Amenemhat II [17.11], where there is a long list of $in.w$-products under the rubric of $[K]\ddot{s} n.w\ Wb\text{.t-sp.t}\ hr(y)\ b3k.t\equiv n$ ‘/// Kush and Webet-sepet bearing their tribute’. That these two lands are included in the one expedition may suggest they are contiguous regions, or at least in proximity. It is important to note here that in the Middle Kingdom, $K\ddot{s}$ had a much more specific sense than its rather vague use for the whole of Nubia in the New Kingdom, and both O’Connor and Posener have pointed out that it is likely that it specifically referred to the areas of Sai (Posener) or more likely Dongola Reach (O’Connor).

---

615 Blažek, citing Thompson, suggests that it may be Arabic in origin, related to *safil* ‘lower-parts’, see Blažek, *Babel und Bibel* 3, 417. In Afroasiatic there is the root *sip* ‘river, river-bed’ (hence Egyptian *sp* ‘bank’), see Orel & Stolbova, *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*, 132, 476. A word following this general meaning does not exist in Beja, but perhaps *siifa* ‘coral-rock’, reported by Roper, is related to this root.

616 Satzinger, *LingAeg* 5, 141-151.

617 *Wb.* 1, 290. I am indebted to Professor Helmut Satzinger for this suggestion.


619 The situation in the Semna Dispatches makes certain that $Md\text{\text{.y}}$ were living in the desert, but that they were also part of the Egyptian patrols at the fortresses, see Smither, *JEA* 31, 8.


621 G. Posener, ‘Pour une localisation du pays Koush au Moyen Empire’, *Kush* 6 (1958), 39-65; O’Connor, *JARCE* 23, 41-42. The emergence of this toponym is attributed to Meroitic-Kushite migrations from the Western Desert, for which see also the lexical arguments in El-Sayed, *Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz*, 31-33, 274-76.
Unfortunately, seriating and dividing which goods are from WbAt-spt and those which are from Kush is not easy (Tab. 6), and most could equally derive from the Nile Valley and the desert, or be the result of intermediary trade. Mineral substances which would usually be characteristic of desert regions may occur in the gold mines along the Nile near the Second and Third Cataracts, although Klemm and Klemm found little evidence for gold-mining along the Nile River in the Middle Kingdom. As can be seen from the relative quantity of these products, many of them (particularly ebony or giraffes’ tails) probably originated further south than Kush, and were thus the result of intermediary trade. Based on comparable literature, the goods procured in large numbers such as the aromatics sntr and ṣṣpository{2}yt as well as ‘malachite’ (wqd) are probably to be

---

Table 6: Tribute from WbAt-spt and Kush in the Annals of Amenemhat II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource of Kush or WbAt-spt</th>
<th>Explanation in Altenmüller &amp; Moussa, SAK 18, 8-9</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Desert Location</th>
<th>Nile Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sntr</td>
<td>Incense</td>
<td>23, 752 balls (? )</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫmṣgt</td>
<td>Garnet</td>
<td>1 25/32 heqat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫm</td>
<td>Gold/Electrum</td>
<td>1 3/4 deben</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫd</td>
<td>Malachite</td>
<td>120 deben</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣṭy</td>
<td>Ochre</td>
<td>11 3/4 heqat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣṣš</td>
<td>Plant (?)</td>
<td>2 1/4 heqat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥb.t</td>
<td>Plant (?)</td>
<td>3/8 heqat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥd</td>
<td>Bow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣṣr</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥt</td>
<td>Unknown mineral (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥtwn</td>
<td>Smooth precious stone (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥṣyt</td>
<td>Aromatic/green pigment (?)</td>
<td>280 sacks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥb</td>
<td>Christ's-thorn-tree</td>
<td>5 sacks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥt</td>
<td>Wooden Headrest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥḥs</td>
<td>Unknown, wood beam (?)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥḥk</td>
<td>Bull/Cattle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥḥg</td>
<td>Gazelle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥḥl</td>
<td>Braid/Wig</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥḥsr</td>
<td>Giraffe tail</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥḥhbny</td>
<td>Ebony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

622 Old and Middle Kingdom goldmining sites include Duweishat and Umm Fahm near Semna, and Sokar near Kerma, see Klemm, Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 557, 564, 576.
623 Abu Siha seems to be the only Old Kingdom mine site south of Wadi Allaqi, see Klemm, Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 549.
624 Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals, 152 concludes that ṣṣpository{2}yt is probably a green pigment, while ṣḥṣyt seems to be an oil known from the land of Medja, see M. Collier & S. Quirke, The UCL Lahun Papyri: Accounts (Oxford, 2006), 84-85 and Excursus I. VIII.
625 For depictions of Nubians from Irr bringing giraffes tails (sd), see N. Davies, ‘Nubians in the tomb of Amun, the Bull’, JEA 30 (1942), pl. 5.
626 Klemm & Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 619.
sought in desert regions. The aromatic $ssjt$ in particular is found only in Medja [24.11-12, 24.20] and Punt [84.33]. It is thus possible that the list is referring to two different ecologies where goods were procured. One was a desert region where minerals and pigments could be obtained ($WbAt$-spt) and the other was a Nile urban-centre which could handle the transhipment of ebony, giraffes, and also create manufactured goods like head-rests and bows ($KS$). Mention should also be made of the discovery by Davies of a text evoking a Kushite ruler $Trh$ at Umm Nabari far into the Eastern Desert, a name known from the Execration Texts as $Trkhi$. This inscription proves the connection between the rulers of Kush and the goldfields to the east, and thus provides a reason for why Kush and $WbAt$-spt may have been included in the same tribute entry in the Annals of Amenemhat II, namely that they were neighbouring polities.

While the goods alone make it difficult to prove its location, a few things may be said regarding its relationship with Kush. $WbAt$-spt was a known territory of the Medjay [17.1-2, 17.4], who in the early Middle Kingdom were frequenting the Nile Valley especially near the Second Cataract. It therefore makes sense that $WbAt$-spt is located either east of the Second and Third Cataract regions or in itself the region between Semna and Kerma (i.e. the Batn el-Hagar). The latter suggestion would easily explain why the tribute list included both $Ks$ and $WbAt$-spt, namely that Nubians from the Third cataract area ($Ks$) came downstream and brought tribute from the Batn el-Hagar ($WbAt$-spt?) en-route to Egypt. This is also the impression given by the Mirgissa Execration Text [17.3-5], where the geographic progression seems to be south to north in the order of $Ks$ (Kerma), $ShAt$ (Sai), then $WbAt$-spt. The Helwan Execration Texts do not follow this list, where the order simply introduces $WbAt$-spt as a $Md$-y-territory, after which $Ks$, $ShAt$, and $Bks$ are listed under the heading of $Nh$s-$y$-Nubians.

An issue with a Nile location, however, is that in the Middle Kingdom the expanse between the southernmost fortress of Amenemhat II at Buhen and the next known Execration Text toponym at $ShAt$ (Sai Island) gives a small region of only c. 140km. Furthermore, as Spalinger has shown, the $b3k$-wt ‘deliveries’ in the Annals come from polities that are outside ‘direct Egyptian

---

627 For these goods, see also Zibelius-Chen, Ägyptische Expansion nach Nubien, 92-94, 104. If $sngr$ is Pistacia one might identify it here with Pistacia khinjuk (see entry [30]) which today grows in Gebel Elba, but its ancient ecology may have been more widespread.

628 See Davies, Sudan & Nubia 18, 25 and the photograph produced in Castiglioni & Castiglioni, BSFE 169-170, 21. It is undoubtedly a similar name to $Trkhi$ from the Mirgissa Execration Texts, for which see El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 294.

629 See the Semna Dispatches in Smither, JEA 31, 8.

630 Koenig, RdÉ 41, 121, 125.

631 Posener, Cinq figurines d’envoûtement, 45-47.

632 See Török, Between Two Worlds, 84-88. For $ShAt$ as Sai, see Zibelius, AOVN, 154.
control. 633 *Wb3.t-sp.t* would thus be a rather small region if it were located on the Nile Valley, while an Eastern Desert location would account for much of the minerals and incense listed in the Nubian tribute of the Annals of Amenemhat. Linguistic evidence also points to an Eastern Desert origin. Rilly has shown through phonological analysis of Nubian names that the populace of Sai in the Exeeration Texts probably spoke a Meroitic-like language rather than an Afroasiatic language like Beja. 634 This may suggest that this region of the Nile was already dominated by Nilo-Saharan speakers in the early Middle Kingdom, and not speakers of Beja, who at least in some contemporary documents were called *Mdj.y*. As such, *Wb3.t-sp.t* and its Medjay are more likely to be found in the desert margins. In the Exeeration Texts, *Wb3.t-sp.t* has two rulers, *IITE*, and *Iwnf* born of *Thwfl* born of *Khbih*, perhaps indicating political fragmentation of the region. 636

**Discussion:** If Wadi Gabgaba and the region further east is the preferred location for *Wb3.t-sp.t*, then there is some archaeological material that may be associated with the toponym. The sites of Wadi Terfowi and Wadi Elei have 14C remains dated to the Middle Kingdom, while sites with second millennium BCE Middle Nubian ceramics are dotted in a few locations throughout this desert region. 637 Cattle pastoralism evidently took place in this region, as is evidenced by the large rock-art tableau at Bir Nurayet, 638 thus mirroring the reference to cattle tribute in the Annals of Amenemhat.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+1.1)

[18] T3-wh.yt-b3k-nbw

**Etymology (I):** The toponym is a compound comprising *wh.yt* ‘settlement’ as an antecedent of the participle *b3k* ‘to work’. 639 An alternative interpretation would be to read *b3k.w* as the agent-noun ‘worker’ and hence a tripartite genitive ‘village of the workers of gold’. 640

---

634 Rilly, CRIPEL 26, 305 compares the consonant repertoire of the Kush-Sai onomastica with the *WbAt-* names and concludes that the former is likely Nilo-Saharan (i.e. Meroitic or other East Sudanic languages) and the latter as Afroasiatic (i.e. Beja).
635 A contemporary Middle Kingdom example of the connection between Beja and *Mdj.y* is evidenced in the name *Kwi* in Boulaq 18 (from modern *kwaaya* ‘friend’), see El-Sayed, SAK 32, 360.
636 Possener, *Princes et pays d’Asie et de Nubie*, pl. 1a, following the conclusion of O’Connor, JARCE 23, 41. Of these, *Khbih* has a plausible Beja name in Beja *kurib* ‘Elephant’, see El-Sayed, Afrikanischslämiger Lehnwortschatz, 282.
639 For the words see *Wb*. 1, 346, 426-427.
640 The orthographies of the toponym support neither conclusion, as this writing is attested in both the agent noun and the verb, see Lesko, *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*, I, 127-128. ‘The gold-working village’ is preferred in R. Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies* (Oxford, 1954), 298 and J. Harrell & V. Brown, ‘The Oldest Surviving Topographical Map from Ancient Egypt: (Turin Papyri 1879, 1899, and 1969)’, JARCE 29 (1992), 87. ‘Häuser der Goldarbeiter’ is cited in R. Klemm & D. Klemm,
**Location (I):** The presence of this toponym on the Turin Map \[18.2-3\] makes it all but certain that we are dealing with a goldmine at the eastern end of Wadi Hammamat.\(^{641}\) The only known New Kingdom gold mine in this area is Wadi el-Sid, although New Kingdom huts could have also existed underneath the Byzantine-Ptolemaic remains at Fawakhir.\(^{642}\) Presumably, the \textit{Tá-\textit{wh.yt-
\textit{b3k-nbw}} from the pCairo text \[18.4\] is also the same location, a fact also reinforced by the mention of ‘Coptos’ in the pCairo letters.\(^{643}\)

**Classification:** +Egyptian (2.2+5.1+1.3)

\[18A\]

\[Tá-\textit{wh.yt-p3-nbw}\]

**Etymology (I):** This is a simple genitival expression, similar to above without \textit{b3k}.  

**Location (I):** In pAnastasi VI \[18.1\] the gold mine is said to be in the \textit{\textit{H}tst-Gbtw} \[35\] and thus it is probably an alternative form of \textit{Tá-\textit{wh.yt-b3k-nbw}} which is known to be in the Hammamat region east of Coptos.\(^{644}\) If this is the case this placename too must refer to the mines in Wadi el-Sid or Fawakhir.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (2.2+1.3)

\[19.\]

\[B3w-d\textit{sr.t}\]

**Etymology (I):** The toponym comprises of two lexemes. The latter is the Egyptian word \textit{d\textit{sr.t}} ‘red-land’, hence ‘desert’. The reading of the first word is not certain. Gardiner transliterated the word as \textit{b\textit{it}}, while El-Sayed read \textit{b\textit{w}k\textit{y}}.\(^{645}\) The orthography itself, \textit{b\textit{w}kw}, suggests the reading chosen by Zibelius-Chen, \textit{b\textit{w}k}, with = classifying the word as an element of physical geography.\(^{646}\) The first lexeme has been analysed by El-Sayed as a foreign-word related to Beja

---

\(^{641}\) As has been noted by most authorities, see for instance C. Meyer, B. Earl, M. Omar & R. Smither, ‘Ancient Gold Extraction at Bir Umm Fawakhir’, \textit{JARCE} 40 (2003), 48 and Klemm & Klemm, \textit{Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia}, 141-144.

\(^{642}\) Harrell & Brown, \textit{JARCE} 29, 97, while C. Meyer & L. Heidorn ‘Pre-Coptic remains’, in C. Meyer (ed.), \textit{Bir Umm Fawakhir} (Chicago, 2011), II, 18 recoded at least one New Kingdom sherd from the Byzantine town, the majority of New Kingdom material being located further south at El-Sid.

\(^{643}\) pCairo A.3 has \textit{Mn nb Gbtw} ‘Min, lord of Coptos’, Helck, \textit{JARCE} 6, 146.

\(^{644}\) Caminos, \textit{Late Egyptian Miscellanies}, 298 states ‘its identity with… “the gold working village or settlement” is not altogether unlikely’.

\(^{645}\) A. Gardiner, ‘The Tomb of a Much-Travelled Theban Official’, \textit{JEA} 4 (1917), 36, pl. 9; El-Sayed, \textit{Afrikanstämmiger Lehnwortschatz}, 186.

\(^{646}\) Zibelius, \textit{AOVN}, 106.
bur ‘land, earth’, but he is unable to explain the second element /wk/.

However, Schenkel preferred connecting it to the word $b\text{sw}$ $\text{bAw}$, found in CT I 256, taking $\text{bAw}$ as a determinative for ‘hill’, thus eliminating the need for the final $k$.

This is probably related to a similar root present in $\text{bAw}$ ‘Hügel (?)’, a metathesised variant of the more regular $\text{bw}$ ‘Hügel, Steinhaufen’. Another similar lexeme ‘(Wasser)loch’ would also be suitable, especially given the use of the canal-sign N2. Both these meanings stem from different but orthographically similar verbal roots $\text{bw}$ ‘be high’ or $\text{bA}$ ‘dig’. Given the use of $\text{b}$ as a determinative, the preference must be to understand the word as ‘high-place of the desert’, which is altogether preferable to reading an unattested $\text{bAwq}$.

**Location (II):** Being a hapax placename, there is little information with which to locate this place.

The relevant text [19.1] describes it as the location of the hapax resource $r\text{-ntt}$. As $ntt$ independently seems to refer to a type of cord or rope, there are a number of botanical possibilities, the most likely being date palm fibre ($Phoenix dactylifera$), halfa grass ($Desmostachya bipinnata$), or bark from $Acacia raddiana$. It is still difficult to locate this toponym, and either the Eastern Desert or Sinai is possible. The toponym is listed between the placename $+w$ and $RA$ both of which cannot be specifically located.

---


651 *Wb.* 1, 415, 454.


653 *Wb.* 2, 367. The *ri* in this expression might relate to $\text{ri}$ ‘item, part’ (*Wb.* 2, 392).


655 Gardiner, *JEA* 4, 36.
but the latter is almost certainly a turquoise mine in the South Sinai. Given Henu’s journeys around to the Sinai and Ayn Soukhna, a location near the Gulf of Suez is likely, and if b3w.t is to be read as ‘high-place’, then the placename must be some orographic feature with local vegetation. In the Wadi Arabah, sites like Ayn Barda, Bir Iraydah or the site of Saint Anthony’s Monastery (with its well-known spring) along the North and South Galala scarps would suit these criteria.

The presence of petroglyphs indicates that the site of Saint Paul’s Monastery was a loci of historical activity well before the Coptic period. Several ecologists have noted that the elevation of the Galala plateau make it a heavily vegetated area, particularly after rainfall.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+1.1)

| 20 | B3k.t |

**Etymology (III):** It is difficult to know the linguistic origin of this name. If it is Egyptian, it could be a noun formed from b3k ‘to work’, but the various locational contexts may suggest a foreign etymology. If a Semitic origin is entertained, then brkt ‘pool, swamp’ might be suggested.

**Location (III):** The location of this toponym is difficult to adduce, as the attestations are found in diverse contexts. There is a B3k.t from the temple of Sahure [20.1], a B3k.t from the topographical list of Thutmosis III [20.3], and a plausible but unconfirmed toponym B3k.t ( kad ) on the shrine of Ankhow at Wadi Gasus [20.2]. As such, the placename is variably located near Libya or Mersa Gawasis. The Mersa Gawasis B3k.t was proposed by Sayed solely due to the placement in the Topographical List of Thutmosis III of a similar B3k.t (no. 108), where it co-occurs with Zwi (no. 111), which Sayed equated with Mersa Gawasis (alt. ZAw.w). The interpretation of a Libyan B3k.t rests on its inclusion in the Sahure reliefs (Fig. 13), where it is associated with a...
damaged text which has $h3.ty-\i \ Thn.w$ ‘mayor of Libya’.\footnote{L. Borchardt, *Das Grabdenkmal des Sahu-re* (Leipzig, 1913), II, fig. 1. Borchardt (p. 12) identified it with the similar $B\ik$ ‘Kuban’. Höscher, *Libyer und Ägypter*, 21 correctly refuted this identification. The toponym $B\il/B\i\w$ is a difficult placename to locate. Occurring almost exclusively in religious texts, it is usually a *Kultort* of Sobek. In the Book of the Dead there is an instance of the ‘Sobek, lord of Bakhru in that Eastern Mountain’ and, as such, most scholars take it to refer to the east, but it is also found in Western contexts, see Zibelius, *AOVN*, 110-111; *AEO* I, 118; P. Grandet, *Le Papyrus Harris I* (Le Caire, 1999), II, 38 n. 148. J. Assmann, *Liturgische Lieder an den Sonnengott* (Berlin, 1969), 39 importantly notes ‘Die Bedeutung von $M\i\w$ und $B\i\w$ wäre dann nicht (geographisch) festgelegt durch die Beziehung auf ein bestimmtes Gebiet, sondern (mythologisch) auf die Phasen des Sonnenlaufs Aufgang (Erscheinen) und Untergang (Entschwinden).’} But the register above depicts the toponym $B\il$ which is usually thought to refer to the solar east (and sometimes also west).\footnote{In favour of reading $B\ik[t]$ as a placename is the preposition $r$, but it could easily be the comparative, ‘this produce was brought together more than the revenue ($b\ik\w$)…’} Thus its relation to Libya or $B\il$, based on the relief alone, is far from certain. The damaged text on the stele of Ankhow \footnote{El-Sayed, *Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz*, 189.} would read well if $b\ik \t$ were a placename, but the extensive lacunae should dissuade one from using this as evidence for a specific name for the port at Mersa Gawasis.\footnote{El-Sayed, *Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz*, 189.}

**Classification:** Unknown (8.1)

---

Figure 13: $B\il$ and $B\ik \t$ in the reliefs of Sahure at Abusir, after Borchardt, *Das Grabdenkmal Des Sahu-re*, II, fig. 1.
An enigmatic Egyptian lexeme $b\dot { h } \cdot t$ ‘Loch’ is also suitable for a geographic etymon. Given the known location is near a spring, the etymology of ‘bush’ or ‘spring’ is quite suitable.

**Location (I):** The mention of $b\dot { h } \cdot t$ on two inscriptions at Ayn Soukhna [21.1-2] almost certainly points to its location at this site on the Gulf of Suez. The $b\dot { h } \cdot t$ of the biography of Khety [21.3] must be a mining centre, as it is the location of the unique substance $b\dot { h } \cdot m\dot { b } (w)$ translated by Gardiner as ‘new metal’. Surveys of the surrounding region of Ayn Soukhna raise the possibility of locally exploited copper ores. But, given the extensive remains of smelting operations at the site, the ‘new metal’ mentioned in the text may simply refer to locally processed ore at Ayn Soukhna. A location of Ayn Soukhna would also account for the etymology of ‘bush, thicket’, as the local spring (Ayn) has produced exceptional vegetation in an otherwise desolate area.

**Discussion:** El-Sayed grouped this placename together with the word $\dot { j } \cdot w \cdot t$ ‘bush’ found in Henu’s Wadi Hammamat inscription. The scribe distinguished this word from a toponym by using the corresponding classifier for [VEGETATION], but a cross-contamination between $b\dot { h } \cdot t$ (toponym) and $b\dot { h } \cdot t$ ‘bush’ is a possibility. Indeed the sense of the text recommends some geographic exactitude in the word, but perhaps not a toponym: $iw\ l\cdot t\ i\ r\cdot t\ (\cdot i)\ Xnm\cdot t\ 12\ m\ b\dot { h }\cdot t\ (14)\ h\nm\cdot t\ 2\ m\ Td\cdot sht\…\ i\ r\cdot t\ (\cdot i)\ k\cdot t\ m\ Tl\cdot th\ b\cdot t$ ‘I built 12 wells in the Bush, two wells in $Td\cdot sht\…$ (and) another at $Tl\cdot th\ b\cdot t$. Bradbury’s reading of Henu’s inscription concluded that Henu built 15 wells in total, and locates this $b\dot { h }\cdot t$ (by inference) as the region between the Nile and the Red Sea Hills.
where he built the overwhelming majority of his wells on his journey to the Red Sea. Murray is even more specific, locating Henu’s bṭ.t with the oasis of Lajeita, en-route to Wadi Hammamat. Gardiner also suggested a possible connection with the Bṣwt of the Topographical list of Thutmosis III, but the progression of this text seems to place this toponym in the environs of Wawat. The bṭ.t of the Henu text is unlikely to be a toponym and has no relation to the Ayn Soukhna Bṭ.t.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.7)

| 22 | Bṭ.t | */bṛc/ |

Etymology (III): El-Sayed related the toponym to the placename Bṭ [21] and hence Egyptian bṭt ‘Busch’, or even Beja burt ‘Land’. However, as the palatal fronting of t > t is not attested until the late Old Kingdom, it is best to treat these placenames as phonetically distinct and as a foreign word, as bṭt is not a productive root in Egyptian. Given the Fifth Dynasty date, it is probably more prudent to reconstruct the auslaut t with its earlier pronunciation as an affricate /c/, but /ts/ or even /k/ may also be plausible realisations of t in foreign languages. Additionally, the fact that Bṭ is classified with ḫ, unlike Bṭt which has ḫ, points to a completely different toponym. Exactly what consonant t would be in a target African language is unknown. If Ehret’s reproduction of Beja phonology is correct, there was a voiceless palatal stop /c/ in Beja which merged with /ʃ/. If the sound represented by t ultimately shifted to /s/ in Beja, there is beress ‘Calotropis procera’ – or, if palatisation had not taken place in Egyptian, then Proto-East Cushitic *burq ‘spring’ or Agaw bäläkw ‘dig’ might be entertained.

675 For the logistics and well construction in this expedition, see Bradbury, JARCE 25, 137 n. 47.
677 Gardiner, JE 4, 37 n. 2 and Urk. IV, 797, no. 35, 804, no. 207. Gardiner’s equation of the placename with the ḫ in a stele from Hauran (for which see also GDG II, 1) is unlikely and has little to recommend it geographically.
678 El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 189. For parallels of this lexeme, see Blažek, Babel und Bibel 2, 381.
679 For ‘palatal fronting’, see Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 123-124. A. Grimm, ‘Das Fragment einer Liste fremdländischer Tiere, Pflanzen und Städte aus dem Totentempel des Königs Djedkare-Asosi: Zu drei bisher unbekannten afrikanischen Toponymen’, SAK 12 (1985), 38 interprets the name as bi-consonantal bt or bt using the much later orthographic systems where aleph may be interpreted vocalically.
680 Tákács in EDE I, 273 gives this value while showing that t derived from Afroasiatic *k. While most authorities cite a palatal /c/ in the Middle Egyptian pronunciation of t, in loans t seems to have been able to represent /ts/ as well; see W. Schenkel, Einführung in die allägyptische Sprachwissenschaft (Darmstadt, 1990), 39 and El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 99; Hoch, Semitic Words, 429-430.
682 For the words, see Almkvist, Die Bischari Sprache, 11 who gives bires while Hudson & Blench, A Dictionary of Beja, 26 give beress. For burq, see Hudson, Northeast African Semitic: Lexical Comparisons and Analysis, 248; Appleyard, Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages, 54.
Location (III): The only locational data relevant to this placename are the resources mentioned in the Djedkare list [22.1] under the heading of $\text{T}\text{i}\text{b} \text{nbw} \text{d} \text{f} \text{m} ‘\text{Land of gold and electrum}’$. From an analysis of the Djedkare relief fragment, Grimm suggested a Lower Nubian location due to the concentration of expeditions in Lower Nubia under this king,²⁷ and Redford, without any supporting evidence, suggested that $\text{BI}$ might be an Asiatic placename.²⁸ The latter suggestion is almost certainly incorrect, as the placenames are associated with goldfields, excluding the Levant. A Lower Nubian location is also problematic as the presence of $\text{S} \text{nsh}$ in Nubian placenames (like Buhun, Kuban, and Aniba) is not attested until the New Kingdom.²⁹ Therefore, either these placenames break this orthographic rule altogether, or are presumably on the Egyptian Nile, i.e. north of Aswan. The problem with an Egyptian Nile location is compounded by the fact that gold-mining occurred only in the deserts east of the Nile, thus if $\text{Blt}$, $\text{Snsh}$, and $\text{Hzt}$ are not goldmines, they must be sites where gold was processed. Furthermore, their non-Egyptian names suggests a non-Egyptian location, and thus somewhere in the Eastern Desert is most likely for this group of placenames. The damage to the inscription and the hapax nature of the toponyms prevents any deeper understanding of their geography.

Classification: Unknown (7.1)

\[ \text{[23]} \quad \text{BI} \text{t}-\text{Ib}\text{.t(y)t-}\text{zbw} \]

Etymology (I): The toponym is part of a longer clause joined to a relative adjective, where the shrine of Amun ($\text{itr.t n.t \text{Imn.w}}$) is upon the $\text{BI} \text{t}-\text{Ib}\text{.t(y)t-}\text{zbw}$. The embedded toponym $\text{zbw}$ refers to the isle of Elephantine,³⁰ and $\text{Ib}\text{.t(y)t}$ is an adjective ‘eastern’ agreeing with the feminine $\text{BI} \text{t}$. The generic $\text{BI} \text{t}$ in toponymic phrase is undoubtedly ‘mine’ (see [55]). There are comparable instances of $\text{BI} \text{t}$ in the stèle of Sa-Hathor and an inscription in a mine-shaft at Umm Huweitat where it is difficult to contest a meaning such as ‘mine’ or ‘shaft’.³¹

Location (III): That this placename is east of Elephantine Island is certain, but one is left with the problem of whether it refers to the area of the nearby granite quarries on the east bank of the Nile,³² or an area much further east, perhaps in the environs of Wadi el-Hudi. As the location of a

²⁷ Grimm, SAK 12, 39 notes expeditions in the reign of Djedkare at Wadi Maghara, Toshka, Tomas, and the oases. He also calls attention to the $\text{BI} \text{t}$ in the Wawat list of Thutmosis III, for which see Urk. IV, 797 no. 34.
²⁸ Redford, JARCE 23, 125-143. A Syrian location was also suggested in Gardiner, JEA 4, 37 n. 1.
²⁹ Zibelius, AOVN, 70; El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 189.
³⁰ Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches, 3-6.
³¹ S. Birch, ‘Tablets of the Twelfth Dynasty’, ZAS 12 (1894), 112. See also the $\text{BI} \text{t}$ mentioned in a galena mine at Umm Huweitat; V. Vikentiev, ‘Les trois inscriptions concernant la mine de plomb d’Oum Huuetat’, ASAE 54 (1956), 179-189.
³² S. Aufrère, L’universe minéral dans la pensée égyptienne (Le Caire, 1991), I, 64 and GDG II, 15. See also Schiaparelli, La geografia dell’Africa orientale, 204 who argued against Brugsch’s location on the Red Sea shore.
shrine/chapel (itr.t) of Amun [23.1], one would expect some archaeological remains to be ascribable to the location. Hathor is known to have had a shrine at Wadi el-Hudi in the Middle Kingdom, but the site lacks any New Kingdom material. 689 There is a New Kingdom graffito near the Ptolemaic fort at Abraq that may suggest an ephemeral presence in the further desert near Berenike and the Red Sea. 690 Given the notion of bi.t as an ‘Erzgebiet’, the ancient copper/malachite mines of Umm Semiuqi (south of Wadi Gemal) would also be a contender for this location. 691 This mine is attributed to the New Kingdom, but has not been the subject of extensive research or fieldwork. An unlocated haematite mine might also be possible, as this mineral is known product of the Aswan region. 692 It is hoped that continued archaeological investigation in this region may yet yield a more suitable location.

Classification: +Egyptian (2.1+3.1+3.4)

[24] | [Md3] | */mdʒr/

Etymology (III): As a ubiquitous lemma in Egyptian texts, there have been numerous attempts to identify the meaning of Md3(y). The issue of its etymology is compounded by several problems, especially confusion with the ethnic term Md3,y, a nisbe ending ‘he-of-Medja(-land)’. The problem is best treated by Takács in his *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian* with extensive bibliographical notes and commentary on most theories, where he lists the many divergent approaches to its etymology. 693 One can divide these arguments into 1) those who seek an inner Egyptian etymology and 2) foreign-language sources. For an Egyptian origin the most commonly quoted etymology is that of Hodge, citing the m-prefix plus the verb d3l ‘to cross, ferry’ to make a hypothetical ‘traverser’. 694 As Takács notes, this can be safely refuted due to Hodge mistakenly identifying Md3 as a name for Egyptian mercenaries, i.e. not a toponym, but a socio-ethnic group, and thus any etymology that explains the term from social terminology is erroneous. An extension of this theory, as per Giuliani, is to treat the m-prefix as referring to a place, that is ‘place in which

---

689 See A. Espinel, ‘A Newly identified Stela from Wadi el-Hudi (Cairo JE 86119)’, *JEA* 91 (2005), 65-66.

690 The inscriptions and titles relate to gold prospecting. There is a h3.ty-r n(y) 3bw ss ḥsb nbw ḫw.ty-htp, ‘count of Elephantine, the scribe who counts gold, Djehutyhotep’ and an im.y-r3 ss ḥr m3† ‘Inw ‘overseer of scribes, elder of the army, Inu’. See de Bruyn, *JEA* 42, 121-122 and de Bruyn, ‘Falcon Graffiti in the Eastern Desert’, *JEA* 44 (1958), 97-98.


693 *EDE* III, 809-815.

one comes and goes’, not an ethneme. There is then the semantic problem of connecting a desert region with a concept like ‘place of crossing (dʒi)’, a verb used almost exclusively with movement over bodies of water. Thus, while this construction is prima facie possible in Egyptian language, it has not been explained why a desert locality would be named in this manner. An obscure etymology proposed by Michaux-Colombot connected Mdʒ with an enigmatic deity from the Pyramid Texts, but this too is semantically dubious for a placename in the Eastern Desert.

The lexical reflexes are a different matter, and much has been written on whether Coptic Maṭo is a reflex of this ethneme Mdʒ, or rather the Persian Medes, or a contamination and conflation of these two disparate lexemes. Complications also arise as to whether Mdʒ, Mdʃ of Napata and Meroitic inscriptions belong to the same placename. A different problem altogether is whether Mdʒ or any of these reflexes are related to the word designating the modern ethnic group Beja, for which the reader is referred to the bibliographic material in Takács. While it is quite likely that there is a linguistic relationship between the people of Mdʒ-land and the modern Beja, it does not hold that these lexemes are in any way related.

Regarding the phonology of the word, several important observations should be made. The diachronic depalatisation (or palatal fronting) of ḫ as is commonly witnessed in Late Egyptian orthography is never apparent in Mdʒ, as the word is never written with ḫ. It is thus quite likely that ḫ maintained its older palatal pronunciation in the placename. Given that Old Egyptian ḫ has multiple realisations from Afroasiatic, with most authorities preferring something closer to /dʒ/ or an emphatic affricate /tʃ/, it is unclear what consonant this would correspond to.

---

695 Giulaini, *DE* 42, 45; Liszka, *A Study of the Medjay and Panggrave as an ethnic group and as Mercenaries*, 140.
696 *Wb.* 5, 513-514.
699 *EDE* III, 775, 843; *AEO* I, 82.
701 Most of these attempts suggested Beja bidʕa ‘nomad’ as the root of the ethneme Beja/Bega. See also A. Zaborski, *BzS* 4, 169.
702 The palatal pronunciation of ḫ in this word may be confirmed by Old Nubian Medʒ ‘slave’, see n. 700.
in an African language.\footnote{There is serious argument over the Old Egyptian pronunciation of \(d\). Takács, EDE I, 263, 271-273 prefers a voiced palatal affricate /\(d\)z\/, while El-Sayed (Afrikanschstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, xxii) prefers a Palato-alveolar ejective affricate /tʃ\'. See also Allen, The Ancient Egyptian Language, 49-54 who prefers a voiced palatal stop [ɟ]. Peust (p. 125) notes that the Coptic letter Janja ϫ was on rare occasions replaced by т+ϣ perhaps confirming, to an extent, El-Sayed’s value as /tʃ/; but it is quite possible that \(d\) was indeed an allophone.} In Semitic loans of the Middle and New Kingdoms, \(d\) most commonly represents šade /\(t\)s\/', and less regularly zayin /\(d\)z\/ and dal /\(d\)/.\footnote{Hoch, Semitic Words, 437. The Semitic transliteration has been regularised here to IPA.} As Beja seems the most likely source, given the Eastern Desert location, it is worth illustrating what historic phonemes could possibly accord to \(d\). According to Ehret, Beja did have similar affricates like /\(t\)s\'/ or /\(d\)z\/ inherited from Proto-Cushitic, which eventually shifted to /\(s\'/. The value of \(z\) as a liquid is a regular correspondence in Old and Middle Egyptian, and seems certain in this word, given the writing of \(M\(d\)\(z\)\) in pWilbour with an augmented \(r\), \(M\(d\)\(r\)\(y\).\footnote{A New Kingdom toponym \(P(\(t\)-\(n\),(y))\)-\(M\(d\)\(r\)\(y\) may show the current pronunciation still conserved a final liquid, given that New Kingdom \(r\) corresponds to /\(r\) or /\(l\/, see Gardiner, The Wilbour Papyrus, I, pl. 50 (B3, line 22).} In Old Egyptian received pronunciation, the word could then have had a pronunciation closer to /\(m\(d\)\(ʒ\)\(r\)/, and if the word still existed in Beja it might appear something like /\(m\(s\)t\). Assuming an \(m\)-prefix in Beja,\footnote{The \(m\)-prefix is no longer productive in Beja, see M. Vanhove, ‘Roots and patterns in Beja (Cushitic): The issue of language contact with Arabic’, in T. Stols, M. Vanhove, H. Otsuka & A. Urdze (eds), Morphologies in Contact (Berlin, 2012), 321-322.} a number of hypothetical possibilities can be suggested, such as \(m+sura\) ‘place of well(s)’or \(m+sera\) ‘place of the front’ or more simply \(m\(a\)\(s\)el\) ‘trockener Wadi-Arm’.\footnote{For these terms, see Hess, Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen 9, 215; Blažek, Babel und Bibel 3, 412 419} These etymologies rest on a number of assumptions, namely \(m\) being a historically productive prefix in Beja placenames and the difficulty of identifying the phonetic realisation of Egyptian \(d\) in an African language.

On the proviso that the word entered Egyptian before the Old Kingdom, when \(d\) may have had a non-palatal pronunciation as /\(g\)/ (\(d\)\(i\)), Takács has suggested Somali \(m\(a\)\(g\)\(a\)l\(-\)o ‘Stadt, Landschaft’ and Somali-Jabartu \(m\(a\)\(g\)\(a\)l\) ‘Männer, Volk’.\footnote{EDE III, 815. Takács treats the word as a locative prefix \(m\) + \(ga\)l ‘enter’. For Egyptian \(d\) in the earliest stage of Egyptian see also Kammerzell, ‘Old Egyptian and Pre-Old Egyptian: tracing linguistic diversity in Archaic Egypt and the creation of the Egyptian language’, in Seidlmayer (ed.), Texte und Denkmäler des ägyptischen Alten Reiches, 182-183, who proposes that \(d\) is the palatised variant of \(k\).} The same word exists in other Cushitic languages closer to the Beja lands, Saho \(m\(a\)\(g\)\(a\)al\) ‘town’ and Oromo \(m\(a\)\(g\)\(a\)la\) ‘city’, confirming its place as a Cushitic isogloss for settlements and their surrounding areas, and thus a similar word may have existed in ancient Beja.\footnote{Parker, English-Afar Dictionary, 300; Leus, van de Loo & Cotter, An Oromo-English Vocabulary, 35. It is possible that Arabic \(m\)\(e\)\(d\)\(i\)na or \(b\)\(a\)\(l\)\(a\)d had replaced similar Beja words like \(m\)\(a\)\(g\)\(a\)l.} El-Sayed has a different tact, reconstructing \(M\(d\)\(z\)\) as *\(m\_\(\check{c}\)\(r\)/ or */m\(n\)ic\(\check{c}\)\(\text{aret}\), in order to follow his suggested etymology of ‘Biɖa-Berge’ (in Beja Biɖa-are),
using the self-designation for the Beja, Biḍa (also Beda\-uye)\footnote{Zibelius-Chen, SAK 36, 393; El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnsprache, 215.}. However, while the shift \( m > \theta / \) would be allowable, this theory does not explain how \( d \) can reproduce the retroflex \( /\theta/ \), or semantically what an appellation like Biḍa\-mountain might mean. A recent interpretation provided by Rilly suggests that the original form of the toponym in Pre-Beja would have been something like \( /\theta d\theta/ \), with the palatal \( /\theta/ \) shifting to \( /\theta/ \) in Beja, and hence he would also connect the toponym to the modern Beja autonym Beda\-uye (also assuming a shift of \( /m/ > \theta / \)).\footnote{Rilly, ‘Language and Ethnicity in Ancient Sudan’, in Anderson & Welsby (eds), The Fourth Cataract and Beyond: Proceedings of the 12th International Conference for Nubian Studies, 1174-1175.} This would neatly explain the various reflexes encountered in Ge’ez Bega, Arabic Beja and Egyptian Md\(\theta \). The only issue with these etymologies is that they do not explain the auslaut liquid \( /\theta/ \). Another issue with this idea is that while Md\(\theta \) is a toponym, the term Beda\-uye is an ethnic designator. Problems abound in all these theories, mainly due to the reconstructing of Egyptian \( d \) and its correspondent in Beja.

Liskza, following a suggestion of Zibelius-Chen, implicitly suggests a process of phono-semantic matching, whereby the Egyptians heard a foreign-word and related it to similar sounding word(s) in their own language, hence the validity of both an Egyptian and foreign etymology.\footnote{Liszka, A Study of the Medjay and Pangrave as an Ethnic group and as Mercenaries, 141-142.} While quite possible, such an etymology is also untestable.

**Location (II):** It is important to note here that Md\(\theta \) as a toponym took a rather different trajectory to its ethneme nisbe counterpart Md\(\theta\).y, and thus these terms should be treated separately in respect to their lexical history and meaning. The ethneme Md\(\theta\).y, while certainly derived from Md\(\theta \), did not necessarily maintain a connection with a desert location, especially in New Kingdom texts. Almost all authorities have favoured locating Md\(\theta \) in the Eastern Desert of Lower Nubia, based on a variety of factors, although Gardiner suggested the Nile Valley north of the Second Cataract.\footnote{‘Die nubische Wüste zwischen Nil und Rotem Meer’, K. Sethe, Die Achtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefässerwerben des Mittleren Reiches (Berlin, 1926), 36; ‘small district just north of the second cataract’, AEO I, 88; ‘liegen zwischen Nil und Rotem Meer’, I. Hoffmann, ‘Beitrag zur Herkunft der Pfannengräber-Leute’, ZDMG Supplementa I (1969), III, 1120; ‘Gebiet in Nubien (beim Wadi Allaqi)’ in HWb, 1351; ‘a small part of Nubia’, K. Sadr ‘The Territorial Expanses of the Pan-Grave Culture’ ANM 2 (1987), 287; ‘eastern desert’, O’Connor, ‘Egypt, 1552-664 BC’, in Clark (ed.), The Cambridge History of Africa, 929-930; ‘Ostwüste’, Zibelius, AOVN, 136.} The only major dissenting opinion is that of Michaux-Colombot who prefers to locate the Medja in the Eastern Desert contiguous with Upper Egypt.\footnote{D. Michaux-Colombot, ‘Md\(\theta\).w, not Policemen but an Ethnic Group’, in C. Bonnet (ed.), Études nubiennes: conférence de Genève : actes du VIIe Congrès international d'études nubiennes, 3-8 septembre 1990 (Genève, 1992), 30-33; Michaux-Colombot, ‘Qui sont le Medjay: et où se situait leur territoire?’, in Bruvier (ed.), Pharaons Noir, 84, fig. 1a; D. Michaux-Colombot, ‘Geographical enigmas related to Nubia: Medja, Punt, Meluhya and Magan’, in T. Kendall (ed.), Nubian Studies 1998: Proceedings of the Ninth Conference of the International Society of Nubian Studies (Boston, 2004), 355.} This view is ultimately based on
little supporting documentation and conflates the toponym with the ethneme while using questionable etymological arguments. Sadr, by equating Medja with Pan-Grave pottery, posited a shift in derivation of \( Md\beta \)-land from the Eastern Desert towards the Southern Atbai by the New Kingdom.\(^{717}\)

Almost all texts are in agreement that \( Md\beta \)-land was encountered by Egyptians in Lower Nubia, and was associated chiefly with locales in Nubia such as Wawat, Irtjet, and the Nehesy-land \([24.1-8]\).\(^{718}\) The fact that there is little chance for habitation in deserts west of Lower Nubia has \textit{a priori} placed \( Md\beta \) in Lower Nubia or to its east, that is the areas around Wadi Allaqi, Wadi Gabgaba, and the Atbai. Furthermore, a New Kingdom occurrence of the toponym connects it with goldmining operations \([24.18]\), thus making the Atbai a suitable location. Medja is differentiated from Wawat and Irtjet in \([24.2-6, 24.8]\) and, in two First Intermediate inscriptions, the ethnica \( Md\beta.y \) ‘Medjay’ and \( W\betaw\betat.yw \) ‘Lower Nubians’ occur in the same sentence, thus leading one to the conclusion that these toponymic based nisbe-ethnemes occupied separate regions.\(^{719}\) The view that \( Md\beta \) was part of the Nubian Nile is thus untenable.

Some early Middle Kingdom documents referring to \( Md\beta.y \) provide further details as to the location of \( Md\beta\)-land. The fortress name \( Hsf-Md\beta.yw \) ‘repeller-of-the-Medjay’, equating to Faras or Aniba, perhaps alludes to Medjay incursions in the region of the Second Cataract.\(^{720}\) The name itself refers to the purpose of the establishment, to defend against \( Md\beta.y \), in a similar manner to the names of other fortresses like \( Hsf-Iwn.tyw \) or \( Hsf-Tmh.w \).\(^{721}\) Such overt ideological assertions in fortress names should be seen in the context of naming practices in buildings, being a quasi-functional statement of the specific purpose of the establishment.\(^{722}\) Perhaps the most informative document for locating some \( Md\beta.y \) in the desert is Semna Dispatch no. 3 (pBm EA 10752 recto), where a report is made of an encounter between Medjay near Mirgissa (\( Iqn \)), on the edge of the Nile cultivation (‘\( d \)’).\(^{723}\)

---

\(^{717}\) Sadr, \textit{ANM} 2, 283-88.

\(^{718}\) For the locations of the Nubian polities in the Old and Middle Kingdoms, see O’Connor, \textit{JARCE} 23, 27-50 and Julien Cooper, ‘Reconsidering the location of Yam’, \textit{JARCE} 48 (2012), 1-22.

\(^{719}\) See Anthes, \textit{Felsinschriften von Hatnub}; 36; Fischer, \textit{Inscriptions from the Coptite Nome}, 70, pl. 20; C. Barbotin, J-J. Clère, ‘L’inscription de Sésosiris 1er à Tod’, \textit{BIFAO} 91 (1991), 5, line 38 (fig. 2). This distinction has been emphasised in C. Näser, ‘Structures and realities of Egyptian-Nubian interactions from the Late Old Kingdom to the Early New Kingdom’, in D. Raue, S. Seidlmayer & P. Speiser (eds), \textit{The First Cataract of the Nile: one region – diverse perspectives} (Berlin, 2013), 140-141 n. 41.

\(^{720}\) Gardiner, \textit{JEA} 3, 190 thought the fortress must lie in the stretch between Wadi Halfa and Aniba.

\(^{721}\) For a similar naming pattern, compare the western frontier fortress of \( Hsf-Tmh.w \), see \textit{KRI} V, 14.13; W. Edgerton & J. Wilson, \textit{Historical Records of Ramesses III: The text in Medinet Habu Volumes I and II} (Chicago, 1936), 13; and the Nubian \( Hsf-Iwn.tyw \), see A. Gardiner, ‘An ancient list of the fortresses of Nubia’, \textit{JEA} 3 (1916), 189.

\(^{722}\) Gardiner in \textit{AEO} I, 75 who notes ‘since it [the fortress name] would be meaningless had not the Medjay at that time been actual or potential aggressors’.

\(^{723}\) Smither, \textit{JEA} 31, pl. 2, 3a.
Then I asked these Medjay, saying “Where did you come (from)?” Then they said: “We have come from the well of Ibhet”.

Such a document links the itinerant Medjay with the placename  ḫḥ.t [12], in the Wadi Allaqi region, where there was a local water source. Thus, it seems likely that at least some Medjay originated in the Eastern Desert. This same transhumance pattern is repeated in dispatch no. 5, where Medjay hḥ.l(w) ḫḥ.t ‘descended upon the hill-country’.724 Liszka has pointed out the importance of these documents in understanding the Medjay, noting that the use of the term Mdḫ.y did not always indicate that these people were from Mdḫ.-land, perhaps a placename that had already lost its relevance by the Middle Kingdom.725 Presumably, such incidents as these were relatively commonplace and perhaps part of the transhumance cycles of the Medjay who wandered between the desert and the Nile Valley in search of pastures for their livestock.

What is surprising, however, is that the fortress of ḫs.f-Mdḫ.yw ‘repelling-the-Medjay’ and the encounter from the Semna dispatches are in the region of the Second Cataract, not at Kuban or the confluence of Wadi Allaqi, where one would expect the majority of interactions with the inhabitants of the Eastern Desert.726 One can justifiably say then that the Mdḫ.y of the Semna Dispatches were most likely inhabitants of a region including not only Wadi Allaqi but perhaps a large portion of the desert in the great bend of the Nile. The core of Medja-land, then, is probably in the deserts east of Lower Nubia, but could have easily extended both north and south of this area. Religious documents group Mdḫ.-land together with Punt and Wtn.t [24.12, 25.14, 24.16], and documentary texts show that the aromatic ḫs.t.yt, which could be obtained in Punt, was also found in Medja-land [24.10-11]. The Sobeknakht inscription groups Medjay together with Kush, Wawat, and Punt in a Pan-Nubian alliance against Egypt,727 suggesting that Punt may have been contiguous with Mdḫ. In Ptolemaic texts, the Mdḫ.y are coupled specifically with the ḫs.t-Iḥb.t,728

724 Smither, JEA 31, 8 n. 5. For the use of ḫḥ.t in the sense of descending to the Nile Valley from the desert, see J. Darnell, ‘The rock inscriptions of Tjemehau at Abisko’, ZÄS 130 (2003), 44; J. Hsieh, ‘Five Middle-Kingdom Stelae from Gebel el-Girgawi’, ZÄS 139 (2012), 118-119. See also the cognates for ḫḥ.t in EDE I, 145.
725 Liszka, JEH 4, 158. Liszka also points out that it is likely that this ‘speech’ represents translated and/or paraphrased speech. Mdḫ.y were in the retinue of the Egyptian patrol so it seems likely that they could have translated for the Egyptians.
726 There is one papyrus at Buhen mentioning Mdḫ.y, see Smith, The Fortress of Buhen: the Inscriptions, pl. 63, 63a. It is true, however, that there are no Middle Kingdom administrative documents from Kuban, and therefore our knowledge of the Medjay in the Lower Nubian administration is certainly incomplete.
defining them as the indigenes of the Eastern Desert. One may cautiously conclude that while Egypt’s main encounter with Medjay occurred in Lower Nubia, the term embraced a rather ambiguous and wide stretch of land in the Eastern Desert that furnished gold and aromatics.

Discussion: 

**Mdj and Mdjyw**

It is epistemologically impossible to discuss the toponym Mdj without some reference to the textually more ubiquitous ethneme Mdjyw. Comprehensive lexicographic works on this ethneme have been published by Meurer and Liszka, and these studies have allowed some pertinent conclusions to be made on their chronological and geographic distribution in Egyptian society. This ethneme is well-attested in Egyptian documents from the Middle Kingdom to the New Kingdom, and underwent a semantic shift from an ethnic designation to an occupation involved in desert activities. This is epitomised in New Kingdom documents like the Onomasticon of Amenemope where the term is listed next to mw ‘hunter’ in the ‘craftsmen section’ of the papyrus. As Liszka notes, it is not certain whether by the New Kingdom the Medjay-ethnicity still existed as a cohesive ethnic group, nor whether all members of the Mdjyw ‘occupation’ stemmed from the Mdjyw ethnic group. That being said, earlier documents, such as the Middle Kingdom Semna Dispatches, seem to still identify Mdjyw as a distinct socio-ethnic group who lived in the desert margins of Lower Nubia. While most New Kingdom documents mention Medjay in diverse geographic contexts - from Thebes, Kurkur Oasis, the Eastern Delta, and elsewhere - there are still some sources that point to the Medjay in the Eastern Desert. In the Nubian alliance of the Seventeenth Dynasty inscription of Sobeknakht, the Mdjyw are grouped together with #nt-Hn-nfr, KS, W3wt, and Pwnt, revealing them as a still functioning foreign ethnic group in Nubia, rather than an occupation. In a scene depicting gold-tribute in the Tomb of

---

730 *AEO* I, 75.
731 For commentary on Mdjyw in the papyri, see Liszka, ‘“Medjay” (no. 188) in the Onomasticon of Amenemope’, in Hawass & Wegner (eds), *Studies in honor of David P. Silverman*, 315-326.
732 Dispatches no. 3 and no. 5 both mention Mdjyw coming from the desert to the Nile Valley, see Smither, *JEA* 31, 7-9.
733 These documents are neatly outlined and listed in Liszka, *A Study of the Medjay and Pangrave as an ethnic group and as Mercenaries*, 218-220, 224-226. For Medjay in Deir el-Medina documentation, see J. Černý, *A Community of Workmen at Thebes in the Ramesside Period* (Kairo, 1973), 261-284. The overwhelming majority have Egyptian names.
734 For a discussion of Medjay at this desert oasis, see D. Darnell & J. Darnell, ‘The Archaeology of Kurkur Oasis, Nuq’ Maneih, Bir Nakheila, and the Sinn el-Kiddab’, in Raue, Seidlmayer & Speiser (eds), *The First Cataract of the Nile*, 38, 36-45. It should be noted that other Nubian ceramic traditions are also encountered in the oases.
735 For Medjay in the Eastern Delta and Tjeku, see pAnastasi V in Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, 253-254.
736 Davies, *Sudan & Nubia* 7, 52-54.
Menkheperresoneb, an individual is labelled as $hr.y\ Md\dot{b}.w\ n(y)$ Gbtw ‘chief of the Medjay of Coptos’ in association with another Egyptian individual who is an $im.y-r\ h\dot{s}.w.t\ nbw\ n(w)$ Gbtw ‘overseer of the hill-countries of gold of Coptos’, that is, the area of Wadi Hammamat.\(^{737}\)

Ramesside inscriptions in the Wadi Hammamat also record $Md\dot{b}.y$ amongst their members.\(^{738}\)

While the majority of such New Kingdom textual occurrences are attributable to the Medjay’s status as patrolmen and soldiers in the employ of the Egyptian state, some of this group may have remained connected to the Eastern Desert.

In a reassessment of the Medjay’s semantic shift from an ethnic group to the designation of an occupation, Liszka has introduced a third idea for Old Kingdom references to Medjay, that of ‘stereotype’.\(^{739}\) This is no doubt due to the rather vague notions of Medjay in texts, a paradigm that applies to many placenames and ethnica in Old Kingdom documents.\(^{740}\) It is likely that this ethneme, like most Egyptian ethnonyms, was used stereotypically, and masked inherently complex cultural distinctions within the supposed ‘Medjay’ culture. Other authorities have on analogy compared the term $Md\dot{b}.y$ to terms like ‘Gypsy’ in their denotation of supposedly homogenous but nomadic communities who reside within other polities.\(^{741}\) Therefore, despite the nisbe-relationship of the two terms, by the New Kingdom the $Md\dot{b}.y$ literally ‘one-of-Medja-land’, referred to an ethnic group who had seemingly severed its ties with a supposed homeland in $Md\dot{b}$.

An inscription at Amada referencing the ‘Land-of-Medjay’ $T-Md\dot{b}.y$ [24.24], and a reference to $H\dot{s}.w.t-n.w(t)-Md\dot{b}.y$ ‘Hill-country of Medjay’ [24.13], must continue this notion of a distinct areal entity east of Nubia, known for being the locus of a $Md\dot{b}.y$ social-group. Indeed, a number of New Kingdom instances of $Md\dot{b}.yw$ ethneme ( ) probably disguise a toponym. This realisation comes from the fact that in these texts $Md\dot{b}.y/Md\dot{b}.w$ is the origin of a resource [24.11], or is qualified by $mi-\dot{k}d$ ‘entirety’ [24.21] and thus must refer to a geographic area. This orthographic confusion can be attributed to the higher frequency of the ethneme vis-à-vis the placename, and the breakdown of the classifier system in New Kingdom orthography.

Furthermore, the biographical inscription at Kumma [24.18] and the inscription at Tombos [24.19] only make sense if the placename $Md\dot{b}$ still had some geographically specific bearing.\(^{742}\) While these toponymic uses have been called anachronistic,\(^{743}\) at the very least they attest to the memory in Egyptian thought of a region which was the Urheimat of the Medjay. Indeed, the shift from


\(^{738}\) Hammamat no. 12 (KRI VI, 14.7-8) records 50 Medjay, while another inscription Goyon (no. 89), records 20 Medjay.

\(^{739}\) Liszka, JEH 4, 155.

\(^{740}\) Espinel, Étnicidad y territorio, 14.


\(^{742}\) As per Zibelius-Chen, SAK 36, 398.

\(^{743}\) AEO I, 78-79.
$M\delta$ (toponym) to $M\delta.y$ (ethneme) and then the rare $T3-M\delta.y$ (ethno-toponym) rather illustrates that New Kingdom scribes may have realised that nomadic groups had rather elastic boundaries (as with other ethnic based toponyms $T3-Tmh.w$ or $T3-\tilde{S}is.w$).

The ethneme $M\delta.y$ took a different trajectory to the archaic placename $M\delta$. From New Kingdom documents, it is clear that the $M\delta.y$ occupied many parts of the Egyptian Nile Valley and were no longer confined to particular regions. It is precisely at this point that the archaeological Pan-Grave culture ceases to be ‘archaeologically identifiable’, perhaps mirroring their acculturation and/or partial exodus from Egypt. But, even if some ‘Pan-Grave people’ remained on the Nile, they may have been ethnically differentiated from Egyptians by non-material means such as language and dress.\footnote{Perhaps these people ceased to make pottery unless they were on the Nile and had access to plentiful clay and water, and when away from the Nile were archaeologically invisible, producing few imperishable artefacts and leaving no material traces. If these $M\delta.y$ nomads are to be equated with the Pan-Grave people, their entrance into the Nile Valley is marked by an ephemeral archaeological phase in the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period, where they lived in proximity to Egyptians for a time, only for their distinctive material culture to vanish, or migrate south, by the early New Kingdom. The archaeological evidence is not sufficiently clear to draw a certain link between Pan-Grave people and $M\delta.y$, and following Raue, the C-Group people should also be brought into the fold of the archaeological Medjay.\footnote{The Middle Nile was full of blurred boundaries both textually and archaeologically, and thus shifts in Egyptian terminology are to be expected for this culturally complex region.}

The religious sources that mention $M\delta$ in the same breath as $Pwn.t$ or $Wtn.t$ [\cite{24.12, 24.14, 24.16}] are attributable to multiple associations. In the case of Min, he is well known as a patron over the eastern regions, and Amun-Re, as a pantheistic deity, often presides over the disparate elements of creation.\footnote{These relationships may ultimately stem from the mutual south-eastern direction}

\footnote{Scenes depicting $M\delta.y$ are rare. On a stele found at Kurkur, a Medjay is easily identifiable by his bow, but not readily distinguishable from other Nubians, see Darnell, \textit{SAK} 31, pl. 2. Sadr, \textit{ANM} 2, 285-287 posited the migration of Medjay to the Atbai, but most scholars cite some level of acculturation into Egyptian society as a reason behind their archaeological disappearance. A. de Souza, ‘The Egyptianisation of the Pan-Grave Culture: A New Look at an old idea’, \textit{BACE} 24 (2013), 109-119 has suggested that cultural assimilation, traditionally called ‘Egyptianisation’, may not be the best paradigm to describe the disappearance of the Pan-Grave culture.}

\footnote{For Min and his epithets, see R. Gundlach, ‘Min’, in \textit{LÄ} IV, 137-138. Epithets of Min such as $hk:\twnt.yw$, $nb \hs:\swt$, $M\delta$ nfr n(y) $\hs:\st$, $sr-h\dd n(y) Pwn.t$ all attest to Min being a deity who asserts dominion over lands to the east and south; see J. Yoyotte, ‘Une épithète de Min comme
occupied by these lands, an area renowned in Egyptian mythology as the land of solar birth (winter solstice) and aromatics.748

**Classification:** +Cushitic (7.1)

---

**Etymology (I):** This placename is a genitive of the ethneme *Mdî.y*, occurring in only [24.13] and [24.24]. As with *Tî-tsîm.w* [5], it appears that *tî* ‘land’ and *ḥîs.t* ‘hill-country’ could be in free variation in ethnic based placenames. If there was a distinction it would be that *tî* was used in a geopolitical sense, while *ḥîs.t* more uniquely denotes its topography and landscape.

**Location (I):** Essentially, this is the same location as *Mdî*. The placename *Hîs.wt-n.w(t)-Mdî.y* [24.13] would refer to a very broad region (*ḥîs.wt*) where Medjay were located and cattle could be raised.749 *Tî-Mdî.y* [24.24] is given little specificity as it occurs in a rhetorical text, emphasizing the defeat of different regions surrounding Egypt.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+6.4)

---

**Etymology (II):** The toponym is a compound placename, with a generic term *rî* ‘mouth, outlet’ and a specific term *ṭ.d.yt*. The orthography is similar to a word noted by Andreu and Cauville.
One might also note a number of verbal roots with qdi, which could all explain this toponym. Given a mineral context, one might prefer the verb qdi ‘to sift’, making this a nomen loci ‘sifting-place’ or some other deverbal sense like ‘sifted-one’.

Location (III): The name is known only from CT VI, 213 [25.1] as a location of a mineral, probably to be read 5.3.t ‘costly stones’. Gomaà connected it with the Eastern Desert on account of the likelihood of quarrying activities here. This is highly probable, although what exact quarry or site it refers to is impossible to ascertain.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1 + 5.1?)

Etymology (I): The lexeme rA is a common toponymic generic term for ‘wadi’ or ‘outlet’. The etymology of the second element is based on the lexeme hAn.w ‘Welle, Flut’ with the syncope of aleph. This etymology can be proven by two writings from Hammamat no. 199 [26.4] which preserve the water classifier ( ) and the š-pool as determinatives, indicating that hnw designates a hydrological feature.

While such a translation as the ‘Valley of the Torrent’ would seem incongruous for a desert location, it must be born in mind that flash flooding was a rare but not unheard of event in Egypt’s deserts. The large watershed of the Wadi Hammamat could collect more than enough water for severe flooding. In the 1994 storm event, two hours of precipitation in the surrounding deserts

G. Andreu & S. Cauville, ‘Vocabulaire absent du Wörterbuch (II)’, RdÉ 30 (1978), 12. J. Janssen, Commodity Prices from the Ramessid Period (Leiden, 1975), 393-394 notes that 5.3.t could be bought for 5 deben and that it was made of wood (qyt), but in Ptolemaic texts it could be made of black stone (inr n.(y) km), see Wilson, A Ptolemaic Lexikon, 189 who prefers the notion of naos from the verb qdi ‘to be safe’. Osing, Nominalbildung, II, 808 translated it as ‘Türsturz’. The fact that it comprises a ‘left’ and a ‘right’ part (inn.y, lab.y) of a door-portal (sbi) in late editions of the Book of the Dead narrows down its range, and thus it is probably a ‘jamb’, see K. Lepsius, Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter nach dem Hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin (Leipzig, 1842), pl. 49, 54-55.

Gomaà, Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches, II, 279.

For rA in toponyms, see GDG III, 112-129. Such toponyms include, R3-pkr, the vale leading to the necropolis at Abydos, and R3-hn.t ‘The mouth of the lake’, a designation for Lahun. D. Fabre, Seafaring Ancient Egypt (London, 2004), 65 introduced the English translation ‘outlet’ which suitably unites the geographic and literal meaning of rA.

G. Andreu & S. Cauville, ‘Vocabulaire absent du Wörterbuch (II)’, RdÉ 30 (1978), 12. J. Janssen, Commodity Prices from the Ramessid Period (Leiden, 1975), 393-394 notes that 5.3.t could be bought for 5 deben and that it was made of wood (qyt), but in Ptolemaic texts it could be made of black stone (inr n.(y) km), see Wilson, A Ptolemaic Lexikon, 189 who prefers the notion of naos from the verb qdi ‘to be safe’. Osing, Nominalbildung, II, 808 translated it as ‘Türsturz’. The fact that it comprises a ‘left’ and a ‘right’ part (inn.y, lab.y) of a door-portal (sbi) in late editions of the Book of the Dead narrows down its range, and thus it is probably a ‘jamb’, see K. Lepsius, Das Todtenbuch der Ägypter nach dem Hieroglyphischen Papyrus in Turin (Leipzig, 1842), pl. 49, 54-55.
produced 15 hours of flooding at the outlet of Wadi Hammamat. Such flood events are recorded in Wadi Hammamat in the Brunnenwunderbericht inscription (no. 191): \( \text{iri.} \text{(w)} \text{ h} \text{s.} \text{ t m nwy st mw hr nh3 n(y) inr} \) ‘the hill-country was made into a flood, and water issued from the roughness of the stone’. In light of this, the placename is an apt descriptor of the hydrology of the wadi. A similar account of an extreme weather event may be behind the verse in the Nile Hymn of oDeM 1675.10: \( \text{h} \text{nw (hr) h3 mrw} \) ‘the flood fought (against) the desert’.

**Location (I):** The toponym has consistently been equated with the east-west valley of Wadi Hammamat, or a part thereof. As the lexeme \( rA \) ‘opening’ is used, the likelihood is that the term originally designated the outlet of the wadi and then the whole wadi by association. There can be little doubt that the areas around the quarrying inscriptions in the Wadi Hammamat were part of the toponym [26.2, 26.4-9]. This can be adduced from [26.4, 26.7] and [26.9] where demonstratives specify that the inscriptions were themselves in \( R3-hnw \). There is probably no connection between this name and the contemporary name \( \text{Wadi Hammamat} \), ‘Valley of the many baths’, as the modern name seems to be derived from the quarries themselves rather than hydrological phenomena. From the Persian till the Roman period, the mining settlement of Bir Umm Fawakhir and the Paneion within Wadi Hammamat seem to have been called \( \text{Persou} \) (\( \Pi\text{e}r\text{sou} \)), there being no evidence for continuity of this placename.

---


756 Couyat & Montet, *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouadi Hammâmât*, 97, pl. 36. An earlier verse in the text \( \text{iri.} \text{(w)} \text{ hw} \) was previously read as ‘rain was made’, however, the lexeme \( hw \) was shown by Lloyd to refer to ‘utterance’ as opposed to the homophone ‘rain’. For this and other lexical issues in the text, see A. Lloyd, ‘Once more Hammamat Inscription 191’, *JEA* 61 (1975), 54-66. This flood was characterised as a ‘wonder’ (\( biA.t \)) in a Hammamat text; see R. Gundlach, ‘Mentuhotep IV. und Min Analyse der Inschriften M 110, M 191 und M 192a aus dem Wâdi Hammâmât’, *SAK* 8 (1980), 89-114.

757 This text could equally refer to waves of the Nile Flood rather than rainfall in the desert. For the text see H. Fischer-Elfert, *Literarische Ostraka der Ramessidenzeit in Übersetzung* (Wiesbaden, 1986), 31. A similar sentiment may be behind a passage in the Hymn to the Aten: \( \text{h} \text{s.} \text{wt nb.w(t) w3.t iri.n} \text{hkh n= nh n=in dl.n=k h4p.y m p.t h3.y= n=in ir-i= h3nw hr dw.w mi w4l-wr} \) ‘All the distant hill-countries, you made life for them, you have put the Nile in the sky and it has descended to them, it (the Nile) makes waves upon the mountains like (waves of) the ocean’; see M. Sandman, *Texts from the time of Akhenaten* (Bruxelles, 1938), 95, l. 4-5.

758 See *HWb*, 1385; Bradbury, *JARCE* 25, 146; Harrell & Brown, *JARCE* 29, 86.

759 A. Sayed, ‘The Land of Pun: Problems of the Archaeology of the Red Sea and the Southeastern Delta’, in Z. Hawass (ed.), *Egyptology at the Dawn of the Twenty-first Century* (Cairo, 2003), I, 439 n. 45 reports that the modern name ‘Wadi Hammamat’ derives from the unfinished sarcophagi excavated from the quarries, which resemble baths (\( \text{hammam} \)).

760 The exact expanse of this toponym is debated. It may have referred to the whole valley, or just the area around Bir Umm Fawakhir and the Paneion, see H. Cuvigny, ‘Le crûpuscule d’un dieu. Le déclin du culte de Pan dans le désert oriental’, *BIFAO* 97 (1997), 139-147. See also equivalent demotic toponym (?) \( \text{Prs} \text{ hyn} \text{ l} \) in H. Thissen, ‘Démotische Graffiti des Paneions im Wadi Hammamat’ *Enchoria* 9 (1979), 86-88.
Discussion: There is only one certain mention of this toponym outside the rock inscriptions of Wadi Hammamat, in the tomb of Shemai at Kom el-Koffar (Kom el-Momanien) [26.1].\textsuperscript{761} Attestations of this toponym from Papyrus Anastasi I, cited by Gauthier, have been called into question by Gardiner, where one instance has been posited as a mistaken writing of the toponym $D\dot{h}y$.\textsuperscript{762} The Turin Papyrus map makes no mention of the toponym, even though much of its topography is featured on the map. Perhaps $Dw-n(y)-b\dot{h}n$ [47] had replaced $R3-hnw$ as a more functional label for the increased quarrying activities that took place in the Ramesside Period. There is a debatable instance of the toponym in the Annals of Senwosret I at El-Tod [26.3], where is preserved, but this orthography could equally refer to other well-known geographic terms like $Rtnw$ ‘Canaan’ or $nw$ ‘desert’.\textsuperscript{763}

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+1.4)

Etymology (I): This name is comprised of the base toponym, $R3-hnw$, with the addition of a secondary generic $in.t$ ‘valley’.\textsuperscript{764}

Location (I): If $R3-hnw$ took on a rather vague geographical notion of the hills around the Wadi Hammamat, this lexeme could refer specifically to the valley floor. The text [26.8] seems to suggest such a reading, emphasizing the quarrying area.

Discussion: The difference between an $in.t$ and a $r\dot{y}$ in terms of physical geography has not been explored; indeed, both these lexemes appear in the placename $R3-in.t$ ‘the mouth of the valley’.\textsuperscript{765} It seems likely that $r\dot{y}$ is the opening of a wadi or its confluence with the valley, while the $in.t$ is the longitudinal stretch of the valley itself.\textsuperscript{766}

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+1.1+1.4)

---

\textsuperscript{761} For the inscriptions and description of the tomb, see M. Mostafa, ‘Kom el-Koffar. Teil II: Datierung und historische interpretation des Textes B’ ASAE 71 (1971), 169-182.

\textsuperscript{762} Following the logic of the text which describes a large military encounter, a quarry site like Hammamat would indeed be out of place. However, only with difficulty could one amend the text to $D\dot{h}y$ as Gardiner does. A reading of $R3-k\dot{h}nw$ would also require another $r$ as a preposition. See A. Gardiner, Egyptian Hieratic Texts I (Leipzig, 1911), 19 n. 7, pl. 29.1-2 n. 1b.

\textsuperscript{763} This reading is suggested in Michaux-Colombot, ‘Pitfall concepts in the Round of ‘Nubia’: Ta-Sety, Nehesy, Medja, Maga and Punt Revisited’, in Anderson & Welsby (eds), The Fourth Cataract and Beyond, 509 and Clere. For $Rtnw$ and $nw$ see Wb. 2, 217; 2, 460.

\textsuperscript{764} Wb. 1, 93.

\textsuperscript{765} Literally ‘the mouth of the valley’, a name for a town near Tehna, see Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches, 136-137. Another $R3-in.t$ also occurs at El-Kab, see K. Zibelius ‘Ra-inet’, in LÄ V, 87.

\textsuperscript{766} This is suggested by Zibelius’s translation of ‘Mündung des Tales’; see ‘Ra-inet’, in LÄ V, 87.
Etymology (I): This expression is the base toponym with the lexeme $hr(y)$ ‘upper’ qualifying it [26.4]. When classified with the sign $\equiv$, it seems to refer to spatial arrangements of a place being ‘above’, sometimes in the sense of the sky or referring to higher terrain.

Location (I): This variant is only known in Hammamat no. 199, the inscription of Antef [26B]. Although Hannig plausibly suggests that the phrase refers to the eastern part of the Wadi Hammamat, the likely scenario is that the placename in no. 199 refers to greywacke sources higher up the cliffs in altitude. This explains the difficulties Antef had in obtaining suitable greywacke and lowering (sfn) the stone down the mountain.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+1.4+3.2)

Etymology (I): It is not entirely certain whether this is a toponym, or reference to some other structure. But the context of the inscription in Wadi Hammamat-Wadi Chagg [27.1], as well as the classifier, point to a name for a hydrological feature. The final sign would then be a classifier for a well whose name is $Hib.t-Mr.y-R^c.w$ (Pepi I). The word $Hib.t$ has been taken by Goyon to refer to $h(i)b(y)$ ‘festival-hall’. A problem with this interpretation, as Zibelius-Chen notes, is that this lexeme is not registered until the Ramesside Period. Alternatively, one might postulate an abstract participle from the verb $H(A)b$ ‘make festive’, thus translating the name as ‘Which made Meryre festive’. The choice of this name might be attributed to the Sed-festival of Pepi, and/or the positive connotations of a local water source.

Location (I): The inscription is located in Wadi Chagg, a small wadi at the confluence of Wadi

---

767 Wb. 3, 142-143.
768 The word $hr.t$ ‘heaven, sky’ literally means ‘that which is above’, see Wb. 3 143. The meaning of $hr.t$ ‘tomb, necropolis’ probably refers to the situation where tombs were located in the escarpment ‘above’ the Nile.
769 HWb, 1358.
770 The text states ‘when I had lowered (sfn) it (the stone), I gave praise to Monthu, lord of this quarry’. For the difficulties faced by quarrymen revealed in this and other inscriptions in the wadi, see H. Goedicke, ‘Some remarks on Stone Quarrying in the Egyptian Middle Kingdom (2060-1786 B.C.)’, JARCE 3 (1964), 43-50.
771 Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches, 169.
772 G. Goyon, ‘Le Papyrus de Turin: dit des mines d’or et la Wadi Hammamat’ ASAE 49 (1949), 370. For the word see Wb. 3, 60.
773 Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches, 169.
774 For the verb $H(i)b(y)$, see HWb, 521 and CDME, 167. Compare to the royal name ///$Hb-R^c$ ‘who makes the /// of Re festive’ in R. Leprohon, The Great Name: Ancient Egyptian Royal Titulary (Atlanta, 2013), 88.
775 Eichler, Untersuchungen zum Expeditionswesen des ägyptischen Alten Reiches, 66.
Hammamat, and thus it must designate a well or some water feature in or around Wadi Chagg. Goyon found a small water-hole further up this small wadi which is likely equivalent with the toponym.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (4.1+6.2)

![Image](chart.png)

**Etymology (I):** The meaning of the placename is literally ‘mansion of gold’, a genitive expression derived from two common Egyptian words hw.t ‘mansion, estate’ and nbw ‘gold’.

The phrase *hw.t-nbw* could describe a number of non-toponymic entities, such as ‘sarcophagus chambers’, ‘workshops’, and a mythic region in the Pyramid Texts. This polyvalent meaning is alluded to in Hatnub Graffito no. 5 [28.3], where the demonstrative ‘this’ qualifies *hw.t-nbw*, meaning that there were multiple *hw.t-nbw* placenames or entities in Egypt. It is debatable as to why a calcite quarry would take this name. Shaw considers the toponym related to the sense of ‘workshop’ in that travertine/calcite statues may have been locally sculpted at Hatnub. Some scholars have even connected *nbw* ‘gold’ with the colouration of the rock travertine. One might also note that the *nomen rectum* here makes more sense if it is interpreted as the IIIae inf. verb *nbi* ‘to smelt, fashion, create’ and hence could mean the ‘mansion-of-fashioning’. This would not only explain the sense of ‘workshop’ in *hw.t-nbw* but also explain how a site involved in the quarrying and working of calcite was labelled with such an appellation.

**Location (I):** As most inscriptions mentioning Hatnub [28.2-6] are located in the calcite-travertine quarries east of Amarna, now known as Hatnub, there can be no argument that *hw.t-nbw* refers to this quarry. While the site is known by this name today, Peust has shown that this is not the traditional Arabic name for the site, but rather one given by modern Egyptologists.

---


778 *Wb.* 3, 1; 2, 237-239.

779 For these divergent meanings, see W. Simpson, ‘Hatnub’, in LÄ II, 1043. For the history and uses of the chamber, see A. Spalinger, *The Great Dedicatory Inscription of Ramesses II* (Leiden, 2009), 26 n. 67.


781 Simpson, ‘Hatnub’, in LÄ II, 1042 cites the ‘golden color of the stone’. Zibelius, *Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches*, 156 relates it also to the ‘costliness’ of the stone. P. Montet, *Géographie de l’Égypte ancienne* (Paris, 1961), II, 154 speculated it may be connected to a gold-bearing region, which cannot be recommended as the nearest mines at Wadi Dara are 180 km distant.


783 Peust, *Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten*, 46.
Some inscriptions at Hatnub expressly mention bi.t or šš ‘calcite’ in conjunction with this placename, and it has been proven that these terms refer to calcite. The nearby toponym of Pr-šš ‘House of Calcite’, modern Bersha, further strengthens this association, although this may refer to another quarry near the Nile. It is, therefore, not surprising that the proximal El-Bersha nobles extol their exploits in this quarry.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (2.1)

![Image](29)

**Etymology (III):** The hapax toponym Hz t is probably a foreign word, as t did not undergo palatal fronting until the late Old Kingdom, and these consonants do not form a productive root in Egyptian. However, what language the placename might originate from is unknown, since there is no supporting data regarding its location apart from a relationship with gold. Due to the writing of Bšt in the same document, it is not inconceivable that there is a suffix –t in the target language. If the placename predates Old Egyptian and masks an original value of t as /k/, one might compare it to Semitic ḥzq ‘strong’.

**Location (III):** For locational arguments see Bšt [20].

**Classification:** Unknown (7.1)

![Image](30)

**Etymology (I):** The placename is a genitive, based on the embedded toponym $r.y-aHA ‘Old Cairo’. These final two lexemes $r(y)-aHA have been translated by Zibelius-Chen as ‘Kampfplatz’, i.e. ‘that-which-is-under fighting’. The translation of the hapax H3f.t is problematic, and has been rendered as ‘territory’ or ‘desert’ due to the presence of the hill-country

---

784 Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals, 77-78.
786 Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 123-125.
787 Satzinger, ‘Some more remarks on Old Bedauye’, in Bay (ed.), Studia Palaeophilologica professoris G. M. Browne in honorem oblate, 4 noted, in onomastica from the Eastern Desert, the presence of final fricatives as a possible ‘Old-Bedauye’ morphological suffix.
789 Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches, 193; Gomaà, Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches, II, 203. Writings of $r.y-‘h3 with the hill-country classifier occur in various versions of the Coffin Texts, where on occasion they may be a mistake for hr.t-ntr ‘necropolis’, see CT II 196c (B2L); CT V 331e (B3L); CT VII 258a (B3C, B12C, B6C, B2Bo, B9c, B1L, B2L, B3L, B2P) CT VII 483a (B1P). The hill-country classifier might also be applied to ‘Old Cairo’ due to the proximity to the desert escarpment. I must thank Dr Dietrich Raue for this suggestion.
classifier. This was the opinion of Černý in analysing the Coptic reflexes ϝⲧⲁ and ϝⲧ, which were tentatively translated as ‘desert’, ‘bank’ or ‘dyke’.\textsuperscript{790} If the word is related to Egyptian ḥf ‘to plunder’ a nominalised form like ‘wastes’ could be recommended.\textsuperscript{791} A different suggestion altogether is to consider ḥff.t as a mistake for ḥšs.t, with the s-bolt being a mistake for a similar horizontal sign in the f-snake.\textsuperscript{792} The toponym could be translated as ‘The great wastes of Old Cairo’.

**Location (I):** Although the stele in which this toponym is mentioned is located at Abydos [30.1], the activity taking place is in the deserts east of modern Cairo due to the mention of ḥr(y)-ḫḥ. The appellation here does not refer to any specific place, but rather a large (wr.t) stretch of desert. Loret’s analysis of this placename was provoked by his discussion of the botanical identity of the aromatic sntr, which in the stele originates from this place.\textsuperscript{793} The resin of sntr has been chemically identified with resin of the *Pistacia* species.\textsuperscript{794} In connection with this, the species *Pistacia khinjuk*, one of the many sources of sntr, is still found in the nearby Galala plateau, and present stands of the tree are considered to be relict populations of a wider distribution throughout the Eastern Desert.\textsuperscript{795} Dependent on the etymology, one might see this as a reference to the deserts, or the ‘bank’ of the Red Sea.

**Discussion:** An issue with this stele (CG 20564), and hence the placename, is its date, for there is no cartouche or onomastic material which would suggest a particular period. Lichtheim and Leahy concurrently redated the monument to the Twenty-Fifth Dynasty from Loret’s and Mariette’s initial Middle Kingdom date.\textsuperscript{796} As such, this placename would fall outside the scope of this thesis. Yet it is retained here as one of the few innovative Eastern Desert place names in the Third Intermediate Period.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+4.1+3.4)

\textsuperscript{790} Černý, *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*, 261. For ḥff.t ‘riverbank’ see *Wb*. 3, 271.

\textsuperscript{791} *CDME*, 190.

\textsuperscript{792} There is no doubt concerning the reading ⲡⲙⲓ, see M. Lichtheim, ‘The Stela of Taniy, CG 20564: Its Date and Its Character’, *SÄK* 16 (1989), pl. 2.

\textsuperscript{793} V. Loret, *La résine de térébinthe (sonter) chez les anciens égyptiens recherches d’archéologie, de philologie et d’histoire* (Cairo, 1949), 29-31.

\textsuperscript{794} See the discussion in N. Baum, ‘sntr: une révision’, *RdÉ* 45 (1994), 30-31, 38; Serpico & White, ‘Resins, amber and bitumen’, in Nicholson & Shaw (eds), *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology*, 438-39; C. de Vartavan, ‘Pistacia species in relation to their use as varnish and “incense” (sntr) in Pharaonic Egypt’, *Bulletin of Parthian and Mixed Oriental Studies* 2 (2007), 76-78. Given that the word sntr refers to the divine quality of the substance, it is possible that it glossed a number of different aromatics beyond *Pistacia*.


Etymology (I): The phrase is a simple genitival expression, with i3b.tyt ‘eastern’ as an adjective agreeing in gender with hīs.t. The nomen rectum iwn.w is a common writing for the cult-centre at Heliopolis.797

Location (I): The toponym is found in only in one text [31.1], inscribed into the inlaid golden fan from Tutankhamun’s tomb. The text states that the fan’s feathers (šw) were obtained from a bhs ‘hunt’ to the east of Heliopolis. Remains of the ancient city of Heliopolis are considered to centre on the Cairene suburbs of Matariyah and Ain Shams.798 East of this region could be anywhere between Cairo and the Red Sea (Gebel Attaqa). Little in the way of Egyptian presence is known in this area, but about 25 km east of Heliopolis, at Wadi el-Anqabiya el-Rawyana, is a single inscription mentioning a Heliopolitan official of the Middle Kingdom.799 The raison d’être of this inscription is a mystery, and Peden remarked that the rock here is of ‘poor-quality’ and the inscription is therefore unlikely to be associated with quarrying.800 One could suggest that this rock inscription might be associated with hunting, or perhaps a route from Heliopolis to the Ayn Soukhna or Sinai.

Discussion: The text refers to Tutankhamun bhs ‘hunting’, but there has been some disagreement as to whether the animal in question was an ostrich or a bustard.801 The word niw found in the text is regularly translated as ‘ostrich’, but this could gloss any large ground-dwelling bird.802 The exact speciation matters little as both these animals thrive in desert environments, according well with a location east of the Nile Valley.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+3.1+3.4)

797 Wb. 1, 54; GDG I, 54.
798 See the helpful lists of findspots in D. Raue, Heliopolis und das Haus des Re (Berlin, 1999), Appendix 1.
799 Townsend, ASAE 33, 1-5.
802 Wb. 2, 202.12; HWb, 391.
Etymology (I): This placename is the same as $Hs.t-nbw-Imn.w$ [8A] with an adverbial predicate $m \overline{\text{T}-sty}$ ‘in Nubia’. The placename $\text{T}-sty$ was a geographic expression that designated the most southerly Egyptian nome, and at times obliquely referred to adjacent Lower Nubia.\footnote{For the meaning of $\text{T}-sty$, consult A. Vinogradov, ‘On the rendering of the toponym $\text{T}-sty$’, CdÉ 75 (2000), 223-234.}

Location (II): This administrative toponym is connected with only one official, Anheretnakht, who in his Sehel inscription was an ‘overseer of the Hill-country-of-gold-of-Amun in Ta-Sety’ [32.1]. Other similar titles do occur, but do not specifically mention the toponym present here.\footnote{The closest title is s$\dot{s}$ pr-$\underline{h}$d $hsb$ nbw n(y) nb $\overline{t}_i.$wy $m \overline{\text{T}-sty}$ ‘scribe of the treasury, counter of gold of the lord of the two-lands in Ta-sety, Mahfouz’, RdÉ 56, 72. For other toponyms connected with the gold-bureaucracy see [7] and [8, 8A, 8B].}

Unlike $Hs.t-nbw$, which designated goldfields equally along the Nile and in the desert, there are no gold on the Nile north of Semna,\footnote{Klemm & Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 608.} and thus this term referring to Lower Nubia ($\text{T}-sty$) must designate goldfields in the Eastern Desert. The major goldfields are around Wadi Allaqi, but there are also Middle Kingdom workings in the area east of Khor Dihmit and a site much further east at Bitan.\footnote{For Bitan, see Klemm & Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 273. Recent surveys south of Wadi el-Hudi by Prof James Harrell and Robert Mittelstaedt have discovered several goldmining sites, some with Middle Kingdom dates (Personal Communication).}

As the inscription is found at Sehel island one might assume that the operative goldfields Anheretnakht was visiting would be those in the Allaqi region, but in his inscriptions at Sehel he is also an overseer of $h$As.wt-$rs.ywt$ ‘southern lands’ and ‘head of bowmen of Kush’.\footnote{For his titles and Sehel inscription, see L. Habachi, ‘The owner of Tomb no. 282 in the Theban Necropolis’, JEA 54 (1968), 109.}

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+1.3+6.3+3.4)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
33 & $Hs.t-n.t-h\text{smn}$
\end{array}
\]

Etymology (I): The placename is an indirect genitive. The word $hzmn$ can designate a number of mineral substances such as ‘natron’ and ‘bronze’ but it must mean ‘amethyst’ here, given the common mention of this term in the amethyst quarry inscriptions at Wadi el-Hudi.\footnote{For these terms see Wb. 3, 162-163; Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals, 63, 121, 195.}

Etymologically, the mineralogical term is surely related to $hzmn$ ‘to purify’, itself a $h$-prefix perhaps originating from $zmnn$ ‘to remain’.\footnote{For the prefix $h$, see Wb. 4, 163; 3, 453. For this prefix, see G. Thausing, ‘Über ein $h$-präfix im Ägyptischen’, WZKM 39 (1932), 287-294. Outside Egyptian this prefix is present in other Afroasiatic languages, for which see W. Leslau, ‘The prefix $h$ in Egyptian, Modern South Arabian and Hausa’, Africa: International Journal of Linguistics 32 (1962), 65-68.}

Location (I): There can be no doubt, due to the local rock inscriptions at Wadi el-Hudi [33.1-2], that the placename designates the amethyst mines. The toponym is unknown outside the local
rock inscriptions at Wadi el-Hudi. Wadi el-Hudi no. 23 [33.2] mentions that other minerals besides amethyst (ḥmḏg.t, mnw-km and mnw-hd) were obtained from ḫṣs.t-n.t-ḥsmin, suggesting that the term may have referred to a wider area than the amethyst mines themselves, although the lack of secure mineral identities for mnw-km and mnw-hd makes it difficult to reach a judgement on this subject.810

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+1.3)

**Etymology** (II): The poor preservation of the name makes analysis difficult [34.1]. Fakhry thought this might be a writing for the Sinai placename ṣšw, a reading rejected by Sadek who considered it a separate toponym for the quarries at Wadi el-Hudi.811 While the damage to the stele makes the toponym difficult to read, if the reading proposed by Sadek is correct, one arrives at the attractive solution of seeing in ṣšw a phonetic variant of ḥšw ‘quarry’, thus enabling the toponym to be translated as ‘Hill-country of the Quarry’.812

**Location (I):** Given the etymology of the name and its location, it is likely that ḫḥṣs.t-n.t-ṣšw.t is simply another name for a quarry at Wadi el-Hudi and/or other nearby quarries in the region south-east of Aswan.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+2.1)

**Etymology** (I): The toponym is a genitival expression formed from ḥḥṣs.t ‘hill-country’ and the toponym ḡbtw ‘Coptos’.813 Unifying all these variant writings is the fact that the toponym could be given the classifier or be coupled with ḥḥṣs.t, in each case marking it as a separate placename for the regions to the east of Coptos (ḥḥṣs.t-ḏḥḥḥb.t).814 The text of the Min festival [35.9] seems to use this toponym without a generic as an epithet of Min. Aufrère translates it as ‘adolescent des deux gebeles de Coptos’ (dual), whereas Leitz prefers ‘Der zum Fremdländ gehörige Jüngling von Koptos’ (nisbe).815 The problem with these interpretations is that even though ḥḥṣs.t is written as an

---

810 Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals, 110-111.
811 Fakhry, The Inscriptions of the Amethyst Quarries at Wadi el Hudi, 40 n. 1; Sadek, Wadi el-Hudi, 44.
812 Seyfried, Beiträge zu den Expeditionen des Mittleren Reiches in die Ost-Wüste, 61 considered this reading ‘questionable’.
813 For discussion of this term, see ṣšw, see entry [59].
814 There can be no doubt that ḡbtw is Coptos as it still survives in its contemporary placename Qift (in local dialect, Guff) see Peust, Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten, 73.
815 Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches, 246-247.
816 Aufrère, L’univers minéral dans la pensée égyptienne, I, 138-139; LGG V, 100.
apparent nisbe $hjs.ty$ in the Min festival text, the text is so riddled with orthographic errors that one might suggest from parallel texts a regular reading of $Hjs.t-Gbtw$ without the nisbe (or dual) $hjs.ty$. The etymology of $Gbtw$ is debated in the literature, and is considered to refer to a ‘sack’, but this word is not encountered as an independent lexeme in Egyptian.

**Location (I):** The $Hjs.t-Gbtw$ must be an areal term for the deserts east of Coptos, which was noted mainly for its gold deposits [35.2-3, 35.6]. In pAnastasi VI, the gold-village $Tj-wh.yt-p3-nbw$ [35.8] and a $htm$-fortress [36] are within its boundaries, both of which are located near Wadi Hammamat. The $Hjs.t-Gbtw$ in the Punt Expedition of $pHarris$ I [35.7] proves that this term extended to the Red Sea coast and the landing point of a Punt Expedition.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+3.4)

---

**Location (I):** The expression $Dw-n(y)-Gbtw$ ‘Mountain of Coptos’ is found twice in the Ramesside mining list at Luxor. In one instance, it is coupled with gold [35.4], surely referring to the goldmines around El-Sid or other mines east of Coptos. The other instance of the ‘Mountain of Coptos’ [35.5] cites $msdm.t$ ‘galena’, and must refer to galena mines at Gebel el-Zeit or, given a closer proximity to Coptos, the mine of Umm Huweitat. $Dw-n(y)-Gbtw$ might thus refer to two separate localities in the Coptos hinterland, or perhaps obliquely to any mine in the region.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+3.4)

---

816 See the epithet $hwn.w$ $hjs.ty$ $Gbtw$ in $LGG$ V, 100 and $hwn.t$ $hjs.t$ $Gbtw$ ‘the youth of the hill-country of Coptos’ in W. F. Petrie, *Athribis* (London, 1908), pl. 31.


818 There are many anciently worked gold deposits in this region, see Klemm & Klemm, *Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt*, 89, 101, 109, 607.


820 Bradbury, *JARCE* 25, 146 incorrectly read $‘j.t$ ‘stones’ with this ‘mountain of Coptos’ and equated it with the Bekhen Quarries.

821 *KRI* II, 617-619.5-9. For Gebel el-Zeit, see *Khb.w* [44]. Mining operations continued at the site into the New Kingdom, see Régen & Soukiassian, *Gebel Zeit II: Le matériel inscrit*, 348-349. The Umm Huweitat mine is recorded in Vikentiev, *ASAE* 54, 179-189.
**Etymology (I):** Same as above with dmi ‘town, village’ as the generic. If taking dmi at its root meaning of ‘to touch’ > ‘landing-place’, it might refer to a harbour or anchorage rather than the broader meaning of ‘town’.  

**Location (I):** The writing of Gbtw in the biography of Amenemhat [35.1] with the hill-country sign is unattested elsewhere. Similar to the toponyms Tp-ih.w or Dbj.w (entry [49] or [50]), this is an example of a generic term being replaced for a classifier to label the desert east of a particular city. Thus, Hs.t-Gbtw has the same referential meaning as Gbtw. With the generic dmi attached, it might refer specifically to a town or harbour east of Coptos. This suggests the Dmi-n(y)-Gbtw might be another name for the harbour at Mersa Gawasis. Texts relating to Puntite expeditions at Mersa Gawasis do use the verb dmi and Gbtw ‘Coptos’ in the same clause to refer to ships landing on the Red Sea coast.  

**Classification:** +Egyptian (2.2+3.4)

---

Etymology (I): The initial lexeme makes reference to a htm-fortress, which were typically located on the borders of Egypt, the term having a verbal origin from htm ‘to seal’. Unfortunately, the middle section of the name is damaged beyond readability, but one may reconstruct a royal name in the lacuna due to the presence of the $n\text{h}(\text{w})$ $w\text{d} j(\text{w})$ $s\text{nb}(\text{w})$ formula. It would be dangerous to speculate which exact king appeared in the lacuna, but a Ramesside king seems certain given the date of the papyrus and the fact that fortress naming with royal names was popular in Ramesside nomenclature.

Location (III): This toponym is part of a letter [36.1], where a htm fortress is designated as being $hr\ t\ Hs.t-Gbtw$ ‘upon the hill-country of Coptos’. The letter concerns the measuring of the distance between this fort and a gold-mining village (see entry [18]) and also mentions a well

---

822 Wb. 5, 465.  
824 The Shrine of Ankhow, in an extremely fragmentary line, records dmi $n\text{f} /// sp\text{t}.1 Gbtw$, see [40] and D. Farout, ‘Des expéditions en Mer Rouge au début de la XIIè Dynastie’ *Égypte, Afrique & Orient* 41 (2006), 47. Gomah, *Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches*, II, 277 reads dmi $n(\text{y})$ $S\text{w}\text{w}$ and hence considers it an independent toponym.  
826 For example, the numerous fortress names of this type on the Ways-of-Horus, for which see the inscriptionsal corpus of Al-Ayedi, *The Inscriptions of the Ways of Horus*, 146; KRI, I, 7-10. This process did start much earlier with Middle Kingdom royal names being used in Nubian fortresses, for which see Gardiner, *JEA* 3, 185-186. Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, 77a, 12a-b measured the lacuna and considered it too short for Merenptah’s full name.
The problem with locating this fortress, as Morris noted, was that there are no archaeologically identifiable fortress remains in the region. Caminos preferred to locate it at the end of Wadi Hammamat on the way to Quseir (his ancient T vals), but there is no evidence for any pharaonic structures on this east-west route past Bir Umm Fawakhir. But this general vicinity around Wadi Hammamat is very likely, and the area is littered with the traces of goldmining activity, much of it datable to the New Kingdom, according to Klemm and Klemm. However, the only large multi-roomed structures in the area are datable to the Graeco-Roman period and later. Any earlier pharaonic construction might well have been built anew in the Graeco-Roman period, or more likely washed away and buried in wadi sediments.

A location near Laqeita and the Graeco-Roman fort at El-Muwayh (Krokodilo) would be suitable, given their proximity to pharaonic inscriptions, easy access to surface water, and control of the route to the mines in Wadi Hammamat and Wadi Qash. A location near the goldmines of El-Sid is plausible as well, where there are the remains of a small New Kingdom settlement and nearby wells at Bir Umm Fawakhir and Bir El-Sid. However, the problem with this suggestion is that presumably this fort would have been marked next to the goldmines on the Turin Geological Papyrus – and Goyon has conjectured reading a damaged hieratic label on the map (no. 21) as [t½ mh½].(w)t n p½-[htm] ‘the control-station of the fortress’. This label, though, if read as such, would not put the fortress near the goldmines but further west, conceivably anywhere between Bir el-Hammamat and Laqeita. An inscription datable to Ramesses IV in Wadi Hammamat

827 Morris, Architecture of Imperialism, esp. 495-496
829 See Klemm & Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 607 for a map of of these sites.
831 Klemm & Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 132-146. Alternatively, noting the presence of an inscription of Ramesses III in Wadi Atallah (ibid, p. 123), one might posit a location near the gold mines north of Wadi Hammamat.
832 Goyon, ASAE 49 (1949), 26 n. 1.
833 This also assumes the correct placement of the fragment. In Harrell’s reconstruction, this fragment lies at the right (west) side of the map before the fortress structure.
(Goyon’s no. 101) mentions ‘the scribe of the fortress (ḥtm)’, perhaps referring to the same structure. A certain ‘scribe of the fortress’ is also mentioned in a late Ramesside administrative letter which evokes Min, lord of Coptos. Due to the Coptite context, this probably refers to the same fortress, but there are few details in the papyri which assist in its location. The fortress was a transhipment centre for products like galena (msdm.t), tusks/bone (kmr), acacia-wood (ṣnd.t), and kt-plant (safflower).

Classification: +Egyptian (2.2+6.2)

\[37\]

Etymology (I): This toponym is a direct genitive between the royal name Seti-Merenptah (Seti I) and the standard Egyptian word for a well, hnm.t. This word could equally refer to natural surface pools or artificial structures accessing groundwater, and in this context the latter is meant.

Location (I): There can be no doubt based on the location of the inscription [37.1] that this refers to the local well adjacent to the Seti Temple at Kanais in Wadi Mia.

Discussion: The extensive dedicatory inscription at Kanais gives us an unprecedented insight into the coining of a placename. The dedicatory inscriptions at Kanais recount how the stonemasons (kA.wt m inr) were ordered ‘to dig a well upon the mountains’ (r šdi.t hnm.t hr dw.w). More ideologically, the construction of the well is related to the beneficence of the gods and their assistance in Egyptian mining activities: ntr.w im.yw t3 hnm.t di=in n=f="h. w=hn m=m wn=f n=tn t3 w3.t r šmi.t ‘the gods who are in the well, may they grant to him your lifetime, in as much as he opens the way for us to go (through)’. The relative location of the well is also made clear as being

834 sS Ra(.w) n(.y) p: htm ‘the scribe Ra, of the fortress’: see Goyon, Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi Hammammat, 113.
835 Helck, JARCE 6, 146, A. 5.
836 For kmr, see Hoch, Semitic Words, 321. The galena source could be Gebel el-Zeit but there are no inscriptions post-dating Ramesses II at this site (see Régen & Soukiassian, Gebel Zeit II: Le matériel inscrit, 349). Otherwise, it might refer to one of several lead sources along the coast, the nearest being Unm Huweitat or Gebel Rosas, see A. Hassan & F. Hassan, ‘The source of galena in Predynastic Egypt at Nagada’, Archaeometry 23 (1981), 79.
837 For the personal name Seti-Merenptah, see J. von Beckerath, Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen (Mainz, 1999), 151-153.
838 For hnm.t, see the analysis of H. Franzmeier, ‘ḥnm.t, šdl.t, hnw.t and bfr. Ancient Egyptian Emic terms for Wells and Cisterns’, in V. Gashe & J. Finch (eds), Current Research in Egyptology 2008 (Bolton, 2008), 31-42 where it refers to any desert well (natural or man made), similar to Arabic Qalt. In the Eastern Desert, the construction of hnm.t/hnw.t-wells was a recurrent topos in local inscriptions, for which see Rothe, Miller & Rapp, Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt, 238, 312, 352, 368. The word survives into Coptic as ˁẖnmt/ẖwḥq, see Černý, Coptic Etymological Dictionary, 280, 288.
839 KRI I, 66.9-10.
Uniquely, the process by which the well was named is also alluded to: ‘ḥn. ḫwzl.(w) s.t tn ḫr rn wr Mn-Mȝ.t-Rȝ.w bḥḥi.n = mw r ṣ.t wr.t ml tKyle tt ḫt. ṣbw ‘Then this place was founded in the great name of Menmaatre; water flooded it very greatly, like the cavern of the two caves of Elephantine’. The name of this temple and associated settlement is never given, but is simply called dmi.t ‘town’ in the text. On this evidence, one might wonder then whether there existed a separate placename such as Tȝ dmi.t St.y-Mri(y)-n(y)-Pȝt ‘The town of Seti-Merenptah’ to designate the well and station at Kanais or whether, by association, the well-toponym also referred to the temple itself.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.4+6.2)

Etymology (I): The toponym is a genitive construction between a royal personal name, with an epithet kn m ʾnh ‘brave in life’, and the hydrographic term hnm.t ‘well’.

Location (I): Given the inscription at Umm Ashira [38.2], the name of this well must refer to a watering station in the Wadi Allaqi. The same well is mentioned in the Kuban Stele as being in ḫkyt [38.1], the name for Wadi Allaqi. It is reported that bedouin still used a well here before Lake Nasser flooded, tentatively the same well-site as that of Ramesses II.

Discussion: The Kuban Stele [38.1] suggests that this was a virgin construction in the reign of Ramesses II. However, the area of Umm Ashira has many other Egyptian inscriptions from previous periods, making one wonder whether there was a previous well in the area that had dried up by the Nineteenth Dynasty and was then rebuilt. The Kuban text implies this by stating ‘every former king has desired (to) open a well in it (fahren)’.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.4+6.2)

---

840 KRI, 65.4-5: irl. n ʾnh m mw n ḫn. y ʾnhm.w-Rȝ.w ḫn psd.t = irl. n ḫn ḫw. n ṣt m mȝw.t nṯr w ḫw m ḫn. w ṣḏl. n Ṣḥnm.t m-bḥḥ ‘he made as his monument for his sovereign Amun-Re and his ennead; the making for them a temple anew, the gods resting in it (after) he made the well in front of it (the temple)’.

841 KRI, 66.11-12.

842 KRI 66.15.

843 A. Balal, Bedouins by the lake: Environment, Change, and Sustainability in Southern Egypt (Cairo, 2009), 47.

844 For the text of the Kuban Stele, see RITA I, 192.
**Etymology (III):** El-Sayed and Grimm read the word as *Snsh*, although plausibly the second *s* might simply be a postpositional phonetic complement (as with */ʃm* for *mṭ*). If this is the case, one could suggest Beja *sana(y)* ‘basin, stream of running water’, *saanha* ‘col, pass’, or *šanha* ‘work’. These suggestions are possible phonetically, but the lack of extra-linguistic evidence on the location of this placename makes etymological analysis difficult.

**Location (III):** Unknown. For locational discussion see *Bšt [22]*, *Hzt [29]*, and *T3-nbw-dималь* [7].

**Classification:** +Egyptian (7.1)

---

**Etymology (III):** While the writing *Josh* on Northumberland 1934 [40.1] appears to be an Egyptian word, the situation is confused by Sayed’s identification of a similar placename *Josh* on the anchor-shrine of Ankhaw, which was read as *Zww*. The use of *A1* for *z* is uncommon outside *zi* ‘man’, but Sayed’s equation with the placename *Josh* from the Thutmose III list goes some way to amalgamating these writings (see ‘discussion’ below). If Sayed’s identification of the toponym on the Ankhaw shrine, or the Thutmose III List, is correct, then *j* could be part of a vocalic group rather than a liquid consonant.

Similar placenames occur in the Nile Valley, such as Asyut (*ZAw.t*) and Sais (*ZAw*), which have been explained as stemming from *zAw* ‘watcher’, itself a deverbalative of *zA* ‘watch’, with the former placename almost certainly connected to the sanctuary of the canine deities Wepwawet and Anubis at Asyut. This name may have the same etymology, although the geminated *w* is difficult to explain. However, a better suggestion may be recommended in Egyptian *zAw* ‘Balken’, given by Hannig as ‘Zweige, Äste’, itself probably derived from *zAw* ‘to cut’. A *zAw*-wood ‘beam’ is mentioned in the contexts of boats in the Abusir Papyri and in a Ramesside papyrus,

---

846 This is present in words like *kmṭ* ‘throwstick’ or *šmṭ* ‘be wild’ (*Wb.* 5, 470; 5, 33).
847 Blažek, *Babel und Bibel* 3, 405-406, 419. These words are attested lexemes in contemporary Beja toponymy, for which see Bechhaus-Gerst, *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61, 165, 167.
848 The orthography of *j* in the placename as written on Northumberland 1934 seems to more closely resemble the writing of the *tw*-bird, but, even though there are no *j*-birds written on the stele with which comparison can be made, one can accept that this is a mistake, as *j* would be the expected phonetic complement of the *z*-bird.
850 Sayed, *RdÉ* 29, 175.
852 *Wb.* 3, 419.14-17, 427.1-4; *HWb*, 657.
where it is translated as ‘wooden beams’. Such an etymology may refer to the construction of ships, or possibly refer to local mangrove forests that grew in the bay, both attested archaeologically at Mersa Gawasis. As and had merged by the Middle Kingdom, it is plausible that the initial consonant could represent either /s/ or /ʃ/. If a foreign etymology is sought, the Beja word ‘sawaw ‘collect, bring together’ might reflect the commercial activity conducted at the port, but this is speculative. On balance, an etymology from Egyptian ‘beams’ seems preferable to a foreign word.

Location (I): There can be little doubt that referred to the port of Mersa Gawasis on the Red Sea. This seems certain from the local inscription of Khentykhetwer at Wadi Gasus [40.1] which mentions a Punt-bound fleet resting (htp) at . While scholars had previously suggested nearby Mersa Gasus as the site of , the discovery of pharaonic remains at Mersa Gawasis makes it almost certain that referred to this harbour.

Discussion: The placename observed on line 5 of the stele-shrine of Ankhow has been associated with the same placename by Sayed and Farout, with the latter giving the reading and translation ‘le havre de Saouou (?) (du?) nome de Coptos’. While this is possible, there is no reason to suspect that should be read as s/z. A reading of ‘I landed at the region (?) of the nome of Coptos’ just as easily satisfies the extant epigraphy. Less well understood is the relationship of these occurrences to the toponym probably read Zw or Zwi on the Topographical List of Thutmosis III. Sayed and O’Connor are in agreement in equating this Zwi with , but Zyhlarz puts this placename in the environs of Punt. Another debatable instance is a placename on the Buhen Stele of Senwosret I (Florence 2540), where Obsomer thought that the eighth toponym was read . This cannot be proven.

854 Fattovich, BMSAES 18, 5 records the use of mangrove wood as a fuel and building material at Mersa Gawasis.
856 Sayed, RdÉ 29, pl. 8. This text has a few problems in translation. One would expect the prepositions or instead of n to follow htp for the sense ‘to rest in/at…’, see CDME, 180.
858 Sayed, RdÉ 29, 175 n. 26 proposes a reading of w.w ‘region’ but rejects it on the basis that Middle Kingdom examples are written as .
from the extant photographs or line-drawings, and would be difficult to accept geographically as most of the names in this stele are considered to be located in Upper Nubia. Yet another toponymic datum that may be related to this placename is a Roman ostracron from the praesidium at Maximianon (modern El-Zerqa, near Quseir) which records fish deliveries from a place called Siarou (Σιαροὺς), a not unexpected pronunciation of earlier ZAw.w given the possibility of aleph as a liquid /r/.861

The archaeological material at Mersa Gawasis has been well studied since the initial discovery of the port by Abdel Monem Sayed.862 The local epigraphic evidence, as well as seals, point to a boat-building centre established by the Egyptian administration in order to facilitate Puntite trade. Interestingly, Pan-Grave ceramics have been found in the area, possibly suggesting a local workforce in addition to Egyptian officials.863 The finds of Nile E Ware and Canaanite Jars also suggest that Mersa Gawasis could be supplied from the Delta.864 While almost all material at the site dates to the Middle Kingdom, some Old Kingdom/First Intermediate and early New Kingdom ceramics have been found at the site.865 Since it can be surmised from the inscription of Pepinakht that Old Kingdom voyages to Punt also left Egypt via the Gulf of Suez, one can plausibly suggest that the origin of Mersa Gawasis was as a transhipment station for southerly voyages down the coast of the Red Sea. As Kitchen points out, any Egyptian vessel sailing down the coast would have needed to beach at various harbours in approximately 40 km intervals on their way to Punt.867 This lends itself to an interesting possibility for the origin of the port, namely that it was founded on a southerly coastal journey by Egyptians en-route to Punt. The site may have been particularly favoured for its natural mangrove harbour and nearby wells. Mersa Gawasis also had good access to Coptos, and would have provided far easier sailing conditions for southerly voyages than using Ayn Soukhna.868

862 K. Bard & R. Fattovich (eds), Harbor of the Pharaohs to the Land of Punt (Napoli, 2007)
864 Bard & Fattovich, JAEI 2, 10.
865 Cave 1 at Mersa Gawasis has yielded Old Kingdom remains, suggesting at least some Puntite voyages in the late Old Kingdom used this port. For a New Kingdom occupation, the excavators identify ‘a few potsherds’ and two calibrated carbon dates that fall within the New Kingdom (1520-1100 BCE and 1260-1050 BCE), see Bard & Fattovich, JARCE 47, 10.
866 Urk. I, 134, 13-15. The connection between Ayn Soukhna, the biography of Pepinakht, and Puntite travel was identified in Tallet, CRAIBL 153, 712-714.
868 W. Facey, ‘The Red Sea: the wind regime and the location of ports’, in Lunde & Porter (eds), Trade and Travel in the Red Sea: Proceedings of the Red Sea Project I, 7-17 notes that due to wind and currents, the northerly Egyptian ports are poorly suited for southerly voyages, hence the continued use of southerly ports such as Berenike and Aidhab over Suez.
The lack of New Kingdom material at Mersa Gawasis is perplexing, as one would expect extensive material from this period given that Red Sea Punt expeditions continued into the New Kingdom. It is not known which port Hatshepsut’s fleet used to embark for Punt, but somewhere on the nearby coast is likely, especially given the use of the phrase ‘by land and sea’ in the expedition text at Deir el-Bahri (see entry [84]), and the depiction of saltwater fish in the reliefs. Puntite commerce depicted in TT143 makes reference to Coptos, as does the Punt Expedition of pHarris I. These references would suggest the presence of another harbour site on the Red Sea east of Coptos dating to the New Kingdom. This harbour could not have been located at the later port at Quseir al-Qadim, as the site has yielded no pharaonic remains, despite extensive excavation, but could potentially lie anywhere between Quseir and Safaga.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (5.1)

Etymology (I): This placename has the same etymology as ḥ₃wt in R₃-ḥ₃w.t [59], referring to a ‘quarry’ or ‘mine’. The feminine ending -wt generally shifts to -yt around the early Middle Kingdom, but whether this is indicative of a later date is questionable.

Location (III): The placename occurs only in the Coffin Texts [41.1] as the location of the mineral ḥrₛ.t ‘carnelian’. This material is so geologically ubiquitous that one cannot be entirely sure if this indicates an Eastern Desert location for the toponym, although carnelian is more common here than other regions. Anciently worked carnelian deposits are encountered at ‘Stele Ridge’ in the Western Desert of Nubia, as well as Eastern Desert locations like Wadi Abu Gerida and Wadi Saga.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (2.1)

---

There are two identical Egyptian lexemes that may be related to this placename, šzm.t ‘girdle’ and šzm.t ‘malachite’. Newberry connected the šzm.t-girdle with the supposed inhabitants of this land, the Šzm.ty, and thus the area was said to belong to foreigners who roamed the Eastern Delta. One may propose, however, that the connection between the šzm.t-belt and the placename may be purely attributable to rebus writing (Gardiner S197) and it is therefore possible that one is actually dealing with two different words with a shared root. The gloss of ‘malachite’ would be an appropriate meaning for the placename, given that the area designated by this toponym is proximal to sources of this mineral, and in one text ‘ore’ is specifically described as coming from this place. Perhaps the designated šzm.t-belt was a belt inlaid with gemstones of a particular colour (such-belts are attested in the archaeological record). If šzm.t refers to ‘malachite’, then it would be logical to interpret the root šzm as ‘to be green’. But the root in Egyptian is much more easily explained with the sense of ‘be red’. The Shezmu-god was the god of blood and the wine press, and Egyptian has a verbal root šsm ‘to be red, inflamed’, which must be related to this sense.

To further confuse matters, the word wḏ is also considered to mean malachite. Falk considered that šzm.t might refer to serpentine, thus eliminating this issue. An alternative to this would be to have wḏ and šzm.t designate different green-blue copper ores, so the terms could individually refer to malachite, chrysocolla, or even azurite. Harris noticed that šzm.t occurs in green-lumps in the tomb of Menkheperresoneb, and there is a better, less debatable source of green šzm.t among the Nubian tribute in the tomb of Rekhmire. The lexical root and reflexes seem to

---

875 Wb. 4, 538-539. Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals, 132 states that the word’s identification with malachite ‘cannot be wholly certain’ and the presence of the supposed synonym wḏ ‘malachite’ provides some problems.


877 For an example of this, see the Badarian belt made of turquoise or steatite green beads in F. Friedman, G. Borromeo & M. Leveque, Gifts of the Nile: Ancient Egyptian Faience (London, 1998), 74, 177. See also instances of green girdles reported in A. Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptian Jewellry (London, 1971), 78-80. J. Allen, The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts (Atlanta, 2005), 214 takes the šzm.t-sign to refer to a ‘malachite sporran’.

878 Wb. 4, 546; 4, 539. Oising, Die Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen, 93 translates the simplex as ‘gerötet, entzündet sein’. For Coptic ⲉⲧⲩⲣⲓⲧⲉ, see Westendorf, Koptisches Handwörterbuch, 207. A bird depicted at the Sun Temple of Niuserre was called šzm.ty and may be identified as a pigeon with a green-banded neck, see E. Edel, ‘Zu den Inschriften auf den Jahreszeitenreliefs der “Weltkammer”’, NAWG (1963), fig. 5. Orel & Stolbova, Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary, 92 consider the Egyptian word cognate with Akkadian sāmu ‘red’ (note that Egyptian š seems to originate from a single Afroasiatic lateral, cf. šap ‘receive’ from Afroasiatic *šap, p. 491).


880 All of these minerals are known from the Serabit and Maghara mine; see Lucas & Harris, Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries, 203.

881 See Nina de Garis Davies & Norman de Garis Davies, The Tombs of Menkheperrasonb, Amenmose, and another (London, 1933) pl. 9. The label šzm.t is only partly extant. In the tomb of Rekhmire, there
provide paradoxical explanations for the meaning of šzm.t. Pragmatically, a translation of ‘malachite(-land)’ for the toponym makes the most sense.

**Location (II):** There is no indication that Šzm.t in the textual sources was a very specific land, as it is primarily found as an epithet of Sopdu or Horus [42.1, 42.3-10]. Sopdu is called nb Tš-Šzm.t and so this place was related to his eastern domain (as the nb-lh.t ‘Lord of the East’). Whether this designated parts of the Eastern Desert, the Eastern Delta, or Sinai is difficult to adduce. Gardiner proposed a shift in the area the term designated, seeing the toponym as originally referring to the Sinai, due to its association with the mineral šzm.t, after which it transferred to Sopdu’s cult centre at Saft Al-Hinnah, a centre which acted as a gateway to the Eastern Delta and Sinai. That the term had some connection with copper-malachite regions is certain, not only from the etymology, but from the Hymn to Senwosret [42.11].

As Gardiner pointed out, the location of this placename is confused by orthographies with both ḫ and — determinatives. But in the earlier writings with — or —, the toponym must designate an area at least outside the confines of the Delta cultivation. Schumacher, noting its connection with id.t ‘Duft’ and ksb.t-acacia in PT 456b [42.2], connected Šzm.t with Punt and the south-easterly regions renowned for aromatics, but ultimately settled on a location in the Eastern Desert near Saft Al-Hinnah: ‘Es ist nur gewiß, daß es im Osten von Ägypten gelegen war, vermutlich sogar im Sudosten von Saft el-Henna’. One does not need to necessarily look outside the environs of Egypt for aromatics, as snTr is described as being obtained in the region of Cairo in CG 20564 (see [30]). very close to the area of Šzm.t suggested by Schumacher. Kitchen translated the Šm from the Senwosret Hymn [42.11] as ‘Sinai’. Nibbi, in analysing the Stele of Khentykhetwer from Wadi Gasus [42.10], where Sopdu has the title nb-Tš-Šzm.t, insisted that the term relates to Sopdu’s domain in the Eastern Desert north of Wadi Hammamat. In the Pyramid Texts, Šzm.t is associated with Horus and ksb.t-wood. The associations of ksb.t, fragrances, and

---

883  A. Gardiner, ‘The supposed Egyptian equivalent of the name of Goshen’, *JEA* 5 (1918), 218-223. For the etymology of the placename Saft al-Hinnah, see Peust, *Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten*, 78. While it seems that Saft may be a reflex of Spdh, other words like sb ty ‘Mauer’ or Coptic coWT ‘storing’ may equally explain the many modern Egyptian village names with the element Saft.
884  Gardiner, *JEA* 5, 223.
885  I. Schumacher, *Der Gott Sopdu* (Fribourg, Göttingen, 1988), 287. The ksb.t tree has been identified as an acacia species in N. Baum, ‘Essai d'identification de l’arbre ou arbuste ksb t des anciens Egyptiens’, *VA* 3 (1987), 195-205.
888  A. Nibbi, ‘Remarks on the two Stelae from Wadi Gasus’, *JEA* 62 (1976), 54ff.
mineral products of the Sinai (turquoise, lapis) are also repeated on the Stele of Montunacht in a hymn praising Min-Amun and products of Min’s easterly domains.889

The instance of the placename in the Hymn of Senwosret [42.11] was thought by Brugsch and later scholars to designate Biblical Goshen, but Gardiner showed that the initial sign was read as $\ddot{s}$, not g.890 The notion of the text is also difficult to understand. In this section of the Hymn, Senwosret is likened to various objects and deities that can aid the defence of Egypt. In line 4 Senwosret is metaphorically called an imDr ‘rampart’ (?), which is qualified as being of a substance that Gardiner (followed by Collier and Quirke) suggested reading as hsmn ‘copper’, thus ‘a copper wall of Shezmet’.891 Given that malachite is a cupric mineral, this would accord well with the likely etymology of the placename.

A toponym based on an areal expanse of malachite/copper exploitation could only refer to the Eastern Desert and/or Sinai. This could easily designate the copper-malachite mining zones in the south Sinai (Wadi Maghara, Wadi Kharig) and Eastern Desert, stretching from Wadi Arabah (Abu el-Maysa, Qasr Girghis) in the north to Wadi Semna in the south.892 Early Dynastic labels suggest that malachite was sought in Sinai as early as the reign of Den.893 If the name $^\dddot{s}m.t$ designated the broad expanse of copper mining operations in the Eastern Desert, from Abu el-Maysa in the north to Wadi Semna in the south, then it would neatly explain why the term disappears from Egyptian texts after the Middle Kingdom, as there are no traces of post-Middle Kingdom exploitation at any of these Eastern Desert copper mines. The associations with acacia


890 Gardiner, JEA 5, 218-223. See also Schumacher, Der Gott Sopdu, 281-285. HWb, 1399 and Gomaà, Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches, II, 127 and F. Ll. Griffith, The Petrie Papyri: Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob (London, 1898), pl. 2, l. 14 retain a reading of Gsm, while Gardiner showed that $\dddot{s}$ was likely a miswriting for $\ddot{s}$. The photograph of the word from the papyrus shows that the initial sign is to be read $\ddot{s}$ (UC32157), see M. Collier & S. Quirke, UCL Lahun Papyri: Religious, Literary, Legal, Mathematical and Medical (Oxford, 2004), 16-19, CD-ROM. For palaeographical comparisons, see G. Möller, Hieratische Paläographie (Leipzig, 1909), I, 49.

891 Collier & Quirke, UCL Lahun Papyri: Religious, Literary, Legal, Mathematical and Medical, 18.

892 For the mines in Wadi Arabah, see Tristant, BSFE 182, 41-45; L. Pantalacci & S. Denix ‘Travaux de l’Institut français d’archéologie orientale 2008-2009’, BIFAO 109 (2009), 613-614. There is a Middle Kingdom stele at Wadi Um Balad, suggesting that the region was travelled even after the mines were inactive, see B. Mathieu, ‘Une stèle du règne d’Amenemhat II au ouadi Um Balad (désert oriental)’, BIFAO 98 (1998), 235-246. For copper mining at Wadi Semna east of Coptos, see Abdel-Motelib, et al., Metalla 19, 33-36. In CT VI 214d, an armband is made from $^\dddot{s}m.t$ ‘malachite’ of Ti-ntr, which could reference a malachite source almost anywhere in the Eastern Desert (Sinai would surely have been called $Mfk.t$ in this corpus).

893 Tallet, Archéo-Nil 20, 100.
and scents further strengthen the connection between Shezmet and semi-wooded areas of the Eastern Desert.  

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.3)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[43]</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Etymology (I):** This reduplicated stem is related to the Egyptian verb *khkh* ‘to hammer, beat’, later Coptic $\gamma\alpha\gamma\varepsilon\vartheta\varepsilon\chi\approx$ $\varsigma\chi\alpha\chi\varepsilon\zeta\varepsilon\varepsilon\zeta$. While this lexeme freely occurs in texts of the Middle and New Kingdoms, Peust suggests for phonological reasons that the word may be a Semitic loan arriving in Egyptian as early as the Middle Kingdom. The issue as to the word’s origin is somewhat immaterial here as, by the time the toponym was written down in the New Kingdom, the word must have been somewhat regularised in Egyptian vocabulary. The verb *khkh* occurs frequently in pHarris I, where it qualifies metals such as *nbw* ‘gold’, *hd* ‘silver’, and *bi\beta/i\beta* ‘bronze/copper’.  

The semantics of the word caused Helck to point out that *Khkh* refers to a place involved in metallurgy or mining. The lack of any morphological suffix for this verb is puzzling, and one probably has to reconstruct a nominal morph (-.w, -.t) in order to make ‘hammering(-place)’ or alike.  

**Location (II):** The toponym only occurs in one text [43.1], which speaks of the Pharaoh, certainly figuratively, casting down the Shasu of *Mw-kd* who ‘occupied’ (*hmsi*) *Khkh* ‘on the shore of the Sea’ (*sp\.t p\varepsilon\gamma* *ym*). Thus, all that is known of *Khkh* is that it was on the Red Sea shore and was inhabited (at least periodically) by Shasu who were further described as being from the placename *Mw-kd*. The term *Mw-kd* is used in such varied contexts in Egyptian texts that it could refer to a various bodies of water, including the Euphrates-Tigris and the Red Sea (see entry [77]), but clearly the latter is meant in this text. The preamble to the text also mentions Nubians from *Ikyt* ‘Wadi Allaqi’, so there has been some confusion as to whether *Khkh* designates a place on the Red Sea coast of the Eastern Desert (near Quseir) and its goldmines, or far away in the Shasu homeland of Edom. Helck and others have suggested locating *Khkh* on the shore of the Eastern

---

895 Wb. 5, 67.8; Černý, *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*, 323; Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 109. Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 73 also relates the word to Coptic $\varsigma\chi\varepsilon\alpha\chi\varepsilon\zeta\varepsilon\varepsilon\zeta$ ‘aushauen, ebnen, heilen’. The word is probably a so-called ‘intensive’ of the simplex *kh* ‘to break stones’ registered in Lesko, *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*, II, 158.  
897 For commentaries on the word, see O. Goelet, ‘A New ‘Robbery’ Papyrus: Rochester MAG 51.346.1’, *JEA* 82 (1996), 117.  
898 Helck, *JARCE* 6, 141.
Desert, and Giveon later placed Khkh in the Gulf of Aqaba near Timna. Thus far these competing notions have not been harmonised.

The text does not necessarily show that Khkh must be located proximal to Ilkt, but rather shows Nubian mercenaries from Ilkt were engaged in distant mercenary activity. Indeed, the final line of the letter seems to say exactly this Nhst.y n.(y) t3 ḥṣ.t Ilkt i:šm m pd.wt r n3 ḥr.w n.(w) Sṣ.w n.(y) Mw-kd ‘The Nehesy-Nubians of the hill-country of Ilkt who went as soldiers against the enemies of the Shasu of Mw-kd’. Thus, the Nhst.y were mercenaries who were used by the Egyptians against Shasu inhabitants further north. But Helck and Giveon suggest that Shasu were roaming the Eastern Desert as far south as Quseir, taking the term Sṣ.w in this text to be related to the later generalised meaning of ṣṣ ‘shepherd, wanderer’, designating any nomadic group. Giveon circumvents this problem by stating that Khkh was the ‘point of departure of the Shosu’, who then attacked Egyptians on a goldmining expedition in the Eastern Desert.

An impediment to this Edomite interpretation is the fact that the text makes mention of ḫ.w-nbw ‘gold-washers’ and the gold-working settlement (Tl-wḥ.yt-blk-nbw [18]), pointing to this action taking place in the vicinity of goldmines. The operative gold source is unlikely to be in Edom or Arabia. By the Ramesside period, it appears that some Shasu had established themselves within Middle Egypt, and thus their presence at a gold-mining site in the Eastern Desert is not unimaginable, nor would it be necessary for Edomite-Shasu to have conducted this operation, as Shasu may have already occupied Egypt’s hinterlands. Thus, provisionally, it would seem that Shasu from the Gulf of Suez area had begun taking advantage of a general insecurity in the Twentieth Dynasty by raiding gold operations near the Coptite coast. While the text in which the toponym occurs has no provenance, it belongs to an archive relating to Coptos and the

900 Giveon, JARCE 8, 51-53. Hasel, Domination and Resistance, 234 mentions Giveon’s argument but cites the incorrect papyrus (pHarris I) and thus seems to have conflated this issue with that of ḥk [54]. J. Tebes, ‘Egypt in the east: The Egyptian presence in the Negev and the local society during the Early Iron Age’, Cahiers Caribéens d’Egyptologie 9 (2006), 81 is open to Giveon’s suggestion.
901 Giveon, JARCE 8, 51-53 shows other documents locating the Shasu in the Nile Valley, but nothing to suggest a Shasu presence as far south as Quseir.
902 Giveon, JARCE 8, 52-53.
903 Giveon, JARCE 8, 52-53.
904 Z. Meshel, ‘Were there gold mines in the eastern Arabah?’, in P. Bienkowski & K. Galor (eds), Crossing the Rift: Resources, routes, settlement patterns and interaction in the Wadi Arabah (Oxford, 2006), 231-239 argues on geological evidence and Roman onomastica that gold may have been mined in Wadi Feinan, but there is no evidence of earlier mining. For mines further afield in North Arabia, see the surveys in A. Kisnawi, P. de Jesus & B. Rihani, ‘Preliminary report on the mining survey, Northwest Hijaz, 1982’, Atal 7 (1983), 82.
905 See Giveon, Les bédouins Shosou des documents égyptiens, 147-149, 153-154 for documents relating to Shasu settlements in pWilbour and a separate Shasu group at Atfih. Two Ramesside stele found at Wadi Sannur might also suggest this region was inhabited by Asiatic foreigners, see Barta, MDAIK 20, 98-101.
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transhipment of galena – affairs of the Eastern Desert of Upper Egypt. These arguments would place Khbḥ somewhere on the coast of the Red Sea in reach of the Coptite goldmines.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (5.1)

---

Etymology (II): The word resembles Egyptian khb ‘to harm’ and khb ‘raging-one (Seth)’, but both these meanings are not very likely toponymic glosses, unless one postulates a hypothetical ‘harmful (place)’. Hannig registers an alternative meaning for the verb khb as ‘durchkämmen (Berge)’ or ‘Bewältigen (Berg)’, both of which would make better sense given the connection with mining in the text [44.1]. In a Ptolemaic description of aromatics, a botanical term kḥb occurs, but we cannot say anything about the meaning or origin of this term. Likewise, a similar lexeme may appear in the Nubian theonym mmrrm-khb, from one of the supplementary spells in the Book of the Dead. As nothing is known about the semantics of this African loanword, it would be dangerous to connect them to this toponym. Foreign etymologies are not as promising. One cannot entirely discount Beja ka(a)fa ‘marine cliff’ as a suitable geographic etymon. On balance, however, a connection with the Egyptian verb kḥb seems most likely, with the morph -w marking a passive participle ending, giving the meaning ‘the-scoured-one’.

Location (I): The toponym is the origin of the mineral msdm.t ‘galena’, and the only known Middle Kingdom galena mine in Egypt is found on the Red Sea shore at Gebel Zeit. The fact

---

906 Helck, *JARCE* 6, 146, l. 3, 147, l. 26, 151, l. 90.


908 *HWb.*, 887; D. Meeks, *Année Lexicographique* (Paris, 1978), III, 311. The verb beyond abstractions of ‘harm’, must refer to a physical action, for which see the examples in Wilson, *A Ptolemaic Lexikon*, 1088-1089. The only text (I am aware of) which gives a geographic sense for khb is KRI II 172:3, nfr nfr kn nšn.ty ‘ḥḥ= mi bik hft šm= ḥfdn dw.w n kḥb ‘good god, raging lion, he rises as a falcon, when he goes and climbs the mountains which were not scoured’.


911 Blažek, *Babel und Bibel* 3, 400 quotes a long-vowel form kaafa which would easily account for a medial laryngeal, i.e. kḥf. Perhaps this is the same as Beja geefe ‘Steilufer des Nils und der Wadis’, which ultimately would make it a later Arabic loan related to qef ‘steile Felswand’.

912 Perfective passive participles are usually transcribed with -w in Middle Egyptian, see Ockinga, *A Concise Grammar of Middle Egyptian*, 61-62.

913 *Wb.* 2, 153.8-15. Harris, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, 174 upholds the translation of ‘black eye-paint’, specifically referring to the mineral galena as distinct from wḏḏ ‘green eye-paint’. The word in question is a m-prefix of sdm ‘schminken’, which passed into Coptic as cηθυμ and Greek στίμμυ, for which see the extensive discussion in *EDE* III, 601-604.
that Khety journeyed to other places in the Gulf of Suez would further point to this as the most likely location for \textit{Khb.w}, as Gebel el-Zeit is easily accessible via the Gulf of Suez. Other scholars have used this text as evidence for galena being mined in the Sinai (in a rather circular argument), but there is as yet no confirmation of ancient galena workings in the peninsula.\textsuperscript{915} The ancient remains at Gebel el-Zeit consist of two mining zones, three km apart, with extensive galleries carved into the mountain, as well as a shrine-cave containing votive stele.\textsuperscript{916} The inscriptive record at the mines begins in the Twelfth Dynasty, somewhat contemporary with the early Middle Kingdom text mentioning \textit{Khb.w}.\textsuperscript{917} Other galena sources are found further south along the Red Sea coast, but have not been the subject of archaeological investigation, so the date of their exploitation is for the moment unknown.\textsuperscript{918} In the Ramesside mining list, a galena mine is ambiguously referred to as the \textit{Dw n(y)} \textit{Gb}tv\textsuperscript{35A}.\textsuperscript{919} However, this placename is hardly specific, as the same geographic expression is also used in the next entry but is said to yield gold.

**Discussion:** Shortland’s isotopic analysis of Egyptian kohl concluded that some Predynastic objects consisting of galena match the Umm Gheig, Zog el-Bahar, and Gebel el-Zeit and thus it is plausible that mining began at such sites much earlier than the Middle Kingdom.\textsuperscript{920}

**Classification:** +Egyptian (5.1)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{[45]} & \text{Tmp\textsuperscript{\text/\textslash}} & *\text{cmp(r)w/}
\end{array}
\]

**Etymology (III):** The word is certainly non-Egyptian. It is unclear if aleph in this loan is a liquid or a vowel. In Semitic loans, Egyptian \textit{t} regularly corresponds to samekh /tn/, but it is unclear

\textsuperscript{914} That \textit{msdm.t} was the object of mining at Gebel el-Zeit is certain, as a stele found at the site (No. 559) mentions \textit{Hw.t-hr.w nb(t) mdsdm[t,]} ‘Hathor, lady of galena’, see Castel & Soukiassian, \textit{BIFAO} 85, 291, pl. 64.

\textsuperscript{915} This idea seems to have been born out of Harris, \textit{Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals}, 175. As a toponymic note, the Arabic word for ‘lead’ \textit{roṣaṣ} is used in four other placenames in the Eastern Desert and Sinai, which to my knowledge, have not been assessed for any ancient material: Gebel Rusays (28.048096, 32.942511), Gebel Rusays (26.986604), Gebel Umm Risays (29.53384, 32.24278) and Wadi ar-Rusays (29.458563, 33.0989) in the Sinai.

\textsuperscript{916} See Régen & Soukiassian, \textit{Gebel Zeit II: Le matériel inscrit}, 1-12.

\textsuperscript{917} Régen & Soukiassian, \textit{Gebel Zeit II: Le matériel inscrit}, 346. The mention of Montuhotep II in stele no. 7 was considered to be posthumous.

\textsuperscript{918} See, G. Castel & G. Soukiassian, \textit{Gebel el-Zeit I: Les mines de galène}, 11; Hassan & Hassan, \textit{Archaeometry} 23, 79. Excluding Gebel el-Zeit, the closest source of galena would have been Gebel Abu Kherfan/Umm Huqat near Safaga. A galena source at Um Zarejia in the Sinai is mentioned in A. El Goresy, F. Tera, B. Schlück-Nolte & E. Pernicka, ‘Chemistry and Lead isotopic compositions of glass from a Ramesside workshop at Lisht and Egyptian Lead Ores: A test for a genetic link and for the source of glass’, in C. Eyre (ed.), \textit{Seventh International Congress of Egyptologists} (Leuven, 1998), 473 n. 9, but the resultant article on this new galena source was never published.

\textsuperscript{919} This conclusion was also reached in M. Legrand, ‘La liste dite “des régions minières”’, in El-Saeed, El-Mahfouz & A. Megahed (eds), \textit{Festschrift Abdel Monem Abdel Haleem Sayed}, 339.

\textsuperscript{920} A. Shortland, ‘Application of lead isotope analysis to a wide range of Late Bronze Age Egyptian materials’ \textit{Archaeometry} 48 (2006), 659, 665.
what sound this would correspond to in African languages. 

The affricates [tʃ]/[tʃ] do occur, for instance in Agaw, and therefore it is unknown whether the t should be vocalised according to its Semitic correspondent of /tʃ/, or rather /c/. A promising prospect for this toponym is a connection with the word Sambil/Sambur ‘sack, basket’, with similar forms present in Semitic, Cushitic, and even Nilo-Saharan languages. This would make good sense on account of the determinatives used for this ethnic group (see below). Other possibilities present themselves from the Cushitic lexicons such as Beja sambura ‘cloud’ or Agaw samb ‘to live’. These are mere speculations and our lack of knowledge about this place or people prevents any etymological attempts. Whether this placename has anything to do with the Nubian Σεμβρῖται (Sembritae) of classical authors (the –ται being a Greek morpheme) seems tempting but there is no basis for this equation apart from an apparent phonetic similarity. If a connection with a mineral substance is maintained, there is an interesting possibility from Nilo-Saharan Teda somb ‘antimony’. 

**Location (II):** The name only occurs in the Annals of Amenemhat II, where it is the origin of the mineral dh.ty [45.1]. It seems likely on the basis of Coptic τΑύτ ‘lead’ that the word refers to this mineral, although Harris is also open to the possibility that this term was on occasion confused with ‘tin’. The placename is probably not to be sought in Asia, since the Annals already mention dh.ty as part of the tribute from the Asiatic toponym, Stt. While earlier scholars connected Tmpsw with Asia on the basis of a similar toponym Tp, other scholars have linked Tmpsw with the Eastern Desert and Red Sea coast, where the majority of Egyptian lead sources are located.

---

921 Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 407-408. This also holds true for Middle Kingdom words in the Execration Texts; Černý, *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*, 206.  
924 Lukas, *Die Sprache der Tubu in der Zentralen Sahara*, 184.  
927 Altenmüller & Moussa, SÄK 18, 10.  
928 For a Levantine location, see W. Helck, ‘Ein Ausgreifen des Mittleren Reiches in den zypriotischen Raum?’, *GM* 109 (1991), 29 and H. Goedicke, ‘Egyptian military actions in “Asia” in the Middle
The problem with this location, however, is that scientifically tested Egyptian objects of lead (*dh.ty?) were isotopically distinct from kohl-galena objects (*msdm.t.), the latter chemically matched to the Red Sea sources at Gebel el-Zeit, and thus Shortland concluded that Egyptian pure lead came from ‘outside Egypt’.\(^{929}\) As such, the foreign-*dh.ty* obtained from *Tmpsw* could well be lead from outside Egypt, and the locality is plausibly anywhere with a lead-source in Africa or Asia. But, in defence of an Eastern Desert location, there is an inscription from the galena mine of Psammetichus at Umm Huweitat near the Red Sea coast that specifically mentions that the product of the mine was *dh.ty*.\(^{930}\) Thus, *Tmpsw* may have been a mining region to be sought near the Red Sea littoral, although there is nothing *a priori* that would exclude this toponym from designating another galena-tin deposits in the region of Nubia or the Eastern Desert.

**Discussion:** The precise word and classifier used to qualify *Tmpsw* has provided difficulties for translators (see Fig. 14). Earlier suggestions included *hrw* ‘nomad’, while other translators have accepted *htp.yw* ‘peaceful/pacified ones’, seeing the *htp*-glyph as part of this word.\(^{931}\) The classifiers used are infrequently attested, but Altenmüller, based on parallels from an extremely damaged passage of the Palermo Stone, argues that they are ‘Sackträgern’ and hence the object depicted behind them are baskets or bags.\(^{932}\) Given the possible etymology of *Tmpsw* and the object depicted on the hieroglyph, it is not impossible that this group, the ‘pacified-ones of *Tmpsw*’, was known for its bag-carrying people. Another, perhaps coincidental point is noted with later histories in that the *htp.yw* are treated as ‘pacified’ exiled-Egyptians by Altenmüller, and that in Greek geographies the *Sembritae* are equated with the *Automoloi* of Herodotus. Egyptian

\(^{929}\) Shortland, *Archaeometry* 48, 659, 666. Even Uganda has been raised as possible tin source in pharaonic Egypt, one study matched Egyptian kohl isotopically to a Ugandan source at Busumbi, see J. Dayton, ‘Geology, Archaeology and Trade’, in J. Best & N. de Vries (eds), *Interaction and Acculturation in the Mediterranean* (Amsterdam, 1980), 159, 164.

\(^{930}\) Vikentiev, *ASAE* 54, 180-181, 189. The geological difference between these terms is not clear, for instance the other mines at Gebel el-Zeit refer to the local product as *msdm.t*. One might suppose that *dh.ty* specifically referred to galena (the ore) and *msdm.t* was the derived eye paint.


deserters who fled south into Nubia. The possibility that the toponym is related to the
placename ḫt-pʾ or the personal name ḫnbw may be entertained, but is beyond proof.

Figure 14: The plural determinative for the ḫt-pʾw in the Annals of Amenemhat II (See Malek & Quirke, JEA 78, 15)

**Classification:** Unknown (7.1)

**Etymology (I):** The placename is a noun ḫw ‘mountain’ qualified by the adjective ṭwb ‘pure’.

Other placenames called ḫw-wb are known from Gebel Barkal and Abu Simbel. The common
denominator between these places is a connection with a sacred area at the base of mountain.

**Location (I):** Hammamat no. 247 mentions ‘The Pure Mountain’ on an inscription on the north-
side of the Wadi Hammamat [46.3]. The text of the Turin map refers to a local shrine (ḥnw) at this
position (see [46.2] and [T14]). Goyon has suggested that the ḫw-wb of the Ramesside mining
list [46.1], which bears gold, is also a reference to this mountain in the Wadi Hammamat, rather
than Abu Simbel which has no local gold deposits. On this evidence, ḫw-wb in these texts
must refer to a mountain near Bir Umm Fawakhir or El-Sid.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+4.1)

**Etymology (I):** The placename is an indirect genitive formed of ḫw ‘mountain’ and a geological
term bhn. The word bhn/bhn is usually translated as ‘greywacke’, ‘schist’, or ‘breccia verde’, with
earlier scholarship wrongfully positing ‘basalt’ and/or ‘diorite’. Such a broad geological
definition acts as a general caveat that Egyptian geological terminology is unlikely to be as exact
as modern mineralogical standards and it would not be surprising if this term could encompass a variety of similar stone types. Sethe derived the root from Hebrew *ḥn* ‘testing-stone’, which Takács rejected on semantic grounds. Furthermore, it would seem strange that Egyptians would use a Semitic word for a stone that was exclusively mined in the Eastern Desert of Upper Egypt. An Egyptian verbal etymology seems quite likely as the word often exhibits morphological noun-suffixes (-.w/y). Thus, one could suggest a connection to the verb *ḥn/bhn* ‘to cut’ for a hypothetical ‘cut-stone’ or alike. Even though *ḥn* is more regularly written with $h$, its connection with *bhn* is not an issue, as $h$ and $ḥ$ had merged in some environments and represented similar sounds.

**Location (I):** Local inscriptions indicate that the Dw-n(.y)-Bhn referred to the quarries in the Wadi Hammamat, as one inscription helpfully uses the demonstrative with the placename, ‘this Mountain of Bekhen’ [47.2], and the toponym occurs on other inscriptions in the wadi [47.1-3, 47.6-7]. Furthermore, as Bekhen-stone was mined at R$j-hnw$ (see [26]), ‘The Mountain of Bekhen’ must be within the confines of Wadi Hammamat. The main area of this mining activity occurred on both sides of Wadi Hammamat between Bir Hammamat and Bir Umm Fawakhir, as is attested by the quarrying excavations and inscriptions.

**Discussion:** Sethe pointed to another attestation of this toponym in the placename $H.t-bhn.w$ from an unpublished Middle Kingdom stele at the Louvre (C44). But in the stele the deceased wishes to be buried in the $H.t-bhn.w$, which hardly suggests a location in the quarries of Wadi Hammamat.

As a geologically orientated placename, Dw-n(.y)-bhn designates the origin of a particular stone used for making statues, sarcophagi, stone vessels and other architectural features. Almost all instances of the ‘Mountain of Bekhen’ are limited to the Ramesside period, with one instance in the early Middle Kingdom [47.1]. This may be attributed to the increased mining activity in this period, replacing $Rj-hnw$ as a more functional term for the quarries of the wadi.

---

939 See EDE II, 286.

940 *Wh.* 1, 468. The eye-classifier in *ḥn* [47.4] was explained as a contamination with *bḥl.w* in S. Bojowald, “Einige Bemerkungen zur Schreibung des „bhn“ – Steines mit dem „Augendeterminativ“”, *ZÄS* 138 (2011), 89-90.


942 Hikade, *JEA* 92, 154-155.

943 Sethe, *SPAW* 22, 905; Lucas & Rowe, *ASAE* 38, 131.

944 Lucas & Rowe, *ASAE* 38, 127-156. A collection of architectural features and statuary which are self-identified as being made of *ḥn* are given in A. Varille, ‘Quelques données nouvelles sur la pierre bekhen des anciens égyptiens’, *BIFAO* 34 (1934), 93-102.

945 For details and logistics of New Kingdom mining in the wadi, see Hikade, *JEA* 92, 154-155.
This quarry was in use from at least the Predynastic until the Roman period.\textsuperscript{946} Recent survey work by Bloxam has found Predynastic workshops near Bir Hammamat, explaining the presence of siltstone and greywacke objects on the Predynastic archaeological record.\textsuperscript{947} The toponym continues in use to the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty.\textsuperscript{948} The placename cannot be specifically located on the Turin Geological Papyrus (see [T17] and [T20]) for, although the map’s raison d’être was to navigate the reader to the Bekhen Quarries, it is not labelled textually. Harrell and Brown suggest a small green-grey splodge on the papyrus illustrates the exact location of the Ramesside Bekhen Quarries (Fig. 15).

Figure 15: Harrell & Brown’s postulated location for the Bekhen Quarries on the Turin Map (grey mark coming out of wadi), after Harrell and Brown, \textit{JARCE} 29, 97-98.

\textbf{Classification:} +Egyptian (1.1+1.3)

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{Etymology (I):} Same as above, with \textit{h}s.t ‘hill-country’ as a generic term instead of \textit{dw} ‘mountain’.
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{Location (I):} Same as above, but probably designating the wider Hammamat region due to the use of the generic \textit{h}s.t ‘hill-country’.
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{Classification:} +Egyptian (1.1+1.3)
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{946} The famous Egyptian statues found in Darius’s Palace at Susa were made from Hammamat greywacke, see J. Yoyotte, ‘La statue égyptienne de Darius’, in J. Perrot (ed.), \textit{Le palais de Darius à Suse} (Paris, 2010), 268-269.


\textsuperscript{948} Lucas & Rowe, \textit{ASAE} 38, 149.
**Etymology (II):** The placename is an indirect genitive phrase formed by Dw ‘mountain’ and the enigmatic term mnt.yw. From the classifier, it is clear that mnt.yw is a type of stone, and it is tempting to equate this term with the substance mnt.t, usually translated as ‘diorite’, ‘gneiss’ or both. The substance mnt.t is most securely connected with the quarries at Gebel el-Asr in the Western Desert, so its presence in the Wadi Hammamat area is difficult to deduce. Dictionaries also reference another mineral substance, mni.t, with unknown meaning. A relation to mn.ty ‘mountains’ is possible, but the phrase would be somewhat tautological unless mn.ty had a much more specific meaning, and the classifier favours a mineralogical term. A mineralogical term is also to be recommended for the odonym T3-mi.t-n.t)-t3-mnt.y [48.2] present in the Turin Geological Papyrus. In his edition of the Turin papyrus, Goyon transcribed Mnty with the classifier O49, making it a toponym, but the hieratic could also be N33, the classifier for mineral substances.

**Location (III):** In pAnastasi VI, this placename is stated to within the Hjs.t-Gbtw [48.1]. The text references ‘measuring’ the distance from the T3-wht-nt-nbw ‘the settlement of gold’ to the P3-dw-n(n.)-Mnt.yw after an initial measurement from the htm-fort to the ‘settlement of gold’. Assuming that the htm ‘fort’ in the text is located somewhere near the mouth of the Wadi Hammamat (see [36]), and the operative T3-wht-nt-nbw refers to the mines at El-Sid or Fawakhir, the ‘Mountain of Mentiu’ should be east of here. The Turin map has a placename, the ‘The road to T3-mnti’ [48.2], which must refer to a road leading to this same mountain. There is a dolerite source at Abu Fannani, 10 km east of Wadi Hammamat. A diorite quarry, located about 80 km south and east of the Hammamat, Gebel Umm Naqqat, could also be a contender for this quarry, but exploitation here seems to be confined to the Early Dynastic and Roman periods. A granite quarry also occurs in nearby Bir Umm Fawakhir, but it is dated to the Roman period.

---

949 See Wb. 2, 91. Harris, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, 87-88; EDE III, 336. There is some confusion in the literature as to whether ‘diorite’ is a suitable term (see Harris, p.231), given that older literature termed the substance at Gebel el-Asr as ‘Chepren diorite’.


952 Wb. 2, 69.


954 As noticed by Goyon, *ASAE* 49, 389.

955 The source is mentioned in Bloxam et al., *Archéo-Nil* 24, 23 remarking that the stone would have naturally occurred in clumps, with little need for excavating the material from the bedrock.


Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+1.3)

Etymology (I): $Tp-ih.w$ is the Egyptian name for the settlement of ‘Atfih’. It is a genitival expression comprising of two Egyptian words, $tp(y)$ ‘head, first’ and $ih.w$ ‘cows’, and is considered to be an epithet of Hathor, referring to the bovine goddess as the ‘first of cows’. The placename is attached with a feature generic $dw$ ‘mountain’.

Location (I): Usually, $Tp-ih.w$ is determined with O49 $\text{外地}$, where it refers to the Nile settlement Atfih, but in the Ramesside mining list [49.1] it is written as $\text{外地}$, surely referring to the nearby desert east of Atfih. This desert is dominated by the mountain of Galala al-Bahariyya, and therefore one might postulate that this region was the ‘mountain’ in $Dw-n(y)-Tp-ih.w$. Alternatively, the $dw$ could just be a personification of a mine, as with all placenames in the Ramesside mining list, and therefore need not specifically refer to a ‘mountain’. As a [FOREIGN-LAND], $Tp-ih.w$ is only found in the list of mining regions of Ramesses II, where the ‘Mountain of Atfih’ bears $\text{外地}$ ‘white-stone’. Legrand considered this word to refer to ‘white-calcite’, while Harris preferred marble or crystalline limestone. Geoarchaeological surveys have revealed a travertine quarry near Bir Barda, dated to the Graeco-Roman period. A Ramesside calcite quarry is found in Wadi Sannur, approximately 50 km from Atfih, where there is a royal stele of Ramesses II. Indeed, due to the contemporaneity of the text [49.1] and this quarry, it seems certain that the ‘Mountain of Atfih’ refers to Wadi Sannur and this region, thus meaning that $\text{外地}$ was the term for the calcite.

Discussion: Given the writing of this placename as ‘Atfih’ [HILL-COUNTRY], it is directly comparable to $Db\.w$ [50A] and other ‘relative’ toponyms [35B], where regions of the Eastern Desert were named due to their proximity to a major Egyptian settlement.

---

This quarry would be barely 3 km from the El-Sid mines, and thus it would hardly be worth measuring the distance between them.

958 GDG V, 52; Gomaà, Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches, I, 380. The modern name Atfih is a reflex of the ancient (Pr) $Tp-ih.w$, Coptic ḫⲫⲓⲛⲡⲛسبة, see Peust, Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten, 15.


960 Wb 1. 165.13-21; 3, 206-207.


962 Harrell & Stormeyer, ‘Ancient Egyptian Quarries – an illustrated overview’, in Abu-Jaber et al. (eds), Quarryscapes, 51-52. The site itself is several km southeast of Ayn Barda. For the date of the remains at Ayn Barda, see Tristant, BSFE 182, 48-49.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+3.4)

Etymology (I): $\text{Dw\,n(y)\,Db\dot{3}.w}$

*Db\dot{3}.w* is the well-known name for the settlement of ‘Edfu’. In the Ramesses mining list [50.1], it appears in a genitival construction with $\text{dw}$ ‘mountain’. However, in the Medinet Habu treasury [50.2], where it is written as $\text{ without the generic } \text{dw}$, it could independently represent a ‘relative placename’ east of Edfu. In this case, the classifier is all that is required to change the referent area of the toponym, as in $\text{Tp-ih.w}$ [49].

Location (I): In both texts, the $\text{Dw-n(y)-Db\dot{3}.w}$ [50.1] and $\text{Db\dot{3}.w}$ [50.2] refer to the goldfields east of Edfu. This would have included Seti I’s temple at Kanais and gold deposits along Wadi Barramiya. The region is littered with pharaonic rock inscriptions, most of which are attributable to gold mining expeditions.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+3.4)

Etymology (I): Same as above, without the generic term $\text{dw}$ and with the substitution of the $\text{[HILL-COUNTRY]}$ classifier for the regular $\text{[EGYPTIAN-PLACE]}$. This classifier exchange indicates it is the shortened form of $\text{Dw-n(y)-Db\dot{3}.w}$, referring to the same desert east of Edfu rather than the Nile settlement.

Location (I): Same as above.

Classification: +Egyptian (3.4)

---

964 Wh. 5, 562. For the etymology of $\text{Db\dot{3}.w}$, see Peust, *Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten*, 51. Rejecting the mythic etymology of Horus from $\text{db\dot{3}}$ ‘bestrafen’, Peust instead daringly connects it to Old Nubian $\text{ⲱⲩⲡ}$ ‘city’ on account of it being near the southern boundary of Egypt. But the equation of $\text{db}$ for $\emptyset$ and $\text{d}$ for Old Nubian $\text{ⲱⲩⲡ}$ is difficult to explain phonologically in an Old Egyptian name.

965 For the many gold mines in the Edfu and Kom Ombo watersheds, see Klemm & Klemm, *Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia*, 190-268. For the temple at Kanais, see *PM VII*, 321.

Figure 17: Inset of places in the Wadi Hammamat region.
5.3 Zone 2: The South Sinai and Edom [51-74]

Etymology (II): This placename appears to be non-Egyptian, despite bearing a resemblance to hi.w/wi ‘Untier’ or ih.y/w ‘camp, pen’. But, given the prevalence of w in foreign words, the Sinai context of the biography, and the difficulty of explaining the morphology in Egyptian, a Semitic origin of the toponym seems certain. It is unclear whether the latter w’s and i in the name are vocalic or consonantal, and it seems likely that at least one of the final three graphemes must be interpreted vocally. The issue of matres lectionis in the Egyptian script is in sore need of research, but most authorities are in agreement that i and w, particularly in the context of foreign-words of the Old and Middle Kingdom, could be vocalic. The reed-i in contemporary Execration Texts is usually either vocalic or a glottal-stop (at least in the Semitic examples with testable cognates) and there are no unequivocal examples where singular i equals a palatal approximant /j/, which instead is written with the dual-reed. Thus one should favour a vocalisation of /ʔhwʔuː/, but /ʔhwyuː/ is still possible.

This placename has been equated with the biblical Tetragrammaton and as a variant form of the Ramesside placename Tś-śis.w-Yhwš [53]. For the word to be related to the Tetragrammaton, one would have to posit a shift of ’ > y in the target Semitic language – or a mistake in the ancient transcription process. Indeed, Isbell has noted the alternation between these phonemes in the

967 For ihw, see Wb. 1, 118 and W. Albright, The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography (New Haven, 1934), 33. For hiw see Wb. 2, 484. If the placename is attributed to hiw it could only be explained by an i-prefix, for which see W. Schenkel, ‘Zum hamitosemitischen ?a-Präfix im Ägyptischen’, LingAeg 3 (1993), 153-154 and R. Gundacker, STUDIEN ZU GENSE GE UND INNERER CHRONOLOGISCHER SICHTUNG DER PYRAMIDENTEXTE (University of Vienna, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, 2009), 165 n. 1094 who gives examples such as isbr ‘thicket’ < sbr ‘branch’. Examples are also given in F. Breyer, ‘Die ägyptische Etymologie von griechisch ἔλεφας = «Elefant» und lateinisch ebur «Elfenbein»’, in S. Bickel & A. Loprieno (eds), Basel Egyptology Prize (Basel, 2003), 263. The prefix does not usually manifest itself as the yodh-digraph.

968 The Wörterbuch registers no examples of ihw with w until the Eighteenth Dynasty.

969 Hoch, Semitic Words, 491 demonstrates that i and w appear too frequently the Execration Texts to be consonants in every case.

970 Hoch, Semitic Words, 492-495; El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 155 favours ?hwjw/. One must remark that El-Sayed’s example of ḫtk for Beja (p. 156-157) has a good correspondent in Coptic personal name ḫta ṭuk, but still one cannot be certain here that the original phoneme was /ʔ/ or /j/, see also El-Sayed, SAKE 32, 358-361.

971 For ihw, see Wb. 1, 118 and W. Albright, The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography (New Haven, 1934), 33. For hiw see Wb. 2, 484. If the placename is attributed to hiw it could only be explained by an i-prefix, for which see W. Schenkel, ‘Zum hamitosemitischen ?a-Präfix im Ägyptischen’, LingAeg 3 (1993), 153-154 and R. Gundacker, STUDIEN ZU GENSE GE UND INNERER CHRONOLOGISCHER SICHTUNG DER PYRAMIDENTEXTE (University of Vienna, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, 2009), 165 n. 1094 who gives examples such as isbr ‘thicket’ < sbr ‘branch’. Examples are also given in F. Breyer, ‘Die ägyptische Etymologie von griechisch ἔλεφας = «Elefant» und lateinisch ebur «Elfenbein»’, in S. Bickel & A. Loprieno (eds), Basel Egyptology Prize (Basel, 2003), 263. The prefix does not usually manifest itself as the yodh-digraph.

972 Hoch, Semitic Words, 492-495; El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 155 favours ?hwjw/. One must remark that El-Sayed’s example of ḫtk for Beja (p. 156-157) has a good correspondent in Coptic personal name ḫta ṭuk, but still one cannot be certain here that the original phoneme was /ʔ/ or /j/, see also El-Sayed, SAK 32, 358-361.


974 D. Sivan, S. Cochavi-Rainey, West Semitic Vocabulary in Egyptian Script (Beer-Sheva, 1992), 16 cites an example of Egyptians writing the loanword 3 ṭ ← i of ybr from an original Semitic ybr ‘metal vessel’. Note also the alternative writings of the Semitic loan ybšt ‘biscuit’ alternatively as 3 ← r or 3 ← y, from a possible root yb ‘dry’. Other examples in Canaanite words are mentioned in Ryholt, The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period, 100 n. 322. Lipinski, Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar, 147, 149 cites conditions under which initial ’ is replaced by  or ; cf. Arabic ra’is ‘head’ for later rayyis. Y. Elitzur, Ancient
Tetragrammaton ('hyh and yhwh'). However, it is easier to relate this initial '/ʔ/ to another process. Franci has illustrated the many instances of the prefix 'a- in Semitic placenames in the contemporaneous Execration Texts, which he analyses as the elative case 'aqtal-um'. Thus, if this approach is taken, there is an underlying root hwj/hw' in the name. This could be attributable to Semitic hyh 'to be' or more likely hwj/hw' I 'to blow' (also with meanings of 'wind, chasm') or hwj 'to fall'. All these roots have been connected with the Tetragrammaton by various Semiticists, with most favouring the verb 'to be'. Given the lack of contemporary Canaanite texts, it is extremely difficult to equate this placename with the Tetragrammaton. One therefore needs to reckon with the likelihood that Ihwiw may simply mean 'windy-place' or alike, this being preferable in a toponym than an abstract notion of 'to be'. These senses are perhaps to be favoured as it requires no unknown phonetic shifts, and is geographically appropriate for a Sinai locale.

**Location (II):** All that is known of this toponym is its relationship with mining activity [51.1]. The toponym is the origin of bi3 psD 'shining-ore', although no scholar has ventured to guess the geological identity of this expression. The word psD as an adjectival attribute is most commonly used of the sun in Egyptian texts. Therefore, the mineral in question probably exhibited a shining or reflective quality when exposed to light. As most of the other toponyms in the stele are associated with the Sinai [52.1], it would seem likely that Ihwiw was part of Khety’s itinerary in this region, although some scholars have favoured locating this toponym in Africa for unspecified reasons. Plausibly, Ihwiw could refer to mines further in the interior of the Sinai, beyond the

---

*Placenames in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem, 2004), 298 notes alternations of ' and y in biblical placenames, but concludes this is related to developments in literary Arabic.

973 C. Isbell, 'Initial 'alef-yod Interchange Selected Biblical Passages', *JNES* 37 (1978), 227-236. Isbell explains that 'hyh is the first person form of the more regular third person yhwh.


975 A. Murtonen, *Hebrew in its West Semitic Setting* (Leiden, 1988), I, 156 has a number of semantically diverse cognates in various Semitic languages with the sense 'to fall, to be, to dwell, to blow'. For connections between Arabic hwj and discussions of Yahweh, see R. Bowman, 'Yahweh the speaker', *JNES* 3 (1944), 5; W. Ward, 'The Semitic Root hwj in Ugaritic and Derived Stems in Egyptian', *JNES* 28 (1969), 265-267; E. Knauf, 'Yahweh', *Vetus Testamentum* 34 (1984), 467-472. The Arabic root hwj has the sense of 'wind, empty space, outdoors' – note also the related word hawiya 'chasm, gulf, abyss'; see H. Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, 1040 and cognates of hawa in Zammit, *A Comparative Lexical Study of Qur’anic Arabic*, 423.


977 For psD and its senses, see P. Lacau, 'Le verbes wbn «poindre» et psD «culminero»', *BIFAO* 69 (1971), 5-8.

978 Zibelius, *AOVN*, 90 and El-Sayed, *Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz*, 155 cite no evidence for this location. *HWb*, 1311 has mistakenly entered this placename twice, one African (Ihi), and another from Khety’s Theban Stele (Ihwiw), even though they have identical orthographies. Presumably, this
Egyptian mines at Serabit (which are known by other names), such as Watia, Wadi Reqeita, Wadi el-Ahmar, or Gebel Samra.\textsuperscript{979} Most of these mines are dated to the early third millennium BCE, but tuyères at Wadi Ahmar have been favourably compared to Middle and Late Bronze Age (2100-1500BCE) parallels at Feinan and Timna,\textsuperscript{980} while Rothenberg reported Old Kingdom pottery and New Kingdom tuyères at nearby Reqeita.\textsuperscript{981} Any of these sites in the central Sinai would be a perfect fit for Khety’s journey and the location of \textit{Ihwiw}. It is worth mentioning that a modern Arabic toponym with a similar name and root to \textit{Ihwiw, Naqb el-Hawa} ‘Pass of the Wind’, still exists in the environs of central Sinai, right next to the EB II settlement of Sheikh ‘Awad and 10 km from the copper smelters at Watia and Gebel Ahmar.\textsuperscript{982}

\textbf{Classification:} +Semitic (7.1)

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
[52] & \includegraphics[width=1cm]{Idm.png} & \textit{Idm} & */ʔdm/* \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textbf{Etymology (I):} \textit{Idm} is not an Egyptian word, but most likely Semitic in origin, usually being treated as identical to biblical Edom אֱדוֹם.\textsuperscript{983} Similar toponyms with different orthographies appear in the Sheshonq list as \textit{Idmt} and \textit{Idm}, but their relationship to the biblical placename or this placename from pAnastasi VI is not known \textsuperscript{52.1}.\textsuperscript{984} Etymologically most scholars have cited the connection between this placename and the Semitic root ‘dm ‘red’ with semantic extensions to ‘earth’ and ‘deserts’.\textsuperscript{985}

\textbf{Location (I):} In Egyptian sources, the placename only occurs in pAnastasi VI \textsuperscript{52.1}, where it is the origin of a group of Shasu pastoralists. Most scholars have taken \textit{Idm} to be identical with the

\begin{itemize}
\item error originated by Hannig entering the toponym in Zibelius’s volume (Afrikanisches Orts- und Völkernamen) separately to that of Khety’s stele.
\item For traces of Bronze Age and early Iron Age mining in the Central Sinai and Wadi Reqeita, see B. Rothenberg, ‘Verhüttung’, in LÄ VI, 997; and B. Rothenberg, ‘Researches in the southern Arabah 1959-1990’, Arx 2-3 (1996-97), 17, where it suggested that the smelting technology at site 590 may have been introduced by Egyptians. For a thorough survey of smelting sites throughout the central Sinai, see Abdel-Motelib et al., \textit{Metalla} 19, 3-28. Although the mines further afield at Wadi Feinan were probably active in this period, they are known under the name &A-^Asw-PAwnw; see Görg, \textit{Biblische Notizen} 19, 15-21.
\item Abdel-Motelib et al., \textit{Metalla} 19, 26. For the chronology of the sites, see also K. Pfeiffer, ‘Archaeometallurgy in Sinai. The Innovation of Copper Metallurgy’, in S. Burmeister, S. Hansen, M. Kunst & N. Müller-Scheel (eds), \textit{Metal Matters: Innovative Technologies and Social Change in Prehistory and Antiquity} (Leidorf, 2013), 91-103.
\item B. Rothenberg, \textit{Sinai: Pharaohs, Miners, Pilgrims and Soldiers} (Berne, 1979), 164.
\item The placename is located at (28.616667, 33.916667), 1 km from the EB II site at Sheikh ‘Awad, for which see I. Beit-Arieh, ‘An Early Bronze Age II site near Sheikh ‘Awad in Southern Sinai’, \textit{Tel Aviv} 8 (1981), 95-127.
\item Albright, \textit{The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography}, 66; Lipinski, \textit{On the Skirts of Canaan}, 364.
\item For the Semitic roots behind the variant \textit{Idm(m)} toponyms in the Topographical Lists, see also the interpretations in Lipinski, \textit{On the Skirts of Canaan}, 118-119, 126-127.
\item E. Knauf, ‘Edom’, in K. van der Toorn, B. Becking & P. van der Horst (eds), \textit{Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible} (Leiden, 1999), 274. For the Hebrew rod, see I. Halayqa, \textit{Comparative Lexicon of Ugaritic and Canaanite} (Münster, 2008), 94.
\end{itemize}
biblical territorial entity, stretching from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Aqaba, and from the Negev to Moab. However, this view has been questioned. Goedicke pointed out the distance between the Arabah and the Egyptian frontier is more than 300 km, making it unlikely that these ‘Edomites’ would have travelled to Egypt for pasture. To this end, he suggests that ‘Idm is here used as the Semitic counterpart to Egyptian dšr.t ‘red-land’, and therefore obliquely refers to (any) deserts outside Egypt. But the distance of the Arabah from Egypt is not in itself proof that peoples from the Arabah did not use the Eastern Delta as part of their seasonal pastures. Furthermore, Goedicke gives no reason as to why the scribe of pAnastasi VI would choose to write a Semitic word for ‘desert’, rather than Egyptian dšr.t. Indeed, as the Shasu always inhabited semi-arid regions of Sinai and Edom, there would be little value in saying ‘Shasu from Red-Land’. Rather, the textual context demands a specific placename following Shasu. Ultimately, given that other biblical placenames are known in contemporary Egyptian documents (see [66]), it is quite likely that ‘Idm refers to the same region of the Wadi Arabah and Transjordan as it does in the Old Testament.

Classification: +Semitic (7.1)

Etymology (I): Most scholars have been compelled to connect this toponym with the Tetragrammaton, and thus the god of the Israelites, although whether this placename can be used as evidence for an early cult of Yahweh seems far from certain. Besides a theophoric

| [53] | Yhw3 (T3-S3w) | *i/hw/ |

---

987 H. Goedicke, ‘Papyrus Anastasi VI 51-61’, SAK 14 (1987), 89-91. Goedicke’s assertion that the Shasu were only permitted into Egyptian territory for ‘one-day’ is unfounded. The letter does not specify the length of their stay, but rather the dates on which the border was open to the Shasu, for which see Ward, JESHO 15, 52, where this document is compared with the Semna Dispatches as a report on border movements.
988 For the boundaries of biblical Edom, see the essay in D. Edelman, ‘Edom, a Historical Geography’, in D. Edelman (ed.), You Shall not Abhor an Edomite for He is Your Brother: Edom and Seir in History and Tradition (Atlanta, 1995), 2-5.
989 For positive identifications with the Israelite god, see Giveon, Vetus Testamentum 14 (1964), 244; Helck, Vetus Testamentum 18, 478; Lipinski, On the Skirts of Canaan, 364-365; T. Levy, ‘Pastoral Nomads and Iron Age Metal Production in Ancient Edom’, in Szuchman (ed.), Nomads, Tribes and the State in the Ancient Near East, 161. D. Redford, Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times (Princeton, 1992), 272-273 is almost certain that this toponym is a reference to an ‘enclave revering this god’. Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms, 122 cites the placename as the location of the worshippers of the ‘god of Israel’, but Goedicke, JSSEA 24, 24-27 ultimately declines a connection with the Hebrew god. T. Schneider, ‘The First Documented occurrence of the God Yahweh? (Book of the Dead Princeton, Roll 5)’, JANER 7 (2007), 113-120 has published a personal name Itr'ā-yāh ‘My lord is the Shepherd of Yah’. Other broadly contemporaneous references to Yahweh include a Babylonian ledger from the Sealand Dynasty (c. 1500 BCE), which may record the deity (ia-ii) in a compound personal name, see S. Dalley, Babylonian Tablets from the Sealand Dynasty in the Schoyen Collection (Bethesda, Maryland, 2009), 3-4, 72. A personal or theophoric name (?) Yw is recorded in the Baal Cycle of Ugarit (c. 1400-1250 BCE), for which see M. Smith, The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Introduction
connection, the placename could easily be a patronymic personal name, hence tribal name, or an original toponym. Phonetically, there are no obstacles in identifying this placename with the Canaanite-Israelite god. Egyptian š in ‘group-writing’ often had a zero value or is more debatably vocalic, and all the other consonants in this word are regular correspondences between Egyptian and Semitic. This connection seems further likely given that Hebrew and Aramaic inscriptions do preserve an abbreviated form of the Tetragrammaton, Yhw, in a variety of texts. Semiticists and biblical scholars have generally analysed the god’s etymology from the Hebrew verb *hyh ‘to be’ via a causative imperfect (Hiphil Stem), although there is by no means a consensus on this etymology. The base of the theophoric name has been reconstructed as the causative imperfect *yahwiyu, whereby the –iyu ending reduces to –h to become Yahweh. This YhwA could well be the same placename as Ihwiw [51], mentioned circa 700 years earlier, but this can also not be proven.

Location (II): The toponym is found only in the Topographical Lists inscribed on the temples at Amara West, Soleb, and possibly Medinet Habu [53.1-4]. Unlike the Shasu land of Sfr [66] which can be associated with a specific region, T3-Šš.w YhwA could be located anywhere within the

990 These possibilities are outlined by M. Astour, ‘Yahweh in Egyptian Topographical lists’, in Görg & Pusch (eds), Festschrift Elmar Edel, 30. Schneider, JANER 7, 119 in the personal name Tinrīyḥ suggests that ‘Yah’ may be a toponym rather than the god’s name.
991 Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 141, 219-222. Even though it was probably the intention of the scribe to note vowels, following Peust, I find it unlikely that group-writing unambiguously represented vowels, especially in C3 biliterals.
992 These inscriptions are all of much later date than the Egyptian toponym, see B. Porten, Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony (Cambridge, Berkeley, 1968), 105-121. A. Millard, ‘YW and YHW names’, Vetus Testamentum 30 (1980), 208-212 identifies many Yhw personal names in Hebrew epigraphy from the eighth century BCE onwards, attributing the alternation between Yw and Yhw in the epigraphy as due to ‘scribal inconsistency’.
993 This argument mainly stems from the passage Exodus 3:14, where Yahweh refers to himself as ‘I am that I am’, see the extensive lexical arguments in favour of this etymology in G. Parke-Taylor, Yahweh: The Divine Name in the Bible (Waterloo, 1975), 51-62; F. Cross, ‘Yahweh and the god of the patriarchs’, Harvard Theological Review 55 (1962) 252-253 n. 122; R. de Veaux, ‘The Revelation of the Divine name YHWH’, in J. Durham & J. Porter (eds), Proclamation and Presence: Old Testament Essays in Honour of Gwynne Henton Davies (London, 1970), 56-62. Rainey noted that the verb *hyh is an isogloss of Aramaic, Arabic, Hebrew, and Moabite and not the coastal languages of Phoenician or Ugaritic which use kwn; Rainey, Israel Exploration Journal 57, 53, 55. But, the existence of both these roots in Proto-Semitic mean that it is impossible to identify YHWH’s name with a particular ethno-linguistic group, see J. Hackett & N. Pat-El, ‘On Canaanite and historical linguistics: A rejoinder to Anson Rainey’, Maarav 17 (2010), 182. The ‘to be’ etymology is not without its problems either: K. van der Toorn ‘Yahweh’, in K. van der Toorn, B. Becking & P. van der Horst (eds), Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible, 915-916 favours the explanation from hwy ‘to blow’ relating Yahweh to a storm god. Knauf, Vetus Testamentum 34, 467-472 warns against using specifically Northwest Semitic roots to explain a god who is possibly Edomite, thus favouring Arabic roots like hwy ‘to blow’. In the study of the vocalisation of the divine name, J. Tropper, ‘Der Gottesname *Yahwa’, Vetus Testamentum 51 (2001), 93 doubts all these verbal etymologies and instead opts for a reduplicated stem wah-wah of uncertain meaning.
sphere of the Shasu in Sinai, Negev, Edom, Midian, or southern Palestine. As this word occurs solely in lists, it seems that it refers to a specific place, but it is also possible that it refers to a tribal group who roamed within the T3-Š3s.w. Reading the list of five T3-Š3s.w placenames in the Amara West list [53.3], it seems that each of the final qualifiers refer to unique regions and/or tribes within Edom, Sinai and generally southern Palestine. Since toponyms with this type of epexegesis are unique in Egyptian geographical lists, it is not apparent why they were used only with the Š3s.w and not with other nomadic ethnica (e.g. Ŧhn.w, Mdl3.y). It is uncertain if the Medinet Habu instance of Yhw [53.5] is the same toponym since, despite the phonetic similarities, it is listed with more northerly names like Rhb, near Beth-Shan.

If one equates Yhw with a biblical toponym connected with Yahweh’s cult, the location is still ultimately unclear. Ahituv, following the thesis of Jarvis, equated Yhw with the region of Kadesh Barnea (modern Ayn el-Qudeirat/Ayn Qadis) and Jebel Hilal. Lipinski locates the biblical Mount Yahwe ‘Mountain of the LORD’, and implicitly the Egyptian Yhw, with Midian, due to the allusion of ‘Mount Yahwe’ in Numbers 10: 33. There are a number of biblical passages, namely Deuteronomy 33:2-3, Judges 4:5, Psalm 68:8-9, Habakuk, 3:3-7, in addition to the ĜAjrud texts, where YHWH is generally associated with the southerly regions (from the Canaanite perspective) of Sinai, Mount Paran, Seir, Teman, and Kadesh. These texts have been generally analysed as relating to the southern ‘theophany’ of Yahweh. Biblical scholarship abounds with a number of theories as to the location of these placenames and their relationship to Yahweh’s cult. There are manifold difficulties, then, in locating Yhw and judging whether the name itself is the earliest evidence of Yahweh’s cult. In summary, both Egyptian and biblical traditions would broadly be in agreement in placing a Yahweh-placename in the area of Sinai-Edom, the region which was inhabited by Shasu nomads and evoked in the theophany of Yahweh.

Classification: +Semitic (7.1)

---

995 For the sphere of influence of the Shasu, see Giveon, Les bédouins Shosou des documents égyptiens, 234-239.
996 For the location of Rhb, see Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms, 164-165.
997 Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms, 122.
998 Lipinski, On the Skirts of Canaan, 366. It is unclear what precisely Lipinski sees as explicit in this passage regarding Mount Yahwe’s location in Midian.
1000 For a summary and historiography of these places and their locations, see P. Maibnerger, ‘Sinay’, in G. Botterweck, H. Ringgren & H.-J. Fabry (eds), Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament 10 (Stuttgart, 1999), 222-235.
Etymology (I): Contextually, as this placename appears as a copper mine associated with the Sinai, the word is probably Semitic. The Egyptian t may represent a number of dental stops in Semitic words such as t, d, and t.\footnote{Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 436-437.} The most promising cognate is Semitic ‘tg, a root which can mean ‘to pass (of space, time)’ or ‘old, perennial, good’.\footnote{Halayqa, *A Comparative Lexicon of Ugaritic and Canaanite*, 94. H. Schmoldt, ‘‘tg; ’ṭtg; ’ṭṭtg; ’ṭāq’, in J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren & H.-J. Fabry (eds), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament XI* (Grand Rapids, 2001), 456-458 also registers an adjectival meaning of ‘fine’ or ‘abundant’. Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions*, 405 reports many instances of ‘tg in Safaitic and Thamudic personal names. There is also a root ‘ṭq ‘branch, hedge’, but the only unequivocal instances come from Ethiosemitic, except for Syriac ‘dq ‘grapes’; see Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez*, 75.} Issues could be taken with the equivalence of Egyptian k for Semitic q as one would expect Egyptian k for a Semitic emphatic, although Egyptian k for Semitic q is an attested, albeit rare, correspondence.\footnote{See M. Görg, ‘Zum Wechsel k/q in ägyptischen Transkriptionen’, *JEA* 63 (1977), 178-180 and Muchiki, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*, 319. W. Ward, ‘Notes on Egyptian Group-Writing’, JNES 16 (1957), 200-201 lists four examples of Egyptian roots with interchanging k and q, all in initial position.} In some Egyptian loanwords in Aramaic, Egyptian k is represented with qoph (ח) and Muchiki cites an inner Semitic shift of k > q in final and initial positions.\footnote{Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 436.} As early as 1883, Samuel Birch connected this placename with biblical Athak of 1 Samuel 30, 30.\footnote{S. Birch, *Egypt from the earliest times to B.C. 300* (New York, 1875), 151. Later espoused in M. Görg, ‘Der biblische Name des Kupferminengebietes von Timna’, *Biblische Notizen* 65 (1992), 5-8.} It has been stated that this placename survives to the present day and Nibbi associated it with the mountain massif west of Suez called Gebel ‘Attaqa, which, while phonetically possible, cannot be recommended from locational analysis.\footnote{A. Nibbi, ‘A note on Atika/Attaka/Taka and Copper’, *DE* 32 (1995), 67-74.} But, in the environs of Timna, where this toponym is located, there are two modern placenames, Har ‘Eteq and Nahal ‘Eteq, only 3 km west of the Egyptian Hathor shrine, which may be the modern reflexes of this name.

Location (I): Since the expedition to ‘tk in pHarris I \footnote{Görg, *Biblische Notizen* 65, 5-8; B. Rothenberg, *Timna: Valley of the Biblical Copper Mines* (1972), 201; L. Dan, ‘Expedition to Atika’, in F. Esmael (ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference on ancient Egyptian mining & metallurgy and conservation of metallic artifacts* (Cairo, 1995), 365-378; Giveon, *JARCE*, 52-53; Tebes, *Cahiers Caribéens d’Égyptologie* 9, 80; T. Hikade, ‘Economic aspects of the New Kingdom: the expeditions to the copper mines of the Sinai’, *BACE* 9 (1998), 46.} makes it explicit that ‘tk could be accessed by both land and sea, and that it was a copper mine, it is more or less certain that it is to be located in the region of Timna.\footnote{S. Birch, *Egypt from the earliest times to B.C. 300* (New York, 1875), 151. Later espoused in M. Görg, ‘Der biblische Name des Kupferminengebietes von Timna’, *Biblische Notizen* 65 (1992), 5-8.} This is the only proximal copper deposit outside Egypt easily accessed by both maritime and overland routes. Furthermore, the next campaign listed in pHarris I is to the nearby turquoise mines in South Sinai, so it is possible that the overland members of this journey returned to Egypt via Serabit el-Khadem. Egyptian mining operations at...
Timna probably began in the mid- to late New Kingdom, and therefore this expedition of Ramesses III matches with the local archaeological evidence. From the pHarris I expedition, it is clear that ṣḥ was the area of the mines themselves, but probably also designated the surrounding lands around the head of the Gulf of Aqaba.

**Discussion:** If this location is correct, it is possible that ṣḥ also referred to the port at Tell el-Kheleifeh. However, the local ceramic material at this site is ambiguous on a Ramesside-Iron Age I occupation, but the site did produce Qurayya ware which dates roughly to this period. At the nearby isle of Geziret Faraʿun, surface finds of Qurayya ware led Rothenberg to date the site to Iron Age I. He also identified slag connected with local smelting operations. It is possible that either Tell el-Kheleifeh or Geziret Faraʿun are the location of Solomon’s Red Sea port of Ezion-Geber and also the landing place of this Ramesside copper expedition.

**Classification:** +Semitic (7.1)

---

**Etymology (II):** The meaning and etymology of the word biˁ biˁ is debated, with most scholars following the Wörterbuch’s definition of ‘mine’. It seems that the consonant sequence b-i-A masks a number of different unrelated roots and therefore one should not be quick to dismiss one theory vis-à-vis another. While Graefe doubted the existence of a meaning ‘mine’ for biˁ, in favour of a more collective ‘Erzgebiet’, etymologically, biˁ is a perfect cognate for Semitic

1008 The youngest stratum at the Timna temple is Twenty-Second Dynasty in date, but the main phase is Stratum II (Ramesses III-Ramesses V), when enclosure walls and furnaces were built; see Hikade, BACE 9, 47-48.


1010 For the debates on the earliest levels at Tell el-Kheleifeh, see G. Pratico, Nelson Glueck’s 1938-1940 Excavations at Tell el-Kheleifeh: A Reappraisal (Atlanta, 1993), 71-72 who cites no unequivocal material before the eighth century BCE. On account of the Qurayya ware at Kheleifeh the site’s earliest occupation could be around Iron Age I, see B. Rothenberg & J. Glass, ‘The Midianite Pottery’, in J. Sawyer & D. Clines (eds), Midian, Moab and Edom (Sheffield, 1983), 76; Parr, ‘Pottery from the late Second Millennium B.C. from North West Arabia and its Historical Implications’, in Potts (ed.), Araby the Blest: Studies in Arabian Archaeology (1988), 75.


1012 Wb. 1, 438.

1013 E. Graefe, Untersuchungen zur Wortfamilie biˁ (Cologne, 1971), 9-90 and A. Lloyd, Review of E. Graefe, Untersuchungen zur Wortfamilie biˁ (Cologne, 1971), JEA 59 (1973), 241-243. Both scholars stress the connection of the root to ‘ore’ and ‘ore-area’ rather than the idea of ‘mine’. A serious problem with the semantic progression of this root, however, is that many of the differing meanings of biˁ can be traced to different Afroasiatic roots (for example the comparanda identified for biˁ ‘sich entfernen’, biˁ ‘Erz’, biˁ ‘Bergwerk’, biˁ ‘heaven, firmament’, biˁ ‘to wonder, to marvel at’, in EDE II, 122-137) and thus the many different biˁ-words are not necessarily related.

1014 Graefe does identify a meaning ‘Wasserloch’, see Graefe, Untersuchungen zur Wortfamilie biˁ, 35-37, 79-80.
bi’r ‘well, cistern’ or verbal sense ‘to dig’.\(^{1015}\) It is plausible that toponymic Biβ instead derives from biβ ‘ore’, an Egyptian root with its own set of Afroasiatic cognates.\(^{1016}\) Balanda prefers to treat biβ in some contexts as ‘wondrous/remote country’, presumably relating it to the verbal root biβ(i) ‘to marvel’ or with a debatably separate root biβ(i) ‘be far from’.\(^{1017}\) Thus, the semantics of this term are rather unclear and could possibly mean: 1) ‘Mining-country’ from a deverbative of ‘to dig’ > ‘mine’; or perhaps 2) ‘wondrous-(country)/far(-country)’. Others scholars who recognise that biβ in Egyptian texts often refers to ore-bearing regions, use translations like ‘Bergwerk’ or ‘Erzgebiet’.\(^{1018}\) Even though it is commonly written with plural strokes and/or -w, the word is singular in number, as it is qualified by the masculine singular demonstrative pn and in one text it is evoked resumptively with the masculine singular dependent pronoun sw ‘it’ [55.1].\(^{1019}\) Therefore, the -w ending must be treated as a nominalisation of a verbal root, and not as a pluralised noun ‘mines’.

The word biβ(.w) in the Sinai inscriptions is frequently qualified with the demonstrative pn [55.4-9, 55.11-12], so it is certain that an individual turquoise mine could be termed a biβ.w. Elsewhere in Egypt, the word biβ.t is used for ore-bearing locales in Wadi Allaqi, Umm Huweitat, and a region east of Aswan,\(^{1020}\) although the morphological interchange of .w and .t is puzzling. In the Duties of the Vizier, the phrase biβ.t nb.t is used in a context that must indefinitely refer to ‘any mine/mining-region’.\(^{1021}\) As there are instances of other toponyms which use biβ(.w/t) as a generic term for individual mines, it seems likely that biβ(.w) in certain textual contexts could specifically refer to the Sinai as the ‘mining-Region’ par excellence [55.1-2]. It is therefore possible that this

\(^{1015}\) Takács, EDE II, 122 supposes a semantic shift of ‘pit’ > ‘mine’. In other Afroasiatic cognates this is a verbal root ‘to dig, bore’. The best example of this ‘mine’ meaning is perhaps the Stele of Sa-Hathor (BM EA 569), which has iri.n = biβ m nbw r iir.t nbw ‘I made a mine in my youth, and I pressed the chiefs to wash gold’; see Birch, ZÄS 12, 112.

\(^{1016}\) EDE III, 123-126.


\(^{1018}\) Most works in this seem to follow Gardiner’s initial meaning ‘mineral country’, given in Gardiner, JEA 4, 36. See Wb. 1, 438 ‘Bergwerk’; HWb, 246 ‘mine, Bergwerk’; Faulkner, CDME, 80 ‘mining region’. Note also the presumably related biβ.t (Wb. 1, 438) as ‘Steinbruch’.

\(^{1019}\) For plural strokes in singular deverbative nouns, see W. Schenkel, ‘Die Nominalbildungslehre und die Realität der hieroglyphischen Graphien’, LingAeg 13 (2005), 165-170.

\(^{1020}\) There is a šdi(.t) biβ.t in the context of Wadi Allaqi, a known gold-mining region, see Helck, SAK 8, 120 who translates it as ‘Steinbruchszisterne’. There is a debatable instance of biβ.t ‘mine’, in Sadek, The Amethyst Mining Inscriptions of Wadi el-Hudi, II, 7, but the use of biβ.t on an inscription in a mine-shaft clenches the matter somewhat, see Vikentiev, ASAЕ 54, 179-189. One might also note an inscription at Wadi Shalul (Wadi Umm ‘Awad) recorded by Green in PSBA 31, pl. 32 (and also published by Rothe, Miller & Rapp, Pharaonic Inscriptions from the southern Eastern Desert of Egypt, 231), which reads biβ.t šfr iri.t im.w-ntrer n(y) Nhht nbw ‘The mayor and overseer of priests of Nekhbet, Renny, coming in order to make a mine in order to bring gold’. Rothe’s reading of biβ as bhs ‘stone’ does not semantically hold - ‘make stone (?)’ - nor is it orthographically suitable for the epigraphy.

\(^{1021}\) ir grt biβ.t nb.t iir.t nb.w;r = [m]t.tw il.t im = ‘Now as for every mine, and every going to it, (when) the things (of the mine) are inspected in it’, following the interpretation in G. van den Boorn, The Duties of the Vizier (New York, 1988), 193-197.
Placename only occurred in the local dialect of Sinai expeditionaries. Therefore, as bi3i ‘to be far’ or bi3i ‘to marvel’ do not make textual sense in the Sinai inscriptions, one must conclude that the meaning of Bi3.w is ‘mine’. It might be possible that Egyptian originally had a verbal root bi3(i) ‘to dig’ (cf. Arabic ba’ra ‘dig a well’) thus producing the nomen loci bi3.w ‘digging(-place)’, hence ‘mine’, while the original verbal root became moribund or is textually unattested.

Location (I): If such a meaning is secure, it cannot be certain that in all cases Bi3.w is strictly a toponym rather than a general term for any mine. Complicating matters is the paucity of references to a specific Sinai Bi3-toponym outside the inscriptions in the Sinai. The bi3 mentioned in the Shipwrecked Sailor may be located elsewhere on the Red Sea, and the bi3 of Sa-Hathor is not a toponym, leaving the biography of Khety and the Ayn Soukhnah text as the only sources for a toponymic Bi3.w in the Sinai [55.1-2]. Khety mentions that he inspected Bi3.w after ‘going around’ the hill-countries of Tnht. This reading suggests that Bi3 in this text is a toponym, like Tjenhet, as both placenames occur in sequential clauses as the object of the verbs mAA ‘to see’ and dbn ‘go around’. From its textual context, Bi3.w in the Ayn Soukhna inscription also demands a certain toponymic proper noun sense. Hoffmeier reasoned correctly that Bi3 would only refer to the mining region on the west coast of the Sinai, and not the peninsula as a whole.

Discussion: The toponym has caused much confusion in the scholarship, especially due to the presence of the appellation Bi3-Pwnt [82]. Sayed showed that this was a genitive (Bia of Punt), not a conjunctive (Bia and Punt), and hence Bi3-Pwnt locationally has nothing to do with Sinai. Gundacker suggests that Bi3.w replaces Mfk.t as the name for the Sinai, and indeed Bi3.w is only present in Middle Kingdom inscriptions, so it might be that Bi3.w was the new name for the mining region, only to fall out of use again in the New Kingdom. One of the entries for this toponym, Bi3.w n.(y) nsw-bi.ty Hpr-K3-R°.w [55.2], could be a separate toponym, dependent on whether one understands n as a genitive or dative. Tallet favours a toponymic sense, based on a parallel Bi3 n.(y) ity [55.3]. However, based purely on philological arguments, it is impossible to determine the meaning of the phrase.

Classification: +Egyptian (2.1)

1022 Gundacker, LingAeg 19, 49.
1023 For the Arabic verb, see Wehr, A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, 39.
1024 Birch, ZAŠ 12, 112.
1025 Hoffmeier, Ancient Israel in Sinai, 39.
1027 Gundacker, LingAeg 19, 49.
1028 It is translated as ‘du roi’ in Tallet, La zone minière pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï, I, doc. 220 and ‘pour le roi’ in Abd el-Raziq, Castel, Tallet & Ghica, Les inscriptions d’Ayn Soukhnna, 55, 57.
**Etymology (I):** The toponym is an indirect genitive between Bi3 and ity, with the latter usually translated as ‘sovereign’.\(^{1029}\) Given the expeditionary nature of the Shipwrecked Sailor [55.3], the most appropriate translation is ‘mine of the sovereign’ or perhaps ‘mining-region of the sovereign’. Only Posener dissents from this translation, taking the n as the preposition – ‘mine for the sovereign’.\(^{1030}\) In view of the fact that, in line 90 of the text [55.3], the protagonist replies to the snake with \(\text{ink p}w\ h\tilde{b}.kwi r\ bi3\ m\ wpw.t\ ity\) ‘(As for) me, I have descended to Bi\(\alpha\) on a mission of the sovereign’, one should take his view seriously and it is difficult to decide between these meanings.\(^{1031}\)

**Location (III):** Bi\(\tilde{b}\) n(.y) ity appears in one of two parallel clauses, both introduced by statives: after going (\(\text{Sm.kwi}\)) to Bi\(\tilde{b}\) n(.y) Ity, the protagonist descends (\(h\tilde{b}.kwi\)) on the ocean (\(w\tilde{d}-w\tilde{r}\)) in a boat. The text describes a maritime landscape, where there is a storm and an island, on which the protagonist encounters the ruler of Punt – the giant snake. Such an environment was no doubt inspired by the Red Sea, and thus this placename must be ‘imagined’ as being in this seascape. However, although the text gives us little indication as to where this Bi\(\tilde{b}\) is, the Sinai is generally considered the likely location.\(^{1032}\) Bradbury, on account of the fact that the sailor was en-route to a Bi\(\tilde{b}\) when he was shipwrecked (line 90) on an island, associated it with Punt and identified Bi\(\tilde{b}\) n(.y) Ity with the toponym Bi\(\tilde{b}\)-Pwnt [82].\(^{1033}\) The crucial piece of evidence for her is line 168 of the text, where the snake-deity remarks that it will take two months to reach Egypt (\(h\tilde{n}w\) ‘the interior’). The protagonist never reaches this Bi\(\tilde{b}\), and is instead shipwrecked en-route to the mine and transported by ship north (line 172) to the residence after a boat appears. Thus, the operative Bi\(\tilde{b}\), as Bradbury and Posener point out, may be further south along the Red Sea coast. However, it is also plausible that the placename could be the same as Bi\(\tilde{b}.w\) ‘Sinai’.\(^{1034}\) Given the imagined geography present in the Shipwrecked Sailor, it would be dangerous to say more on its location. It is likely that the toponym was never meant to be more than a literary device.

**Discussion:** Whether this is a ‘real’ place rests upon the understanding of reality in the Shipwrecked Sailor. The story mentions real locations such as Punt, but dramatic episodes, particularly the sailors’ encounter with the giant snake, are too fantastic to consider the tale as a

---

\(^{1029}\) Wb. 1, 143.

\(^{1030}\) G. Posener, ‘Le canal du Nil à la Mer Rouge avant les Ptolémées’, CdÉ 13 (1938), 267.

\(^{1031}\) For the text, see A. Blackman, *Middle Egyptian Stories* (Bruxelles, 1932), 44.

\(^{1032}\) As Gardiner pointed out, a similar placename, bi3-nb\(\tilde{w}\) ‘the mine of my lord’, is known from a local text in the Sinai; see Gardiner, *JEA* 4, 36 n. 4; Wainwright, *JEA* 32, 31.

\(^{1033}\) Bradbury, *JARCE* 25, 139 n. 59.

As Enmarch notes, the story ‘departs entirely from concrete geographical reality’, and some of the geographical elements, such as the fertile nature of the island, seem fictitious in a Red Sea context. As the placename occurs in a piece of narrative literature, it is worth noting that no historical king is mentioned in the text (unlike, for example, Amenemhat and Senwosret in the Story of Sinuhe). This explains the use of the more general *ity ‘sovereign’ instead of a specific royal name and gives the story a sense of timelessness by not anchoring it to a particular reign or epoch. If this approach applies to the placename as well, it may have been envisioned as belonging to a particular king, i.e. ‘Mine of Senwosret’, but was replaced by a generalised *ity ‘sovereign’ when the name no longer suited the timeless perspective of the story.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (2.1+6.2)

---


1036 Enmarch, ‘Of spice and mine’, in Hagen, Johnston, Monkhouse & Piquette (eds), Narratives of Egypt and the ancient Near East: literary and linguistic approaches, 103. See also J. Baines, ‘Interpreting the story of the Shipwrecked Sailor’, JEA 76 (1990), 62, who is stronger in his language, claiming that the island is an ‘explicitly fictional location outside the cosmos, time, and space’.

1037 A similar development may be behind the fortress names on the Way of Horus, which could change name with the accession of a new king, or use a more general ideological term for king like ‘lion’ to replace a particular royal name; see Al-Ayedi, The Inscriptions of the Ways of Horus, 80-84. The elision of royal names in toponyms is treated generally in J. Yoyotte ‘Souvenirs de rois anciens (Toponymie de l’Égypte pharaonique II)’, Comptes rendus du Groupe Linguistique d’Études Chamito-Sémitiques 8 (1957-1960), 73-78. On anonymity in the story, Loprieno comments that this gives the characters a ‘paradigmatic status’; see Loprieno, ‘Travel and Fiction in Egyptian Literature’, in O’Connor & Quirke (eds), Mysterious Lands, 39.

1038 For the gender of placenames, see Allen, Middle Egyptian, 38. Note also the use of the feminine participle *swt.d in [67]. An exception to feminine gender is present in some names, marked by the masculine definite article, such as *Pr-Kf*n; see Al-Ayedi, Ancient Egyptian Geographic Dictionary, 253. Presumably, participles in names were perfective as none of IIIa inf. class verbs are geminated; see Leprohon, The Great Name, 4. Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des domaines funéraires sous l’Ancien Empire égyptien, 71-72 also gives many examples of perfective participles in domain names, but only one example of an imperfective participle.

1039 L. Morenz, Das Hochplateau von Serabit el-Chadim (Berlin, 2014), 51.

**Location (I):** This periphrastic toponym is given as the name of a gallery or mine (ḥl.t). This inscription [56.1] is at ‘Mine II’, south of the temple at Serabit. The mine is just to the east of another named mine, Swdj.t-nfrr = rdj.t-n.t-tm = [67].

**Discussion:** Morenz has identified two images from Sinai no. 124 as enigmatic cryptograms of this placename. The wedjat-eyes communicate the sense of ptr.t ‘to behold’, with the three nfr-signs and the titulary of Hathor (nb.t-mfk3.t) representing nfr.w and Hw.t-Hr respectively (Fig. 18).1042

![Figure 18: Cryptographic writings of the placename Ptr.t-nfr.w-Hw.t-Hr.w in local Sinai inscriptions, after Morenz, Das Hochplateau von Serabit el-Chadim, 51.](image)

**Classification:** +Egyptian (5.1+4.1+6.3)


1042 Morenz, *Das Hochplateau von Serabit el-Chadim*, 51.

1043 Wb. 2, 60.1-4, 5. 86.8-9. For these royal names see von Beckerath, *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen*, 55, 59.

1044 For an example of this, see the tḥ t n.t Syv ‘the dwelling of Sese’ referring to (Rame)sses II, see Al-Ayedy, *The Inscriptions of the Ways of Horus*, 82-83.

**Location (II):** This hapax placename is known only as the location of the mineral bi3-rwd, literally ‘hard-ore/copper’ [57.1]. Harris and others have affirmed that rwd in mineralogical terms may refer to the ‘hardness’ of the stone, but what this means in the terms of cupric minerals is not known. This expression has been phonetically equated with Coptic ḵp̱w ‘brass, bronze’ and thus may refer to an alloy rather than a naturally occurring mineral. If this is the case, the site may well be a smelting site or trading entrepôt, rather than a mine itself. In the context of Khety’s travels to Sinai [57.1] and Ayn Soukhna, this placename likely refers to a place in this region. Therefore, it is probably a mine or smelter located in the Maghara-Serabit area, named after Menkau(hor) or Menkau(re). If the site was connected with Menkauhor it may designate the smelting sites around Seh Nasb, as, based on the pottery finds, the smelting batteries in this area were constructed in the Fifth Dynasty. But there is little connecting the placename to one site in particular, and it may well be located anywhere in the South Sinai. Another tact would be to etymologically relate this word to the copper site of Gebel Mongul, in the desert east of Middle Egypt – in Arabic Manqal means ‘mountain road’.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (6.2)

| 58 | <- | R3-ḥt.(y)w |

**Etymology (I):** Usually read as R-ḥ.t or alike, with the latter word being interpreted as ‘horizon’ or ‘office’, this hapax placename has provided difficulties for translators, because it is orthographically unparalleled. Pantalacci, however, makes a good argument that the term is to be read R3-ḥt.w ‘Outlet of the Terraces’, which simply requires us to read the vulture as the tw-bird (G4). That the mining region should have been referred to as ḥt.w ‘terraces’ suits the local topography of the Sinai, given the use of this word in the nearby Ḥt.yw-Mfk3.t [64].

---

1046  Harris, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, 23


1048  For individual smelters in this area, see Tallet, Castel & Fluzin, *Paléorient* 37, 79-89. Some of the furnaces in this area at Seh Nasb and Wadi Khariq are datable to the Old Kingdom.


1051  L. Pantalacci, ‘Un été à Serabit el-Khadim’, *GM* 150 (1996), 88-89. Furthermore, ḥ.t ‘horizon’ is almost never spelled completely with uniliterals. This orthographic variance can also be proven in the inscription’s palaeography, as aleph (line 11) differs from tw- (line 8) in the toponym.
**Location (I):** The text [58.1] makes clear that R₃-ḥt.yw was a stopping point on the way to the turquoise mines further east. In light of the meaning, ‘Outlet of the Terraces’, and the [BUILDING] classifier, it must refer to some construction in the El-Markha plain, perhaps at the archaeological site at Seh Baba. This site is situated at the entrance of the wadi which gives access to the copper and turquoise mines. ¹⁰⁵²

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+1.1)

---

**Etymology (I):** The word r₃ is a common generic term for desert valleys (see [26]). The latter word ṣḥ(ţ).wt is more difficult to interpret, and there are a number of Egyptian roots that could relate to the toponym. There is a word ṣḥ has the meaning of ‘plant, garden’ and many derivatives of this root refer to specific types of plants and herbage, but also collective stands of vegetation like ‘meadow, marsh, bush’. ¹⁰⁵³ There is also ṣḥt/ṣwt ‘haft, stick, rod’, only found regularly in Late Egyptian and Demotic, which would be a better semantic match given that, in one text, sticks are procured from this place. ¹⁰⁵⁴ But, noting the shift and interchangability of ṣ and ḫ, there is every possibility that the etymology of the placename could be identified as ḫṣ.wt. ¹⁰⁵⁵ A good option presents itself in ḫṣw.t ‘quarry, mining region’, derived from the verb ḫṣ(w) ‘to break up’. ¹⁰⁵⁶ This meaning of ‘The opening of the mineral-region’ would fit the context rather well. The fact that the toponym uses ṣ instead of ḫ might indicate that the placename was fossilised in its original orthography, which would date it to before the Third Dynasty when one finds the first examples of – ḫ. ¹⁰⁵⁷

Goedicke relates this placename to Ṣḥwtw from the Exeaction Texts and Ṣḥw(τ) from the tomb of Khnumhotep II, a suggestion which seems unlikely on both orthographic and contextual

---

¹⁰⁵² For Seh Baba, see Chartier-Raymond, Gratien, Traunecker & Vinçon, CRIPEL 16, 51-53, fig. 10. For sites on the El-Markha plain see Mumford, BASOR 342, 13-67.

¹⁰⁵³ Wb. 4, 400.18-19; HWb, 800-801; Lesko, *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*, II, 105. The phonetically identical phrase r₃-ṣḥ.wt occurs in the domain name Grg.t-prf-nfr-r₃-ṣḥ.wt ‘The foundation of Pehernefer of the mouth of the marsh’, where ṣḥw has the meaning of marsh; see Jacquet-Gordon, *Les noms des domaines funéraires sous l’Ancien Empire égyptien*, 329.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Quack, ZDMG 146, 511; Lesko, *Dictionary of Late Egyptian* II, 110, 139.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 115-117. Hence the ṣḥt-rod originally derived from Middle Egyptian ḫṣḥ ‘stake’, see Wb. 3, 361.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Wb. 3, 360-361. For ḫḥwt ‘quarry’, see Aufrère, *L’univers minéral dans le pensée égyptienne*, I, 67-68 and Osing, *Nomenbildung*, I, 265, who treats the -t as a nomen loci. This term is used specifically in a toponym at Aswan (*KRI* I, 73.13): Tḥ-ḥḥ-t-n(t)-Mn-Mf5.t-R₃.w-hkh-t-t-.wy-dl-“nh ‘The quarry of Menmaatre-Heqatawy, given-life’. The anlaut alternation is evident in the Delta placename ḫḥt.wt/ṣḥ.t.wt; see Gomaà, *Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches*, II, 250.

The orthography of $\delta w.t$ is quite variable. In one case [59.5] it seems as though the scribe thought it was a mistake for the much more frequent geographic term Shasu, when they adapted the $ti$-pestle into the $sw$-plant $\text{ʃ}$ (Fig. 19). The orthographic differences may be put down to the rarity of the placename, or scribes being unfamiliar with the word $\delta t.wt$ ‘quarry’, where the contemporary word for quarry was $h\delta.wt$.

Figure 19: Orthographic corruption of $R\gamma-\delta(w)t$ into $R\gamma-\delta\delta.w$ (Medinet Habu V, pl. 328).

**Location (II):** The texts are not overly helpful in identifying its location. Its proximity to the South Sinai seems certain due to its association with other Sinai toponyms in the text of Khety [59.1], and it being a source of turquoise in texts from Medinet Habu and Hatshepsut’s obelisk base inscription [59.3-5]. The only dissenting opinion is that of Goedicke, who, for unclear reasons, places this toponym in the North Sinai. As turquoise is only mined at two sites near Egypt, Wadi Maghara and nearby Serabit el-Khadim, $R\gamma-\delta\delta wt$ must refer to one of these sites or, more generally, the whole turquoise mining area. Additionally, the Khety text [59.1] mentions that $mdw$ ‘staffs, sticks’ were procured there, and thus the area was somewhat vegetated. What

1061 Goedicke, JARCE 21, 210; Kamrin, JAEI 1, 24 also equates this name with $\ddot{S}wtw$, but see J. Quack, ‘Eine Erwähnung des Reiches von Aleppo in den Ächtungstexten?’; GM 130 (1992), 76, who locates $\ddot{S}wtw$ in the Transjordan and Moab.
1062 This was the conclusion of Gardiner, Peet & Černý, The Inscriptions of the Sinai, II, 3 n. c and Gomaà, Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches, II, 255. For the sources of turquoise, see B. Aston, J. Harrell & I. Shaw ‘Stone’, in Nicholson & Shaw (eds), Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology, 62. The nearest turquoise mine outside the Sinai is site 200.1005 in North Arabia, noted in Ingraham et al., Atlal 5, 74.
1063 Wb. 2, 178; HWb, 377 ‘Stab’. Helck, Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr., 73 n. 6 believes that, even though the $mdw$-stick is clearly written, it may nevertheless stand for turquoise on the assumption that this is the most common mineral from this land, noting that the $\|\|$ strokes may be ‘längliche Perlen aus Türkis’. This should be treated as a speculative
exact wood *mdw* sticks were made from is difficult to verify, but the presence of *mdw*-staffs in the tomb of Djehutynakht suggest that *Acacia* was used.\(^{1064}\) Comparisons with bedouin ethnobotany may be helpful here, and a number of plants (*Acacia raddiana, Acacia ehrenbergiana*) are known to be used by local pastoralists for walking sticks.\(^{1065}\) However, the toponym’s connection with a valley (*r*) as well as vegetation seems to suggest an individual wadi, such as Wadi Maghara. The problem with this, however, is that the chronology of the inscriptions mentioning the placename – early Middle Kingdom [59.1], Hatshepsut [59.2-3] and Ramesses III [59.4-5] matches the local chronology of mining operations at Serabit. Only at this site do we have continued mining operations into the Ramesside Period, as late as Ramesses III, while Maghara seems to have been abandoned somewhat earlier.\(^{1066}\) Continued association of this placename with turquoise mining in the Graeco-Roman period (*Ṟš*) further suggests that Serabit would be more likely, as no such later material is present at Maghara.\(^{1067}\) A middle ground might be to conclude that *Ṟš-st* designates Wadi Kharig, Wadi Baba or Wadi Nasb, the pathways providing access to the plateau at Serabit el-Khadem. Mining operations occurred at Wadi Kharig and Seh Nasb as early as the reign of Sahure, with most activity dating to the Middle Kingdom, and there is a turquoise mine at nearby Bir Nasb.\(^{1068}\) This would also concord with the distribution of toponyms in the Sinai mineral zone, leaving Serabit el-Khadim as *D̤d* [70] and Wadi Maghara as *Ḫtyw-mfkt.t* [64].

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+2.1)

---

\(^{1064}\) A. Hassan, *Stücke und Stäbe im Pharaonischen Ägypten bis zum Ende des Neuen Reiches* (1978, München), 63, 89 reports generally that acacia, tamarisk, and sycamore were the main materials for staffs. S. Auria, P. Locavara & C. Roehrig, *The Funerary Arts of Ancient Egypt* (Boston, 1988), 117 note that, in the tomb of Djehuty-nakht, staffs (of which some were of the *mdw*-type) were made largely out of acacia, although tamarisk is also reported; see also H. Fischer, ‘Notes on Sticks and Staves in Ancient Egypt’ *MMJ* 13 (1978), 12-13 n. 48 who notes some sticks were made of ebony, tamarisk and even inlaid with gold. In the text of Khety the reference to *mdw*-staffs must refer to their basic construction material, not the procurement of already fashioned staffs.

\(^{1065}\) S. Goodman & J. Hobbs, ‘The Ethnobotany of the Egyptian Eastern Desert: A comparison of the common plant usage between two culturally distinct Bedouin Groups’, *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 23 (1988), 79, 80, 85. *Acacia raddiana* still occurs in the Wadi Maghara area and has been reported in the main channel of the adjacent Wadi Sidri; see Zahran & Willis, *The Vegetation of Egypt*, 234. T. Hikade, ‘Crossing the frontier into the desert: Egyptian Expeditions to the Sinai Peninsula’, *Ancient West & East* 6 (2007), 9, 19 notes that the only alternative would have been importing charcoal from elsewhere.

\(^{1066}\) See the table in Tallet, *BIFAO* 103, 471-472 in which the last inscription at Maghara seems to be under Ramesses II (Gardiner’s no. 45) while Serabit is continuously visited throughout the New Kingdom.


Etymology (I): The name appears to be a plural of Egyptian *hrr.t* ‘flower’. The second *t* is probably a collective suffix, with an assumed nisbe-*y* ‘(The place-of)-the-Flower-Fields’. Ward, citing the previous objections of Gardiner, believed this was an unsuitable name for the Sinai deserts, and connected it to Hebrew *ḥarerim* ‘parched places’. Against this proposal is the objection that the Sinai does have many flowers, and the modern ecology of the area is hardly admissible evidence for estimates of its vegetation in the second millennium BCE.

Location (II): Almost all authorities have located this placename in the South Sinai or a part thereof. But the presence of *mfkt* ‘tiqué’ at this locality should leave little doubt that it corresponds to the ‘mineral zone’ of the south Sinai, perhaps Wadi Maghara and/or Serabit el-Khadem. Outside the turquoise zones at Wadi Maghara and Serabit, there are turquoise mines at Wadi Kharig and Wadi Nasb, either of which would be suitable locations.

Discussion: The fact that this placename appears only once is possibly attributable to the notion that the density of flowers are highly dependent on rainfall. The Jerusalem botanical expedition to the Saint Catherine’s area, for example, noticed that ‘few specimens of *Ziziphora tenuior* [a flower] were seen by us between 1967 and 1971. [But] In spring 1979 sites which received high quantities of rainfall…supported carpets of this species’. It seems probable that this ephemeral placename was coined only due to witnessing floral fields after favourable rainfall which occurred before Khety’s expedition, thus explaining why this placename is never used again in texts referring to Sinai.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.7)

---


1072 See, for example, A. Danin, A. Shmida & A. Liston, ‘Contributions to the Flora of Sinai III. Checklist of the species Collected and Recorded by the Jerusalem Team 1967-1982’, *Willdenowia* 15 (1985), 255-322, where mention is made on several occasions of the ubiquity of floral coverings after heavy rainfall.


Etymology (I): A tripartite genitive comprised of three regular Egyptian words ‘gallery’, ‘house’, and ‘foreigner’. The writing of šmā is rare, as it has the [PRAISING-MAN] (A4) instead of the expected [ITINERANT MAN] (A33) classifier, but it is is attested. The toponym to some extent presupposes another nearby separate placename ‘The House of the Foreigner’.

Location (III): Being the location of a turquoise mine, there can be little doubt that the location of this hₜ.t ‘gallery’ should be in the Serabit-Maghara area [61.1]. That foreigners worked and lived in the Serabit area is well-known from Egyptian inscriptions which mention ⁵šmₕ.w-Asiatics, as well as the reference to the ‘brother of the ruler of Retjenu’ in Sinai no. 112. Outside these passing references, the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions at Serabit and Bir Nasb/Wadi Kharig also prove that Semitic speaking peoples visited or lived in the area.

Some remains of a third millennium BCE local population have been found in the Serabit-Maghara region, leading Rothenberg to suggest that the turquoise mines were originally worked and inhabited by Asiatics, and were only controlled by Egyptians after sustained expeditions throughout the Predynastic and Old Kingdom, with the earliest inscriptions at Serabit el-Khadem being ascribable to Amenemhat I. While the temple at Serabit has not been excavated, it might be possible that an Asiatic structure stood on the site of the later pharaonic temple, as the area was probably sacred to Asiatics in the area as a shrine of Baalat. Whether a remaining Asiatic-structure was the inspiration for the name Hₜ.t-n.t-pr-šmā must remain an interesting possibility, but as yet beyond proof. Giveon suggested that due to the distribution of Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions, which cluster around Mines XIII and XIV, that the nearby buildings above the site may have been a ‘Semitic Camp’.

Classification: +Egyptian (2.1+2.1+6.4)
Etymology (II): Given the lacuna in this placename [62.1], its meaning is unknown. The lacuna contains a bird, either m or Hr.w.\textsuperscript{1082} Schenkel reconstructed the word as \texttt{Hr.w-n(y)-Rtnw},\textsuperscript{1083} but it is difficult to explain in the word Rtnw. There are traces of on the second group.

Location (III): It is difficult to place this toponym anywhere with confidence, but it would be surprising if it was outside the mineral zone of the Serabit-Maghara region, given the other localities mentioned in Khety’s biography [55, 57, 59, 64C].

Classification: +Egyptian (2.1+?)

Etymology (I): There can be little doubt that this placename is connected to the Semitic root hrb/ḥrb ‘to dry up, lay waste’.\textsuperscript{1084} Due to this etymology, it has been questioned whether Hrb in this text was indeed a placename or rather a general word for desert.\textsuperscript{1085} However, a generic term like ‘desert’ is unlikely to take the throw-stick as a classifier.\textsuperscript{1086} Furthermore, the phrase dm\textsuperscript{e} hrb ‘parched fields of the desert’ is unnecessarily tautological, and a placename would suit the context.\textsuperscript{1087} Although its connection with the biblical placename Ḥoreb (חֹרֵב) seems possible, it cannot be conclusively proven.\textsuperscript{1088}

Location (III): Apart from emphasizing that Hrb is a dry-place, the Leiden medico-magical text [63.1] does not assist in locating this placename. The magical practitioner in this text is earlier described as being of Ḥrtkn, but the scribe(s) classify this word interchangeably with and, with the latter probably being a mistake.\textsuperscript{1089} This fact, and the high frequency of Semitic words in the text, particularly deities, suggests that this corpus was at least partly Semitic in origin and

\begin{flushright}
[62] | ⌑ | ⌑ | Ht.t-n.t-[m]///
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
[63] | ⌑ | ⌑ | Hrb | */xrb
\end{flushright}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1082} All scholars transcribe the placename as קְרִב, see Gardiner, JEA 4, 35; Gomaà, Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches, II, 249; R. Landgráfová, It is My Good Name that You should Remember: Egyptian Biographical Texts on Middle Kingdom Stelae (Praha, 2011), 280.

\textsuperscript{1083} Schenkel, Memphis Herakleopolis Theben, 283 n. i.

\textsuperscript{1084} Halayqa, Comparative Lexicon of Ugaritic and Canaanite, 174; Hoch, Semitic Words, 249. See also the discussion in J. Hoffmeier, ‘Sinai in Egyptian, Levantine and Hebrew (Biblical) Perspectives’, in Barnard & Duistermaat (eds), A History of the Peoples of the Eastern Desert, 119.

\textsuperscript{1085} GDG IV, 115. Hoch, Semitic Words, 249 also questions its status as a placename. Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms, 119 prefers a placename rather than a generic term.

\textsuperscript{1086} The only non-proper noun in this archive to have the throw-stick classifier is בֵּשֶׁת ‘foreigner’.

\textsuperscript{1087} For the word dm\textsuperscript{e} ‘parched’, see Wb. 5, 574.10-11; Hoch, Semitic Words, 386.

\textsuperscript{1088} Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms, 119-120.

\textsuperscript{1089} See A. Massart, The Leiden Magical Papyrus: I 343 + I 345 (Leiden, 1954), rt 6:8, vs 11:1, 73 n. 10. There is a settlement ’Elteqon near Judah, but Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms, 92-93 doubts Ḥrtnk has anything to do with this settlement due to its ‘insignificance’. The fact that it was determined with may be etymologically influenced with Ahituv relating it to a Semitic phrase ḫ-dgn ‘the god Dagon’. 201
\end{footnotesize}
influence. As other mythological texts in this corpus are considered Ugaritic or Canaanite, it is quite possible that the name is to be sought within the confines of modern Syria, although one cannot disprove a connection with the southern biblical Horeb.

From the papyrus, it is clear that Hrb had some ritual or mythological significance, and thus it is possibly paralleled by the biblical ‘Horeb’, which was also important to the cult of Yahweh. That biblical Horeb was associated with Sinai and Edom can be taken for certain, and the mention of the har Horeb ‘Mountain of Horeb’ (Exodus 33:6) in association with the Mountain of God suggests that Horeb is connected with Yahweh’s southern theophany. As Hoffmeier notes, one of the most diagnostic texts for locating Horeb is Deuteronomy 2:1, where it is said that Horeb is 11 days from Kadesch Barnea (modern Ain el-Qadis) by way of Mount Seir. This would place ‘Horeb’ either in the southern Sinai or in Edom/Midian. But, it would be simplistic to use this as evidence for the location of Egyptian Hrb and one must conservatively locate the toponym somewhere in the Levant, Edom or Sinai.

Discussion: The toponym ḫrūb of New Kingdom historical texts appears phonetically identical to the Hrb under discussion, but is generally understood to refer a different site in Syria, ‘Aleppo’. But, Bardinet has suggested that the Hrb from the Biography of Amenemhab is an Edomite placename. In the Biography of Amenemheb the ‘foreign-land of the ridge of ṣn-wood (=Juniper)’ is west of Hrb. In a papyrus from the Louvre (E. 32847), a placename ṣn ‘Juniper-place’ is mentioned, perhaps the same as Amenemhab’s ‘ridge of ṣn’ which is ‘west’ of Hrb. However, this Edomite location finds little support in Amenemhab’s biography, particularly as this official campaigned on the Euphrates at Carchemish. Thus, one can reckon with at least two Hrb-toponyms, one in Syria, and another from this magical papyrus [63.1], at an

---

1090 H.-W. Fischer-Elfert, ‘Samunu on the Nile: The Transfer of a Near Eastern Demon and Magico-Medical Concept into New Kingdom Egypt’, in M. Collier, S. Snape (eds), Ramesside Studies in Honour of K. Kitchen (Bolton, 2011), 194-197. A forthcoming work by Susanne Beck (Ludwig-Maximilians University Munich) is devoted to this magical papyrus. She has concluded that this magical tract is related to Canaanite and Ugaritic mythological cycles. I am indebted for her thoughts on this subject.

1091 Hoffmeier, Ancient Israel in Sinai, 119; Hoffmeier, ‘Sinai in Egyptian, Levantine and Hebrew (Biblical) Perspectives’, in Barnard & Duistermaat (eds), A History of the Peoples of the Eastern Desert, 122

1092 Urk. IV, 793, no. 311. ḫrūb ‘Aleppo’ is differentiated from this toponym in all relevant works (Massart, The Leiden Magical Papyrus: 1 343 + 1 345, 70; Ahituv, Canaanite Toponyms, 120 n. 297; HWb, 1375).

1093 T. Bardinet, Relations économiques et pressions militaires en Méditerranée orientale et en Libye au temps des pharaons (Paris, 2008), 88-89. Bardinet’s main objection to a Syrian Hrb in this text is the lack of coniferous woods near Aleppo, but wooded areas are to be sought, as the text states, to the west of Aleppo (near modern Hatay), nor should historical deforestation be discounted in the distribution of these trees.


1095 Urk. IV, 891.9; Carchemish is only ~100km from Aleppo.
unknown location. From Seti I’s Shasu war there is a similar placename Ḥrḥt, the site of a well and fortress on the Ways-of-Horus.\textsuperscript{1096} It is plausible that this has something to do with Ḥrḥ, but given its general meaning as ‘dry-place’ it could be a separate toponym altogether, especially considering the different auslaut –t.

**Classification:** +Semitic (7.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[64]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ḥt.yw-Mfk(\dot{3}.t)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Etymology (I):** It has long been realised that the placename has a connection with the material mfk\(\dot{3}.t\) ‘turquoise’, but the underlying etymology of this word is debated.\textsuperscript{1097} Takács noted the incompatibility of \(m\) and \(f\) in Egyptian roots, thus the \(m\) must be a prefix and not part of the original root \(fk\(\dot{3}\)).\textsuperscript{1098} Takács’ most promising solution was a connection with a supposed Afroasiatic root f\(k\dot{l}\) ‘a (dark) colour’.\textsuperscript{1099} Gundacker proposes a very different approach, relating the mineral term to the Egyptian root \(fk\(\dot{3}\) ‘to lay waste’, proposing two derived forms, from which the words were later confused and contaminated: a) \(fk\(\dot{3}.t(y)\) ‘the one (namely the stone) belonging to the wasteland’, and b) the toponymic mfk\(\dot{3}.t\) ‘wasteland’ from the same root (with \(m\)-prefix -\(t\) *nomen loci*).\textsuperscript{1100} Although *prima facie* both these etymologies are possible, against Gundacker’s hypothesis is the semantic pattern common with the generic term Ḥt.yw ‘terrace’, which seems to be coupled with resources (see toponym [85]), not landscape descriptors like ‘wasteland’.

The earlier examples of the toponym without the \(m\)-prefix suggest this prefix was a secondary addition in the late Old Kingdom, but this feature also occurs in the writing of ‘turquoise’. The rarity of independent toponymic Mfk\(\dot{3}.t\) [64.8, 64.11-15] outside the compound placename Ḥt.yw-mfk\(\dot{3}.t\) suggests that \((m)fk\(\dot{3}.t\) originally referred to ‘turquoise’, and that Ḥt.yw-mfk\(\dot{3}.t\) (on analogy with Ḥt.yw-\(nt.yw\) ‘terraces of myrrh’ or Ḥt.yw-\(s\) ‘terraces of cedar’) was the full form of the placename. The name underwent some confusion with the mineralogical term and finally lost its generic element (ḥt.yw) when used in Sinai inscriptions [64.11-15].

\textsuperscript{1096} *KRI* I, 8:2. Al-Ayedi, *The Inscriptions of the Ways of Horus*, 105 located this placename at modern Kharuba near El-Arish, on the basis of the remains of a fortified structure, for which see E. Oren, ‘The “Ways of Horus” in North Sinai’, in A. Rainey (ed.), *Egypt, Israel, Sinai: Archaeological and Historical Relationships in the Biblical Period* (Tel Aviv, 1987), 97-107. There is also the placename Ḥrḥt ‘Aleppo’ which is differentiated in all relevant works (Massart, *The Leiden Magical Papyrus: I 343 + I 345*, 70; Ahituv, *Canaanite Toponyms*, 120 n. 297; *HWb*, 1375).

\textsuperscript{1097} *Wb.* 2, 56. For the identification of mfk\(\dot{3}.t\) as turquoise see the extensive arguments in Harris, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, 106-110.

\textsuperscript{1098} *EDE* III, 210.

\textsuperscript{1099} *EDE* III, 211. One might also note a possibility of the Semitic root *plg* ‘split, divide’ as a plausible etymology for a mineral, which would simply require a metathesis of *l/g* to be connected to the root *(k)*. For these roots, see Halayqa, *Comparative Dictionary of Ugaritic and Canaanite*, 255; Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez*, 159.

\textsuperscript{1100} Gundacker, *LingAeg* 19, 47-50.
Egyptian $f^k\lambda.t$, beyond referring to the stone turquoise, could be used metaphorically to refer to its colour and it is this meaning of the word that probably gave it the gloss ‘turquoise’. $M^f j\lambda.t$ in religious literature is associated with the colour of the sky and the rays of the morning sun.\(^{1101}\) The Biblical Hebrew $n^p\epsilon k‘$turquoise’ is related to the word and, based on its form, is most likely a loan from Late Egyptian.\(^{1102}\) But, given the fact that turquoise may have been mined first by a local Sinaic population (see below), it cannot be excluded that $(m)f^k\lambda.t‘$turquoise’ derives from a very old Semitic loan into Old Egyptian.\(^{1103}\) Indeed, the different spellings of $f^k\lambda.t$ [64.10], $m^f j\lambda.t$ [64.8], and $m^f j\lambda.t$ [64.12-14] might point to a difficulty or ambiguity in pronunciation, a rather unexpected phenomenon in a native Egyptian word.

**Location (I):** There can be no doubt that $H_t.yw-m^f j\lambda.t$ refers to the South Sinai, the location of Egyptian turquoise mines. Local inscriptions at Wadi Maghara [64.1] make it certain that this area was called $H_t.yw-m^f j\lambda.t$, as do the instances of the term at Ayn Soukhna across the Gulf of Suez [64.3-4]. While more specific locales for turquoise mines are known locally, $H_t.yw-m^f j\lambda.t$ could refer to the broad area east of the El-Markha plain at Wadi Maghara and Serabit.

**Discussion:** Turquoise is attested in the Egyptian archaeological record as early as the Predynastic period,\(^{1104}\) so it is safe to conclude that Egyptians had some familiarity with the substance and its point of origin at a relatively early date. That being said, it is possible, given the Timnian (3500-2650 BCE) remains in the Wadi Maghara region, that the indigenes of the Sinai were working turquoise well before the Egyptians.\(^{1105}\) State interest in the mines of the South Sinai is attested as early as King Den,\(^{1106}\) and, by the Third Dynasty, the first specific expeditions mention the procurement of $M^f j\lambda.t$.

---


1102 The phonology of the Hebrew word, without the Old Egyptian liquid $\ddot{\iota}$, suggests that $n^p\epsilon k$ arrived in Hebrew in Late Egyptian or later, when $\ddot{\iota}$ had been lost (Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 142) and $m$ shifted to $n$; for similar Egyptian forms, see also Wilson, *A Ptolemaic Lexikon*, 420. The word $m^f j\lambda.t$ also occurs in a Neo-Assyrian transcription of an Egyptian placename $P^i-h\dot{a}-a-t-ti-h\dot{u}-r\dot{u}-u-n-pi-\dot{t}$ (<$P^r-h\dot{u}.t-h\dot{r}(-n\dot{b}.t)-M^f j\lambda.t$) ‘House of Hathor, (mistress) of Turquoise’, but this probably refers to Kom Abou Billou, which is known by this name; see G. Fecht, *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur* (Glückstadt, 1960), 229; Osing, *Nominalbildung*, II, 829-830; Muchiki, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*, 251.

1103 See Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 505. This point is also proposed by G. Brein, *Wurzelinkompatibilitäten im Wortschatz der Pyramidentexte* (University of Vienna, unpublished Magisters dissertation, 2008), 197. While most authorities (Hoffmeier, *Ancient Israel in the Sinai*, 167-168; Takács in EDE III, 209-210) have reservations on the likelihood of such an early Semitic loan in Egyptian, the local archaeology of the turquoise mines suggests that turquoise was worked here well before Egyptian domination (see discussion below) so that the original $(m)f^k\lambda.t$ could plausibly be a Semitic loan (but not from $n^p\epsilon k$) into Old Egyptian, especially as all Egyptian words derived from this root stem from the idea of ‘turquoise’.


1105 Rothenberg, *Sinai: Pharaohs, Miners, Pilgrims and Soldiers*, 114, 139.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+1.3)

[64A] \[\text{H}3s.t-mfk\]

Etymology (I): Same as above, with \(\text{h}3s.t\) ‘hill-country’ as a generic term in place of \(\text{ht.yw}\). The late date of this expression compared to other instances suggests that \(\text{ht.yw-mfk}\) had become obsolete by the Ramesside period [64.16].

Location (I): Same as above.
Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+1.3)

[64B] \[\text{(M)fk}\]

Etymology (I): The same etymology as \(\text{ht.yw-Mfk}\), but the generic term is dropped. The confusion between the toponym and the mineral came about as Gundacker suggests, due to the ‘special sociolect…[of] the everyday miners in Wadi Maghara who coined these terms’.1107

Location (I): Same as \(\text{ht.yw-Mfk}\)

Discussion: All instances of this term are in Middle Kingdom Sinai rock inscriptions [64.11-15], except for one reference in the Coffin Texts [64.8], which is the only instance where it is not found in the epithet \(\text{nb.t-Mfk}\). It seems safe to assume then that \(\text{Mfk}\)-land without a generic term \(\text{ht.yw}\) ‘terrace’ is a rare and dialectal toponym and was a shortening of \(\text{ht.yw-Mfk}\). It is also worth noting that instances of \(\text{nb.t-mfk}\) ‘mistress of turquoise(-land)’ with the former occurring on 146 inscriptions in the Sinai, and the latter in just six.1108 It is possible then that the writing \(\text{nb.t-Mfk}\) was a mistake, although epithets of the form \(\text{nb.t + toponym}\), like \(\text{nb.t + mineral}\), do occur.1109 Furthermore, these \(\text{Mfk}\)-land writings all occur (except for one undated inscription) in the reign of Amenemhat III [64.11-14], thus making it probable that this writing was an idiom of scribes in this period. But it is difficult to assume that the local scribes in the Sinai confused a well-known epithet referring to a mineral with a placename. Indeed, it may be that there were two distinct and different epithets, which suffered from lexical contamination. The presence of writings like [64.12-14] may indicate that scribes had deliberately intended to provide a dual meaning to the epithet.

1107 Gundacker, LingAeg 19, 49.
1108 See the references in Gardiner, Peet & Černý, The Inscriptions of the Sinai, II, 234.
1109 Professor Pierre Tallet (Personal Communication) suggests this may be due to a peculiarity of scribes on their Sinai expeditions in the reign of Amenemhat III. It may also be worth noting that one of the scribes of another Amenemhat III inscription at Sinai (no. 53) also wrote \(\text{BiA.w}\) in an idiosyncratic manner without the [FOREIGN-LAND] classifier.
Classification: +Egyptian (1.3)

\[64C\] \[Pr\text{-}n(y)\text{-}Hr\text{-}w\text{-}n(y)\text{-}Ht\text{-}yw\text{-}Mfk3.t\]

**Etymology (I):** The toponym is an extended genitive, where \(pr\text{-}n(y)\text{-}Hr\text{-}w\) ‘House of Horus’ is joined with the nested genitive \(Ht\text{-}yw\text{-}Mfk3.t\).\(^{1110}\)

**Location (II):** This name is clearly a temple or shrine to Horus within the boundaries of the Turquoise-Terraces \([64]\). Gomaà considered that the toponym \([64.9]\) refers to a temple construction at Wadi Maghara.\(^{1111}\) This seems quite likely, since the placename \(Ht\text{-}yw\text{-}Mfk3.t\) would have first referred to Maghara before Serabit el-Khadem, as Egyptian mining operations at Maghara predate those at Serabit. There is no known temple at Maghara, but there is a fortified hilltop settlement containing a cluster of houses, including one larger six-roomed house.\(^{1112}\)

However, the operative \(pr\) probably refers to the settlement as a whole.

Classification: +Egyptian (2.1+6.3+1.1+1.3)

\[65\] \[T3\text{-}hnm.t\text{-}Rc\text{-}msi\text{-}s(w)\text{-}Mri.y\text{-}Imn.w\]

**Etymology (I):** Exactly the same as entry \([38]\), without the adverbial qualifier.

**Location (III):** The placename appears in the title of a ‘troop commander’ in two inscriptions from Serabit el-Khadem \([65.1-2]\). In pAnastasi III, there is a \(hr\text{-}y\text{-}pd.t\text{ }hn.m.t\text{ }Mrl.y\text{-}n(y)\text{-}Pth\text{-}htp\text{-}hr\text{-}Mf\text{.}t\) ‘troop commander of the well of Merenptah’ which is near Tjaru, and thus by comparison it would seem that military titles referring to well-sites were in reality references to fortress officials.\(^{1113}\) The placename here may refer to a well locale in the South Sinai,\(^{1114}\) but it could just as easily denote a fortified well along the North Sinai frontier, where there is plentiful textual and archaeological data for structures in the vicinity of water sources.\(^{1115}\) Texts at Serabit also note North Sinai officials from Tjeku,\(^{1116}\) so it was a regular occurrence for Ramesside officials of the Eastern Delta and North Sinai to come overland to Serabit and Bir Nasb, rather than use the marine route, and thus this toponym might belong to the official’s point of origin.

---

1110 For \(pr\) ‘house’ and \(Hr\text{-}w\) ‘Horus’, see Wb. 1, 511; 3, 122.
1111 Gomaà, *Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches*, II, 257
1114 Following Hannig in *HWb*, 1377, who cites ‘Serabit el-Khadem’.
One might also entertain the Ramesside remains at Kom Al-Qulzum as a possible location, but there is little data for this supposition apart from proximity to the Sinai.\footnote{1117}

**Classification**: +Egyptian (1.4+6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[66]</th>
<th>Sfr (T3-Ś3sw) ( Dw )</th>
<th>*/fr/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Etymology (I)**: It is very likely that this name is the same as the biblical placename ‘Seir’ (שֵׂﬠִ֔יר), which in the Old Testament is generally considered to be a southern region roughly synonymous with Edom (see [52]). Phonologically, this connection is permissible.\footnote{1118} The placename Seir derives from the Semitic root šr ‘hair’ and could refer to diverse ideas such as ‘thicket’, ‘vegetation’, and ‘barley’.\footnote{1119} Beeston cites a number of placenames throughout the Arabian Peninsula called Šara which are typified by vegetation.\footnote{1120} It is worth calling attention to an identical word šr ₐושא /sara which arrived as a loan from a Semitic language in New Kingdom Egyptian.\footnote{1121} The presence of this word in Egyptian proves that šr was a contemporaneous word in a neighbouring Semitic language, and also adds weight to its identification as the root of the toponym. Furthermore, the orthography of the placename and the loanword is almost identical to the toponym Sfr in pHarris I, and thus it is plausible that some literate Egyptians understood the meaning of the placename.

Lipinski thought that the placename Seir may be connected with the Nabataean god Dushara, Dwšr ‘he-of-Shara’, whose cult-centre is considered to be in the Hisma desert of southern Jordan.\footnote{1122} He further speculated that šr/sr of Dushara may stem from a number of lexemes, including šāra ‘scrubland’, Arabic ša’ira ‘cultic practice’, while Healey and Beeston preferred Arabic etymologies referring to vegetation.\footnote{1123}

As Ahituv noticed, the reduplication of the r in the Sfrr of the Amara List [66.3] should not be analysed as linguistically diagnostic, given the predisposition for copying and reproduction mistakes in the Topographical Lists.\footnote{1124} Astour interpreted this instance as a separate toponym, to

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{1117} For the Ramesside remains at Kom al-Qulzum (Clysm), see n. 211.
\item \footnote{1118} See Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 436.
\item \footnote{1119} For these correspondences see Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 255.
\item \footnote{1120} A. Beeston, ‘The “Men of the Tanglewood” in the Qur’an’, *Journal of Semitic Studies* 13 (1968), 254.
\item \footnote{1121} Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 255.
\end{itemize}}
be equated with Šeḥlal of the Amarna Letters.\textsuperscript{1125} As another point of comparison, he suggests that $\text{Š}\text{rr}$ from the Thutmosis List is the same as $\text{S}\text{rr}$ from the Amara West list. However, a few caveats should be noted here. Even though the different sibilants in $\text{Š}\text{rr}/\text{S}\text{rr}$ may be due purely to dialectal differences in Semitic languages, the use of common geographic terms like ‘thicket’ is common in Levantine toponymy.\textsuperscript{1126} Also, none of the associated placenames in the Thutmosis III Topographical List co-occur in the Amara West List. Finally, if one follows the logic of Astour in assigning different toponyms to small orthographic errors in the Topographical Lists, the number of names in the lists would easily double. Unlike errors in connected Egyptian texts, errors in onomastica are the rule rather than the exception,\textsuperscript{1127} and can be explained via hieratic copying errors, phonological shifts, and scribal unfamiliarity with the lexemes.

**Location (I):** The Tanis Obelisk [66.2], the Amara West list [66.3], and pHarris I [66.4] connect $\text{S}\text{r}$ with the Shasu ethneme. Astour considered all the $\text{T}\text{i-Š}\text{s.w}$ placenames to refer to much more northerly lands in Syria,\textsuperscript{1128} but the fact that Shasu are securely known in the contexts of Edom and Sinai, and only speculatively from further north, seems to speak against this theory.\textsuperscript{1129} The texts of the Tanis Obelisk [66.2] and the Gebel Shaluf Stele [66.1] indicate that $\text{S}\text{r}$ was noted for a mountain ($\text{dhw}$). The mention of $\text{S}\text{r}$ in the Tale of Woe [66.5] indicates little about its location, save that it was distant from Egypt, like $\text{Nhrn}$ (Syria).\textsuperscript{1130} From these texts, and its equivalence with biblical Seir, there is almost unanimous agreement that $\text{S}\text{r}$ is somewhere in southern Jordan and Wadi Arabah.\textsuperscript{1131} However, as Astour warned, using biblical evidence to locate this placename, or Egyptian evidence to locate the biblical placename, are rather circular arguments, and thus it is prudent to deal with the bodies of evidence separately.\textsuperscript{1132}
Given the location of the Gebel Shaluf stele near Ismailia [66.1], en-route to the Sinai from the Delta residence, it is likely that $S^r$ was reached via the Sinai hinterland, leading to the Edom, rather than the regular coastal route to Canaan. The Ramesses III campaign against $S^r$ recorded in pHarris I shows that this region was inhabited by pastoralists. In fact, linking this campaign with the the Shaluf stele and Sinai-Arabia route noted by Somaglino and Tallet, it is tempting to view this inland Sinai route, marked by cartouches of Ramesses III, as demarcating the way to $S^r$. This would put $S^r$ in the area of Wadi Arabah and southern Jordan.

Almost all biblical and Egyptological authorities have equated this placename with biblical Seir, but unfortunately there are many divergent views as to the location of Seir. Beyond the phonetic correspondence between these names, their equivalence is echoed in the mirroring of the generic terms for ‘mountain’, Egyptian ($\text{ḏw}$) and Biblical Hebrew ($hr$, רֶשֶׁר - $Dw\ n(y)$ $S^r$). As Old Testament Seir is often grouped with Edom, Ezion-Geber, and Mount Sinai it seems certain that its location is in the south with respect to Canaan, with the balance of scholarship putting it in and around Wadi Arabah. This could include much of the historical regions of Edom, Midian and Sinai. In one of the Amarna letters (BM EA 288), the King of Jerusalem Abdi-Khepa refers to a contemporary Seir, exclaiming he is at war ‘as far as the land of šeru and as far as Ginti-kirmil’ presumably meaning he was at war with a land far to the south (šeru) and far to the north (Ginti-kirmil). The Assyrian King Ashurbanipal campaigned against a region called Seir, but the text is not specific as to its location, grouping it with the Qedarite Arabs of Northern Saudi Arabia and southern Syria. In fact the name may be extant in contemporary geography. Lipinski equates Seir with the Gebel esh-Shera just east of Petra, while Healey relates that local Arabs of the eighteenth century called the mountain range of southern Jordan Shara(t). On balance, it would seem that $S^r$ referred to the Wadi Arabah region following this valley down to the Red Sea. Broadly speaking, the Egyptian and Near-Eastern documents are in consensus that Seir is Edom. The toponym, at least in Egyptian documents, is probably no more specific than this.

---

1133 For the possibility of this route, marked by cartouches of Ramesses III at various locales, see Somaglino & Tallet, BIFAO 111, 361-369.
1134 For the location of the cartouches, see Somaglino & Tallet, BIFAO 111, 369.
Discussion: The emergence of this placename in Egyptian documents, along with other names of the Edomite area, may have originated in new Egyptian interests in the Wadi Arabah copper mines. Ramesses II campaigned in Seir and also near Moab,\(^{1140}\) and mining operations were conducted at Timna under his reign.\(^{1141}\) Indeed, Haider linked the Ramesses III S\(^r\)\(^r\)-campaign [67.4] to the securing of copper imports at Timna from local bedouin.\(^{1142}\)

Classification: +Semitic (1.7)

\[
\text{Etymology (I): The expression is qualified by } rn= \text{‘its name’ [67.1], so we can be certain that it is the name for the local gallery (ht.t).}^{1143}\text{ The word } swal.t\text{ and } rdi.t\text{ are perfective participles, whose antecedents are the placename itself.}^{1144}\text{ The ensuing toponym, an adverbial sentence, may thus be translated as ‘That which prospered its expedition, which gave that which is in it’.}
\]

Location (I): Elsewhere in the text the inscription is described as being on bi\(\ddot{z}\).w pn ‘this mine’ and so there can be little doubt that the inscription itself is the location of the mine. This is the so-called ‘Mine II’, about 800 metres southwest of the temple enclosure at Serabit.\(^{1145}\)

Classification: +Egyptian (5.1+6.4)

\[
\text{Etymology (II): This toponym is difficult to transliterate and interpret, owing to the lack of phonetic complements and multiple possible readings of the ideograms. The first word is } s\ddot{r}.t\text{ ‘nostril’ and the next word appears to be } tp\text{ ‘head’}.\(^{1146}\text{ Roccati suggests that } s\ddot{r}.t\text{ is to be understood in this text metaphorically as ‘gorge’ or ‘fortified place’}.\(^{1147}\text{ Hannig registers a number of secondary meanings for } s\ddot{r}.t\text{, such as ‘Vorderteil’ of a boat, or ‘Schießscharte’ which}
\]

---

\(^{1140}\) For these campaigns, see K. Kitchen, ‘Some new light on the Asiatic Wars of Ramesses II’ \textit{JEA} 50 (1964), 66-70 and Haider, S\(\ddot{A}\)K 14, 107-123. Haider’s analysis of the campaigns rejects the previous assessment of Kitchen who linked the campaigns to S\(\ddot{r}\)\ and Moab in one single razzia.

\(^{1141}\) For an extensive commentary on the problems of Egyptian chronology at Timna, see J. Bimson & J. Tebes, ‘Timna revisited: Egyptian Chronology and the Copper mines of the Southern Arabah’, \textit{Antiguo Oriente} 7 (2009), 75-116.

\(^{1142}\) Haider, S\(\ddot{A}\)K 14, 117-118.


\(^{1144}\) For the participle swal in royal names, see Leprohon, \textit{The Great Name}, 63, 69, 76.

\(^{1145}\) Tallet, \textit{La zone minière pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï}, I, fig. 8-1 and 8-3.

\(^{1146}\) \textit{Wb.} 4, 523; 5, 263-267.

\(^{1147}\) A. Roccati, \textit{La littérature historique sous l’Ancien Empire égyptien} (Paris, 1982), 195. It is plausible that } s\ddot{r}.t\ ‘nose, nostril’ has a relation to the Egyptian root s\(\ddot{r}.i\) ‘to block’, but the determinative clearly refers to a nose. The word s\(\ddot{r}.i\) ‘blocked’ is specifically used of desert routes; see J. Darnell, ‘A Bureaucratic Challenge? Archaeology and Administration in a Desert Environment (Second Millennium B.C.E.)’, in J.-C. Moreno Garcia (ed.), \textit{Ancient Egyptian Administration} (Leiden, 2013), 785 n. 3, 4, where its use in Seti’s Kanais inscription and the earlier Ballas inscription of Montuhotep II is noted.
could be figuratively applied to the physical landscape. Alternatively one could take šr.t as referring to a cavity ‘nostril’ or summit ‘nose’ on the tpt-ghs/wnD.w, which could be the ‘gazelle-head-(hill)’. Miroschedji also suggests glosses of ‘ridge’ or ‘headland’. Even the word for the final lexeme is unclear, as the palaeography of the animal leaves doubt as to whether it is a gazelle, oryx, or even a goat. An inspection of the photograph suggests that sign is probably a bovine (Gardiner E1), as ibex/goats in Egyptian usually have their horns pointing in one direction while cattle are shown with horns in front-profile. However, the horns of the animal are twisted, which is more reminiscent of goats than cattle. In light of this, Gundacker has suggested the ideogram resembles the wnd.w ‘goat’.

Edel emphasised that the sign tp should not be ignored, translating the name as a tripartite genitive ‘Gazellenkopfsnase’, which he thought designated a ‘hillside’. The word tp in this context seems to be redundantly tautological (all noses are on heads), which has led many to simply translate it as ‘gazelle-nose’ and ignore this ideogram. Beyond ‘head’, tp has the semantic field of ‘top, first, beginning’, so it could plausibly be read prepositionally, as Šr.t-tp.(yt)-wnD.w ‘the Nose which-is-upon the goat’. Ultimately the semantics are unclear, and it presumably refers to a geomorphological metaphor, that is a landscape shaped like the nose of a goat-head.

A completely divergent reading, which would avoid the tripartite genitive, would be to treat the last two lexemes as an embedded toponym Tp-ih.w ʿnḫw.s[j]t’, designating ‘Atfih’, thus reading the placename as the ‘The šr.t (of) Atfih’. This would make the phrase a relative placename, marking a region near modern Atfih, and avoid the need for a somewhat rare and semantically clumsy tripartite direct genitive. Against this reading is the drawing of the ideogram with twisted-horns, which resembles the wnd.w cattle more than ih.w.

---

1148 HWb, 832. The only other placename known with this generic term is Šr.t-bnbn, which might be a mistake for Š-bnbn; see M. Zecchi, Geografia religiosa del Fayyum (Imola, 2001), 171-172.


1150 Piacentini, L’Autobiografia di Uni, 31 opts for ‘goat’ (Hircus Mambrinus). Wilson, ANET, 228 n. 10 notes the possibility that the sign is a deer or bubalis.

1151 For the epigraphy, see G. Maspero & E. Grèbaut, Le Musée Égyptien: recueil de monuments et de notices sur fouilles d’Égypte (Le Caire, 1890-1900), I, pl. 28. I am indebted to Dr Linda Evans for this observation.

1152 See P. Duell, The Mastaba of Mereruka (Chicago, 1938), II, pl. 152. This identification was proposed by Dr Roman Gundacker (Personal Communication), which will be published in ‘The Significance of Foreign Toponyms and Ethnonyms in Old Kingdom Text Sources’, in The Early/Middle Bronze Age Transition in the Ancient Near East: Chronology, C14, and Climate Change (in press).


1154 For the meaning of the placename Tp-ih.w see [49].
Location (II): This placename is found only in the biography of Weni [68.1], as the location of a military action against the hr.yw-$\delta$ ‘sand-dwellers’. In the context of Pepinakht’s biography or the Story of Sinuhe, this ethneme is known to operate in the Gulf of Suez and also southern Canaan. Most scholars, assuming Weni was campaigning in Canaan, have seen in this toponym the first large mountain that Egyptians would meet on the Levantine coast, Mount Carmel. Helck suggested a location much closer to Egypt in Mount Cassius, near the Delta, while some scholars have preferred the Tumilat area. Miroshchedji prefers keeping these actions in the Yarqon-Jaffa area, reasoning that the local geography of this region with a headland and a river better matches the Weni text than Mount Carmel. However, Miroshchedji’s approach is conditional on delineating a rather specific boundary for the T$h$-$hr.yw-$\delta$ ‘Land-of-the-sand-dwellers’ exclusively on the Canaanite littoral, a conclusion which can be questioned on semantic and geographic grounds. In Weni’s text, the ‘sand-dwellers’ are given some specificity by the location of m$h.t$ T$h$-$hr.yw-$\delta$ ‘north of the Land of the Sand-dwellers’, but there is no reason to specifically locate the T$h$-$hr.yw-$\delta$ in any location outside a sandy desert.

Mumford and Parcak note that the verb used in Weni’s campaign refers to a maritime activity, where one branch of Weni’s expedition ‘crosses’ ($\text{d}$?) in order to get to the ‘Goat’s-nose’ and the T$h$-$hr.yw-$\delta$ ‘Land of the sand-dwellers’. This verb is regularly used in reference to ‘crossing’ the Nile. The same verb is used in reference to the Gulf of Suez in the Sinai no. 25: $\text{iw} \text{ d}？\text{n}(\neq) \text{nww}$

---


1158 Miroshchedji, ‘Egypt and Southern Canaan in the Third Millennium BCE: Uni’s Asiatic Campaigns Revisited’, in Ahituv, Lehmann & Talshir (eds), All the Wisdom in the East: Studies in Near-Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren, 267-269, generally following an earlier interpretation of B. Couroyer, ‘Ceux-qui-sont-sur-le-sable: les Hériou-Shâ’, Revue Biblique 78 (1971), 558-575. To quote Miroshchedji (p. 273): ‘thus, the “sand” on which they live cannot be that of the Sinai desert; it can only be the “sand” of the south Palestinian littoral, which is indeed covered with dunes … and is indeed a “flat” land, distinct from the mountainous hinterland, in accordance with the use of the ideogram t$\beta$ (“(flat) land”) in the expression “the land (t$\beta$) of the Ḥeryu-shâ”’. While Miroshchedji astutely identifies $\text{t}m$.w as an autonym and hr.yw-$\delta$ as an Egyptian exonym for the same group of people, it is perhaps too semantically narrow to assume such geographic specificity in these groups. The Red Sea littoral is in places flat. More importantly, t$\beta$ is the regular geographic nomen regens coupled with ethnic groups (cf. T$\beta$-$\text{m}$.h.w, T$\beta$-$\text{h}$.tyw, T$\beta$-M$\text{d}$.y, T$\beta$-$\text{W}$.h$.tyw$, T$\beta$-N$\text{h}$.y, T$\beta$-$\text{f}$.h$\text{w}$, T$\beta$-$\text{S}$.w, many of which are in mountainous areas) vis-à-vis much rarer examples of $\text{h}$.$\text{s}$.t like $\text{h}$.$\text{s}$.t-$\text{t}m$.w in Pepinakht’s biography (Urk. I, 134, 13-15).

1159 Mumford, BASOR 342, 55-56.
‘I crossed the Nun-water’. Furthermore, dīlī, to my knowledge, is never used for any lengthy nautical journey, such as those found in the Shipwrecked Sailor, Wenamun or Hatshepsut’s Punt Expedition. Therefore, it would be clumsy to suggest that ‘cross’ is an apt descriptor for sailing from the Delta to the Levantine coast, or for an overland journey. Mumford and Parcak ultimately identify their ‘Gazelle-Nose’ in the Sinai at Hammam Faraon, just north (c. 30 km) of the late Old Kingdom fort at El-Markha, where Egyptian ships landed in the late Old Kingdom. The mention of a ridge in the text finds support in the prominent coastal range of Gebel Hammam Faraon which rises 400 metres directly out of the sea.

As a daring thesis, if the lexical argument relating the toponym to ṫp-iḥ.w ‘Atfih’ is correct, Weni’s campaign could be a raid on bedouin east of Atfih. While there is scarce evidence of the indigenes in this region, a Ramesside stele in the area indicates the desert here was probably occupied by Asiatics, and the Pepinakht biography makes clear that this part of the desert was occupied by ḫm.w, who troubled Egyptian expeditions. The ridge (ṭz.t) could easily be the Galala mountain, and the dīl-crossing could refer to a maritime force coming from Ayn Soukhna southwards to land at the north (ḥr mh.t) of this area, while another attachment went overland upon the ridge. Another plausible suggestion is that the action at the ‘Nose-of-Atfih’ was on the Sinai coast, following the thesis of Mumford, with Atfih being mentioned in the placename as the closest major Egyptian settlement. It is already known from the toponym Dw-Tp-iḥ.w that Atfih christened the desert around the Galala al-Bahariyya.

Discussion: A problem with the Weni text is the number of campaigns launched against the ‘sand-dwellers’. Most scholars assume that the Ṣr.t-ṭp-wnḏ.w campaign is identical or related to the preceding campaigns against the ḥr.yw-ṣfl. As such, the campaign against the Ts-ḥr.yw-ṣfl, where figs (ḏlb) and vines (ḏrr.t) are cut are seen to be identical with the following expedition against Ṣr.t-ṭp-wnḏ.w. There is nothing in the text prima facie to point to an identical location for these campaigns, except that they were both somewhere within an area occupied by ḥr.yw-ṣfl.

---

1160 Gardiner, Peet & Černý, The Inscriptions of the Sinai, 13, see also Abd el-Raziq, Castel, Tallet & Ghica, Les inscriptions d’Ayn Soukhnâ, 110-111.
1162 For local population in this region see Barta, MDAIK 20, 98-101. There are graves and ancient material in the Wadi Kittar of the Galala al-Bahariyya range of uncertain date; see L. Covington, ‘Report on a summary exploration of Wady el-Kittar’, ASAE 9 (1908), 97-104 and Hosni, ASAE 12, 51-56 for burials and wells north of the Galala. Covington dates the Wadi Kittar burials to the Early Dynastic on account of some pottery fragments and a figurine of Nephthys.
1163 Officials from this part of Egypt are attested on the Red Sea coast. At Wadi el-Jarf, there is an official śš n(y) ṣ-rx.y ḫdw ‘Scribe of the ‘Southern-Lake(=Fayum), Idu’; see Tallet, Marouard & Laisney, BIFAO 112, 412-413.
Mumford equates Weni’s campaign with ventures against EB IV sites in west Sinai in the area of Wadi Gharandel and Wadi Sudr. Miroshchjii sees the action against EB III sites in the southern coastal plain. This same area of the Sinai was also the seat of hostilities as early as the First Dynasty, as indicated by the inscriptions at Wadi ʿAmeyra and Wadi Homr.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.2+1.2+1.6)

\[
\text{Etymology (II): This hapax toponym is most probably foreign, as a root } \text{tnh} \text{ is not registered in any Egyptian lexicon. The penultimate sign is somewhat difficult to read, but may be the throwstick } \text{[70].} \text{ While Egyptian } \text{t} \text{ reproduces voiceless palatal stop [c] or affricate } \text{[tʃ]}, \text{ in Semitic loanwords, } \text{t} \text{ corresponded to Semitic samekh, which itself probably had a pronunciation closer to [ts]. Given that the name is likely to be from a Semitic language, one should reconstruct the pronunciation as } \text{ṣnḥṭ}, \text{ which after the shift of [ts] to [s] would later resemble } /\text{snḥṭ}/. The toponym then recalls the name for the peninsula where this place-name is likely to be located, סיני. The etymology of ‘Sinai’ is usually explained through Biblical Hebrew ṣnh (snh), the ‘bush’ encountered by Moses on Mount Sinai. However, there is no consensus amongst biblical historians as to the etymology of Sinai; connections to Semitic sn ‘tooth’, Arabic sina ‘stone’, Sin the Mesopotamian moon-god, and the territorial entity of Sin have also been proposed as equally valid as snh ‘bush’. A difficulty with this connection is accounting for the auslaut -ṭ, which must be a suffix, possibly a feminine marker. In ancient Levantine toponymy, the suffix

---


1170 A. Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets: A Linguistic analysis of the mixed dialect used by the scribes from Canaan* (Leiden, 1996), I, 148 remarks that the suffixes –ātu/āti/āte/āta also occur in ‘many masculine nouns’. For the suffix more generally, see Lipinski, *Semitic Languages: Outline of a comparative grammar*, 225, 243; Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 444. An Old Kingdom Semitic toponym ʿann.t might also reflect the same morphological suffix, although N. Kanawati & A. McFarlane, *Deshasha: The Tombs of Inti, Shedu and Others* (Sydney, 1993), pl. 26 record only ʿnn(n), unlike W. F. Petrie, *Deshasheh* (London, 1898), pl. 4 which has ʿn.u./. For this toponym, see also A.-L. Mourad, ‘Siege
-t is witnessed in toponyms, but its exact morphological role is not apparent. Rainey suggests it may be a nominal or adjectival marker.1171

**Location (II):** Wherever Tnht was, it was a large area, comprised of multiple hıs.wt. The only text where it occurs mentions it in the context of Biš.w [69.1], and thus it would seem to be in the environs of the South Sinai or at least contiguous with the Sinai.1172 In the biography of Khety, Biš.w [55] and Tnht seem to introduce the enumeration of specific ore-bearing localities, and these names are probably rather broad choronyms for the modern Sinai Peninsula, hence Khety’s apt use of the verb dbn ‘to go around’ the hills of Tnht. An equivalency with the biblical ‘Sinai’ is tempting on these grounds, but the caveat here is that there is about one thousand years separating this toponym Tnht from the ‘Sinai’ in the oldest biblical traditions (c. 1000 BCE).1173 In biblical traditions, Sinai is generally a finite locality, a ‘mountain’. In the Table of Nations (Genesis 10:17, 1 Chronicles 1:15), Sinai is evoked as a tribe subordinate to Canaan, perhaps designating a regional entity.

**Classification:** +Semitic (7.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Etymology (I):** It is not certain if this placename, written as ḫ.u/u in Sinai no. 120, is a mistake for ḫ.n found on Sinai no. 317, as both occur in identical contexts in hr-ib.t D3d3 ‘in the midst of Djadja’ [70.2].1174 As such, there is divided opinion as to whether this is a placename at all, or an orthographic error.1175 There are a number of homonyms in the Wörterbuch which could feasibly be related to this placename, but the most likely remains DADA ‘head, tip’ or DADA ‘barque station’.1176 A geographic meaning is evident in the writing and a comprehensive study of this root determined its spatial value as ‘plateforme surélevée’. In a

---

1171 A. Rainey, ‘Toponymics in Eretz Israel’, BASOR 231 (1978), 4 remarks that the suffix may be a sign of an ‘earlier linguistic stratum’. See also Elitzur, Ancient Placenames in the Holy Land, 227-228.
1172 Gomaà, Die Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches, II, 258.
1173 For the earliest estimates of biblical authorship, see now Carr, The Formation of the Hebrew Bible, 487-489.
1174 Gardiner, Peet & Černý, The Inscriptions of the Sinai, 198 n. a cited the presence of ḫ.u as ‘embarrassing’ and preferred to emend the writing in Sinai no. 120 to ḫ₂₂.
1175 LGG VII, 605 has the epithet as referring to a toponym. Tallet, La zone minière pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï, I, doc. 194 n. c is in favour of its placename status, while Valbelle & Bonnet, Le sanctuaire d’Hathor maîtresse de la turquoise, 166 and Aufrère, L’universe minéral dans la pensée égyptienne, 127 cite the possibility of the word being alternatively a placename or an architectural feature in a temple.
1176 Ṭḥb. 5, 530-532.
topographical context it must refer to a ‘plateau’. The fact that $D\digg$ is coupled with a demonstrative in one text [70.1] suggests that this word could be used as a standard topographical term.

**Location (I):** Given that $D\digg$ only occurs in texts at Serabit el-Khadem [70.1-2], it is likely that this refers to the region of the temple site. Indeed, the etymological notion of ‘plateau’ perfectly fits the topographical situation of Serabit el-Khadem.

**Discussion:** Given the variant orthographies with different classifiers, it is possible that local scribes were uncertain of whether this appellation was a true toponym or an architectural term. A similar predisposition of classifier variance in Middle Kingdom placenames at Serabit el-Khadem occurs in the name $Mfk\digg$ [64B] in the reign of Amenemhat III.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.2)

| Location (III): | Little has been said of the significance and locality of this toponym. The placename occurs in the so-called Story of the Blinding and Subsequent Vindication of Truth [71.1], where ‘falsehood’, a personified antagonist, exclaims the value of a lost knife. The knife’s worth is related to its exoticism, being comprised of metal of the ‘Mountain of El’, wood of the ‘trees of Coptos’, and being bound together by the ‘cattle of Karoy’. While *prima facie*

---


1179 The writing of two w’s is common in hieratic orthography and does not always indicate a plural, for comparable writings, see Lesko, *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*, II, 265.


fictional, this fantastical blade is comprised of materials from real places, ‘Coptos’ and ‘Karoy’, and as such, ‘The Mountain of El’ would suggestively also be a real place – even if the weapon is not. Gardiner declined to speculate on its location, while Gabolde has suggested ‘Sinai’. As copper or metal deposits are a requirement for the location of ‘The Mountain of El’, a location somewhere in the Sinai-Edom area seems likely.

Ugaritic Cycles relating to the cult of El refer to his abode by two terms, ġr and šd, both of which can mean ‘mountain’. These terms seem to be couched in mythological language and it is unlikely that a real topographic mountain is meant in these texts. Hebrew traditions, particularly Psalm 68:16, have the har ‘Elohim, which is related to Bashan (Mount Hermon) as the dwelling place of El. A related expression with the Hebrew article, har ha ‘Elohim ‘The mountain of god’, is encountered in Exodus 3:1, 4:27, 18:5, 24:13, 1 Kings 19:8 and occurs in contexts of the Sinai (Horeb and ‘the wilderness’) and is therefore more likely to be the inspiration for the Egyptian P3-dw-n(y)-Il than the ‘Mountain of God’ in Bashan. Correspondingly, this southern ‘Mountain of El’ must be a local term for a copper-bearing mountain. As Feinan and Timna already have names in Egyptian documents, one might prefer a mine in the central Sinai (Reqeita, Wadi Samra), or Nahal Amran near Eilat/Aqaba.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+6.3) +Semitic

Etymology (III): Given some phonetic similarities, Görg espoused a connection with the biblical entity Amalek (ךָמָלֵ֑ק). This was met with some skepticism by biblical scholars, especially regarding the correspondence of Egyptian ḫ for Canaanite ayin. Phonologically, this

---

1184 See M. Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts (Leiden, 1955), II, 61-71. This mountain is reproduced in the Thutmosis III Topographical List as Hr-il, equated by Ahituv with Harmil on the Orontes. Although considering the previous entry is Krr (=Galilee?), it may be that this is referring to Mount Hermon.
1186 For Pwnw as Feinan, see n. 1423. For 7ik as Timna see entry [54].
1187 The site of Nahal Amran has recently revealed late Bronze and early Iron Age archaeological material. I must thank Professor Juan Manuel Tebes for bringing this to my attention. A publication by Dr Uzi Avner will appear soon on the issue. Until then, see A. Hauptmann, The Archaeometallurgy of Copper: Evidence from Faynan, Jordan (Heidelberg, 2007), 64, 67, 96.
1189 B. Becking ‘Amalek’, in van der Toorn, Becking & van der Horst (eds), Dictionary of Deities and Demons of the Bible, 26, for this reason, finds Görg’s etymology unconvincing, so too D. Jericke, Die Ortsangaben im Buch Genesis (Göttingen, 2013), 129. But, L. Morenz, ‘Rescheph und “jtwm (=Adam(m)i), seine Frau” Ein altlyrisches Götterpaar in einem ägyptischen medico-magischen text
correspondence is possible, given the similar pharyngeal articulation of the consonants /h/ (voiceless) and ayin /ʕ/ (voiced). Indeed, the admixture of these phonemes is attested in a small number of loans into Egyptian, compare Egyptian ṭḥṣyt for Semitic ḥṣr ‘Grasshopper’, bḥr for ḏhr ‘sea’, ṁḏk for ḥbq ‘sexual intercourse’, and ḏn for ḥttn ‘grain’. Admittedly, the reverse development, Egyptian ḥ for Semitic ayin, is not known, but it would be possible. The unknown and debated Semitic etymology of ṁmlq (ʼlmql) means that one cannot be certain if this is indeed a personal name, a tribal patronymic or an original toponym, although Lipinski suggested that this word was originally a Hurrian word meaning ‘enclosure’, but later came to refer to the Negeb and adjoining deserts. Another theory has been espoused, connecting the toponym with Amaruk, a placename preserved in an Eblaite document, located somewhere near Aleppo.

Location (III): The magical spells are of little assistance in locating the placename [72.1] and their interpretation is exceedingly difficult. According to an analysis by Fischer-Elfert, the text is associated with the Ugaritic pantheon, thus making an equation with biblical Amalek unlikely. But, in the absence of other similar written traditions for Canaanite religion, it would be premature to say that the text is quintessentially ‘Ugaritic’ rather than generally Canaanite. That being said, the present evidence does favour an Ugaritic connection, and hence would put the placename much further north than biblical Amalek. The magical text is an utterance, and specifies that Re place his back to the desert, and his shoulder (rmn) at the mountain of Ḥmrk. In a performative sense, this was meant to cast aside an illness, but the interpretation of these mythological references is impossible to determine. Based on the high frequency of Semitic words in the text, it seems that the god or mountain Ḥmrk had some mythological significance to the practitioners.

und zur *Gottin Edom* Ugarit-Forschungen 31 (1999), 373-375 is implicitly in favour of the connection.

1190 See Hoch, Semitic Words, no. 72, 75, 104, 114.
1191 The admixture of these phonemes in Egyptian is not known until later periods, but Peust notes that cases of ṣ > h in Napatan Egyptian mš > mšh ‘to march’; see Egyptian Phonology, 105.
If an equation with biblical Amalek, and hence the Amalekites, is preferred over a northerly Ugaritic location, then this toponym may well be located somewhere in Sinai, Edom or the Negev. Mirroring the Egyptian usage of the generic *dw*, the placename *hr h-ᶜ mlq* ‘Mountain of Amalekites’ occurs in Judges 12:15, but any specific location is unlikely due to the oblique references. In Exodus, the Amalekites attack the Israelites on their march from Egypt at Rephidim (Exodus, 17:8). Consequently, most commentators have located the Amalekites in the Negev or Sinai. The problem here is that the location of Rephidim is somewhat contingent on the thorny issue of the location of biblical ‘Sinai’ and the Exodus itinerary. In 1 Samuel 15:7, the Amalekites are associated with Havila and Shur, in Genesis 14:7 with En-Misphat (Kadesh Barnea), in Numbers 13:29 with the Negev, in Judges 6:3 the Midianites and in 1 Chronicles 4:42-43 Seir. All these locations and nations are associated with the region of Edom, Sinai, and North Arabia and thus it seems likely that the Amalekite nation was situated somewhere in this general vicinity. As this biblical term is primarily an ethneme, not a toponym, there is no reason for Amalekites to be geographically static. Soggin even suggested, based on a reading of Judges 12:15, that Amalek designated a region near Nablus.

Discussion: The recto III and verso VI text alternates classifiers between a deity and a toponym for *Hmrk*. The fragment on recto XXIII preserves only *ܢื่ܥעין* so it cannot be certain whether this is a placename or a theonym. But given the recto XXIII text of *m-dd Hmrk* ‘said Hmrk’, it seems likely that *Hmrk* was originally a deity, which christened a mountain(-range) – although, an understandable confusion is possible here, as the personification of mountains is an attested phenomenon in Canaanite religion.

Classification: +Egyptian (1.1+6.3) +Semitic

Etymology (II): The initial generic term needs no explanation, but the word *hz.tyw* is enigmatic. The toponym is only written clearly as *hz.tyw* in the text of JdE 45058. A lacuna in Sinai no. 211 was reconstructed by Helck as *ܓܙܲܲܢܲܨܲܨܲ * [73.2], perhaps another attestation of the same name. Translators of this text have assumed that this was part of the writing of an unattested

---


1196 Jericke, *Die Ortsangaben im Buch Genesis*, 129.


toponym Yw, with the lacuna including part of the expression m-hz ‘gegenüber’.\(^{1199}\) Semantically, m-hz.t Yw ‘gegenüber Yw’ makes good sense in the text, but neither Helck nor Hikade explained what or where Yw (\(\begin{array}{l}\text{Y} \end{array}\)) is and the traces in the lacuna leave open the possibility that it is to be read as one toponym Hz.tyw.\(^{1200}\) A possible etymology of the placename is revealed in the writing on Sinai no. 211 [73.2], where the verb-of-motion legs (\(\begin{array}{l}\text{\(\wedge\)}\end{array}\)) suggest that the placename is a nominalised from of hzi ‘heranbringen, entgegentreten’.\(^{1201}\) In the context of the Sinai and the Gulf of Suez, the placename might have the sense of being the ‘opposite’ shore, or perhaps a ‘turning point’ in reference to maritime navigation. Gardiner astutely derived such a meaning for this verb in expeditionary texts as ‘the technical term for the homeward turn after the culminating point of an expedition had been reached’.\(^{1202}\)

**Location (II):** From the text of Khety’s biography, ‘the mountain of Hz.tyw’ [73.1] was a location from which the substance htfyw3 was obtained. Most authorities have seen in this term a reference to petrified wood, but the scarcity of this expression in texts is an impediment to a more finite assessment.\(^{1203}\) More literally, the material htfyw3 could be rendered as something like ‘harvested/spoiled wood’.\(^{1204}\) Accordingly, an alternative to the interpretation to fossilised wood would be to follow the Wörterbuch’s definition of ‘faulendes Holz’, whereby the phrase would refer to naturally felled wood, perhaps for medicinal use or charcoal.\(^{1205}\) This would explain the relatively large amounts of the material procured on the Sinai expedition (8,700 dbn=118kg) of the Annals of Amenemhat II, which is greater than any other material procured on this expedition.\(^{1206}\) In the Annals, htfyw3 is listed under the rubric spr m8\(\wedge\) m3\(\wedge\) \(<r:\) Ht.yw-Mfk.t

---

\(^{1199}\) Helck, MIO 2, 193. If Helck’s initial theory is correct, then perhaps the toponym could have a relation to 7uw [75], but this also diverges from the writing of this placename, as \(\begin{array}{l}\text{\(\wedge\)}\end{array}\) would operate as a determinative for hz.t, not phonetic iw in the placename. See also the translations in Hikade, Expeditionweisen im ägyptischen Neuen Reich, 169; W. Murnane, ‘The Organization of Government under Amenhotep III’, in D. O’Connor & E. Cline (eds), Amenhotep III: Perspectives on his reign (2001), 191.

\(^{1200}\) One may also counter that is difficult to parse as m-hz.t Yw. The writing \(\begin{array}{l}\text{\(\wedge\)}\end{array}\) is part of the morphological ending of hz.t, as y is absent in anlaut positions in Egyptian placenames, being only present in foreign names (for a list of y-anlaut names see GDG I, 164-172).

\(^{1201}\) Wb. 3, 159. HWb, 559 gives ‘umkehren’.

\(^{1202}\) AEO I, 159. The sentence from which he draws this meaning is in the context of Thutmosis III’s campaign in the Gebel Barkal Stele (Urk. IV, 1222-1223): hsi.n ≠ m-hnt r Tl-mri dl.n ≠ hps Nhmr ‘I turned southward towards Egypt, after I caused the conquering of Naharin’.

\(^{1203}\) Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals, 178-179 notes the use of htfyw3 in medical papyri, concluding that htf ‘wood’ is a figurative designation. This identification is followed in T. de Putter & C. Karlshausen, Les pierres utilisées dans la sculpture et l’architecture de l’Égypte pharaonique (Bruxelles, 1992), 55, pl. 7.

\(^{1204}\) W3 has a diverse semantic field in Egyptian and can also mean ‘robbed’ or ‘spoiled’. Helck, Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr., 72-73 n. 5, 6 also follows this sense.

\(^{1205}\) Wb. 340.8.

\(^{1206}\) It is a larger amount than almost any other comparative material in the entire Annals. Only hmt copper (15, 961 dbn), ismrw ‘unknown material’ (16,588 dbn) and hmw.t ‘abrasive-sand’ (39, 556 dbn) were procured in greater quantities than htfyw3, see Altenmüller & Moussa, SAK 18, 14. The Middle
‘arriving of the expedition, which led to the Terraces-of-Turquoise’, where it is mentioned with the other well-known Sinai mineral of turquoise (mfk₃₄.t).¹²⁰⁷ This Sinai expedition of the Annals of Amenemhat II would necessarily have left Egypt through the Eastern Desert towards Ayn Soukhna and/or along the head of the Gulf of Suez, and therefore ḥt₅w₃ may have been obtained anywhere along this general route, either in the South Sinai itself or the coasts of the Gulf of Suez.¹²⁰⁸ One may add that, given most of the placenames in Khety’s biography are in the Sinai, the ‘Mountain of Hz.tyw’ should also be placed somewhere in the Gulf of Suez. If ḥt₅w₃ does indeed refer to petrified wood, then there is a local deposit near Mokattam between Cairo and the Red Sea.¹²⁰⁹

In Sinai no. 211 [73.2], Amenmose boasts of his achievements in ‘foretelling the wonders of Punt’ (sr Bi₃ Pwnt) and also more generally refers to his journey to Serabit el-Khadim where he ‘crossed the Wd-wr’ and moored (mn₃) in [Hz.tyw]. This inscription is located in the Sinai itself and therefore the mooring at Hz.tyw must refer to a landing on the Sinai coast. The only known locality where archaeological remains have been found is the El-Markha plain (Tell Ras Budran), where an extensive Old Kingdom circular fort has been found (site 345), in addition to a Middle and New Kingdom smelting site further north (site 346).¹²¹⁰ As this toponym is attested in the early Middle Kingdom and New Kingdom one can postulate that the general area of the El-Markha littoral was called Hz.tyw. The dw ‘mountain’ would presumably be the range north of the New Kingdom remains (Site 346). In Sinai no. 181, the same Sinai coast near Serabit is mentioned as mr.yt ‘the shore, quay’.¹²¹¹ One cannot altogether eliminate other possibilities, and it is possible that the toponym referred to a site on the Egyptian side of the Gulf of a Suez, perhaps near Ayn Soukhna.

Discussion: Edel also records this placename in lacunae from the Eloquent Peasant, written in different copies as (pRamesseum) or (pButler). Edel was influenced by the fact that the lacunae has the same morphological endings as Hz.tyw and was written after ḥt ‘wood’, with Edel reconstructing ꞌ in both damaged sections.¹²¹² Based on his own text edition,
Parkinson thought Edel’s emendations impossible. A further problem with this assumption is that the lacunae in different copies are treated as a toponym or a wood product.

The individual leading the expedition in Sinai no. 211 is a certain $\text{Sbk-htp}$, also called $\text{P3-nhs.y}$, who has the title $\text{im.y-r3 pr-hd}$ ‘overseer of the treasury’. As Tallet identified, the same individual is mentioned in two contemporary inscriptions at Ayn Soukhna as $\text{im.y-r3 pr-hd} \text{P3-nhs.y}$ ‘overseer of the treasury, Pa-nehesy’ (no. 25) or $\text{s$s-nsw P3-nhs.y}$ ‘royal scribe, Pa-nehesy’ (no. 33). This proves without doubt that the route $\text{P3-nhs.y}$ took to reach the turquoise mines crossed the Gulf of Suez. It is possible that the text of Sinai no. 211 implicitly describes two voyages to Sinai, as the sequence of events narrated in the stele, where $\text{P3-nhsy}$ receives the gold of honour for his exploits, must be in reference to a previous expedition to the Sinai, not contemporaneous with the commissioning of the stele itself. Therefore, the stele must date to a later voyage which recounted his investiture for a previous expedition. That $\text{P3-nhsy}$ undertook two voyages finds further support at Ayn Soukhna, where the two inscriptions attribute different titles to him, $\text{s$s-nsw}$ (first voyage) and $\text{im.y-r3 pr-hd}$ (second voyage).

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+5.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[74]</th>
<th>[74.1]</th>
<th>[74.2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Etymology (I):** It cannot be entirely certain that this is a placename, but based on parallels cited by Tallet, it would fit well with the practice of naming mines in the Sinai. The lacuna in the text presumably also contains an initial participle, as in [56] and [67].

**Location (I):** For the location of this placename, see entry [56].

**Classification:** +Egyptian (?+5.1+1.3+6.2)

and $\text{hz.tt ‘Bauholz’}$, see *HWb*, 562. F. Vogelsang, *Kommentar zu den Klagen des Bauern* (Leipzig, 1913), 31 thought it might be the name of an oasis.


1214 The damaged section in pButler hardly seems to have room for such tall vertical signs as $h$ (in the same papyrus); see F. Ll. Griffith, ‘Fragments of Old Egyptian Stories’, *PSBA* 14 (1892), pl. 1.


1216 This rewarding of the gold of honour probably took place in Thebes, for which see S. Binder, *The Gold of Honour in New Kingdom Egypt* (Oxford, 2008), 170-171. I am indebted to several discussions with Dr Susanne Binder regarding this text and $\text{P3-nhs.y}$’s voyages to Sinai.

Figure 20: Placenames of the Sinai and Edom. Names with an unknown location not placed on the map include: [53] Yhwî, [57] Mnkîw, [63] Hrb, [65] Tî-hmr.m.t-R^5-msi-s(w)-Mrt.y-Imn.w, [68] Sr.t-tp-wnd.w, [71] Pî-dw-n(y)-Il, and [72] Pî-dw-n(y)-Hmkî
Figure 21: Inset of the Sinai Mineral Zone
5.4 Zone 3: The Southern Atbai and Further Red Sea [75-85]

Etymology (II): The writing of this placename resembles the Egyptian verb *iwi* ‘to come’. However, unless one takes the toponym to have an abstract sense of '(place-of)-coming’, it would seem that the word is foreign in origin and sounded similar to the verb *iwi*. The toponym may be pronounced as */ywː/ or */ʔwː/, dependent on the consonantal realisation of *i* and whether the auslaut *w* was vocalic. Given the frequent interchangeability of *w* and *y* in Semitic languages, a good semantic match for the toponym is Canaanite *‘y* ‘island, coastal region’. This root (‘*y*) occurs frequently throughout the Old Testament and as בּוֹי with mimiation. Murtonen suggested a cognate for Canaanite *‘y* in South Arabian *‘wy* ‘shelter’, while Dahood seems more certain of its relationship to the Arabic verbal root *‘wy* ‘to seek shelter’. Both the meanings of ‘island/coast’ or ‘shelter’ in an unknown Semitic tongue are suitable explanations for the meaning of this placename. However, this etymology cannot be proven and an African language origin is equally possible.

Location (III): The toponym is known only from two texts, Coffin Texts IV 46 [75.1], where it is implied that gold (*nbw*) comes from this locality, and from Hatshepsut’s Speos Artemidos

---

1217 Wb. 1, 44.1.
1218 Wb. 1, 47.4.
1219 In Coptic, *iwi* became ⲁⲓⲧ/ⲧⲓ, for which see J. Winand, ‘Le verbe iy/iw: unité morphologique et sémantique’, LingAeg I (1991), 386. For discussion on *w* and *matres lectionis* especially in Egyptian verbal morphology, see D. Werning, ‘Hypotheses on glides and *matres lectionis* in Earlier Egyptian orthographies’, in J. Allen, M. Collier & A. Stauder (eds), Proceedings of the workshop on Earlier Egyptian Grammar (in press). I am indebted to Dr Werning for making a draft of this paper available to me.
1220 See Lipinski, Semitic Languages: Outline of a comparative grammar, 114.
1221 Halayqa, A Comparative Lexicon of Ugaritic and Canaanite, 70; Hoftijzer & Jongeling, Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions, I, 43-44. For semantic reasons, chiefly the problem of why a Levantine language would borrow an Egyptian word for ‘island/coast’, ‘*y* is probably a cognate of Egyptian *iw*, not a loanword, making it a Semitic-Egyptian isogloss. The same conclusion is reached in Muchiki, Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic, 239 who doubts the loanword status of this lexeme due to the way instead of yodh, contra T. Lambdin, ‘Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament’, JAOS 73 (1953), 147. M. Dahood, ‘Egyptian *‘Iw* “Island” in Jeremiah 10, 9 and Daniel 10, 5’, in P. Fronzaroli (ed.), Atti del secondo Congresso internazionale di linguistica camito-semitica (Firenze, 1978), 101-103 does not comment on the precise relationship of this Semitic word to Egyptian *iw* (even though the title of the article suggests otherwise).
1222 For this lexeme in Biblical Hebrew, see J. Mauchline, ‘Implicit signs of a Persistent Belief in the Davidic Empire’, Vetus Testamentum 20 (1970), 300-301, who states that it is mainly used in the sense of ‘coast’ rather than ‘island’.
1223 A. Murtonen, Hebrew in its West Semitic Setting I, 89. For the Arabic *‘wy* see Zammit, A Comparative Lexical Study of Qur’anic Arabic, 84; Dahood, ‘Egyptian *‘Iw* “Island” in Jeremiah 10, 9 and Daniel 10, 5’, in Fronzaroli (ed.), Atti del secondo Congresso internazionale di linguistica camito-semitica, 101-103. Harding, An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions, 87 reports *‘wy* and *‘wyː* in Safaitic and Thamudic personal and tribal names. Mendenhall connected the Midianite King *‘Ewi* to these personal names, see G. Mendenhall, ‘Quarayya and the Midianites’, in Abdalla, Al-Sakkar & Mortel (eds) Second International Symposium on Studies in the History of Arabia: Pre-Islamic Arabia, 140.
inscription [75.2], where it is stated that Iww, along with Rj-šš.wt, is not hidden from her. While Rj-šš.wt is almost certainly located in the Sinai, the grouping of Iww with this toponym does not readily point to their proximity, and the lack of ancient gold workings in the Sinai Peninsula rules out this location.

The allusion in Coffin Texts IV 46 [75.1] should be understood primarily in its mythological context. The spell is one of the so-called transformation spells (ḥpr.w), where the deceased takes the form of a mn.t-bird ‘swallow’. The neck (b’n.t) of the swallow into which the deceased is transformed is said to be comprised of gold from Iww. The fact that the neck is being mentioned may suggest that a golden amulet is being described, but a more plausible explanation of the text is that it is describing the colour scheme of a barn swallow (mn.t). The mineral colour-scheme alluded to in the spell, where the bird has a lapis (hsbd) head and back, a white electrum ġfm-gold body, and a darker red gold (nbw Iww) neck, perfectly matches the colouration of this bird (see Fig.22). Using the colour of the bird as a guide, it would seem that ‘gold of Iww’ was a much darker gold than ġfm-gold. Geologically, this probably refers to a higher copper or iron content in Iww-gold than regularly sourced gold (nbw or ġfm). The majority of Egypt’s gold workings were in the Eastern Desert and Nubia, but it is strange that this appellation is not referred to in any contemporary documents, and is notably absent from the Ramesside mining list or any other text mentioning gold sources.


1225 For analogies to this elsewhere in the Coffin Texts, see R. Nyord, Breathing Flesh: Conceptions of the Body in the Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts (Copenhagen, 2009), 227.

1226 Cooper & Evans, ‘Transforming into a Swallow’, ZÄS (in press).

1227 Gomaà, Besiedlung Ägyptens während des Mittleren Reiches, II, 279 suggested the Eastern Desert. For the Ramesside mining list see KRI II, 617-619.
Iww should, then, be sought in a gold-bearing region on the outer periphery of Egypt’s reach, it being only worthy of mention in texts because of its remoteness and distinctive gold. As local Nubian goldfields are known under other names, it is quite possible that this term refers to Arabia, including the well-known mines in the Hejaz such as the Mahd ad-Dhahab.\footnote{M. McDonald, ‘Trade Routes and Trade Goods in at the Northern end of the “incense road” in the first millennium B.C.’, in Avanzini (ed.), Profumi d’Arabia (Rome, 1997), 333 cites biblical and other Near Eastern textual evidence for Arabian gold, but concludes ‘I cannot find any clear evidence that these were worked extensively in the Pre-Islamic period or that they produced quantities of Ore.’ Parr, Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy 4, 51-52 is also sceptical of ancient Arabian gold exploitation, but importantly notes some Pre-Islamic remains at gold mines of Al-Wajh and Al-Ula. For Arab historians and Arabian gold, see R. Hoyland, Arabia and the Arabs: from the Bronze Age to the Coming of Islam (London, 2001), 14, 45, 110-112 and G. Heck, ‘Gold Mining in Arabia and the rise of the Islamic State’, JESHO 3 (1999), 365-367, 381-389. Heck proposes that mining in the Islamic period used second millennium BCE workings as a method for prospecting.}

There is little in the way of systematic data on the chronology of ancient goldmining in the Arabian Peninsula, but surveys have identified pre-Islamic mines stretching from Al-Bad’ in the north to Asir in the south, with major mines in the vicinity of Al-Wajh.\footnote{See Kisnawi et al., Atlal 7, 76-83; J. Hester, R. Hamilton, A. Rahbini, K. Eskoubi & M. Khan, ‘Preliminary report on the third phase of ancient mining survey southwestern province’, Atlal 8 (1984), 115-141.} Hoyland mentions a carbon date of 950 BCE at the Madh adh-Dhahab, suggesting pre-Islamic exploitation of gold deposits.\footnote{Hoyland, Arabia and the Arabs from the Bronze Age to the Coming of Islam, 112.} An Arabian location fits the sense and progression of the Speos Artemidos text which mentions Iww in between the other Red Sea locales of RA-SA.wt (Sinai) and Punt (Sudan-Eritrea). This theory is speculative and is posited to promote future research into the question. Indeed, if the etymology is correct, the placename could equally refer to any gold bearing region nearing the Mediterranean.
or Red Sea littoral – the Bronze Age gold mines on the Greek isle of Siphnos or the Taurus Mountains of southern Turkey, would also satisfy these criteria.  

It is tempting to connect this placename with the biblical 'Upház (עָפָז) found in Daniel 10:5 and Jeremiah 10:9. Dahood connected this to the above mentioned term 'än ‘island’ (despite the waw for yodh) plus a Semitic word pház šp ‘fine gold’, thus ‘the island of gold’.  

In the Targum and the Syriac versions, ‘Ophir of Red Sea fame replaces the older 'Upház, making it likely that they were considered related by the editors of these texts. The analysis of these biblical passages and their lexical and geographic issues is outside the scope of this work, but is mentioned here as a possible counterpart to the Egyptian term, given their lexical similarities and mutual relationship to gold.

Discussion: Given the bird colouration, it is likely that Ḳww-gold designates a deep red gold. Schorsch noted ‘red-gold’ samples among the many gold specimens from Tutankhamun’s tomb, which was attributed to the naturally high iron content in certain gold sources, while an earlier ‘red-gold’ ring of Akhenaton was the result of high copper content. This natural ‘red-gold’ is incredibly rare in the archaeological record, being only found in royal contexts. Either of these minerals could be the origin of Ḳww red-gold. In some cases, the red gold was an artificial alloying process, but both copper and iron naturally occur in some gold deposits. As such, it is difficult to know whether the distinctive Ḳww-gold was the result of a naturally occurring cupric- or ferric-gold deposit, or if it was alloyed by the indigenes of Ḳww.

Classification: +-Semitic (?)(7.1)

Etymology (I): The toponym is an indirect genitive formed from of iw ‘island’, qualified with a demonstrative, and ḳ₃ ‘soul’. Golenischeff and Gardiner thought that ḳ₃ meant something like...
‘This Phantom Island’. In modern commentaries the $k\beta$ of this island is generally taken to refer to the spirit of the snake, but Vandersleyen translated it as ‘île de Cocagne’ relating it to $k\alpha$ ‘food’. It may be taken that subsequent references to $iw$ ‘island’ in the story are referring to this placename.

**Location (III):** This placename is only mentioned once in the Shipwrecked Sailor [76.1], and as such, it may be questioned whether this is a real place, much like the $Bli-(n,y)-lt$ ‘mine of the sovereign’ [55A]. Derchain-Urtel has pointed out the connections between this island and Book of the Dead 175, where the mound of creation was compared to the snake’s island, which is inextricably linked to the life-force ($k\beta$) of the snake, and so when the snake leaves, the island is destroyed ($n-sp \, m i\neq \, iw \, p n$ ‘Never will you see this island’).

Nevertheless, it is still worth analysing this placename geographically, as part of the Egyptians’ imaginative geography of the Red Sea, in this text the $w\ddot{id}-wr$. The island is occupied by a snake, the ruler of Punt, and is said to be two months distant from Egypt, in keeping with the maritime voyages to Punt. Radomska suggested that the isle was actually a peninsula on the basis of the use of the dual in $w\ddot{id}-wr$ $n.t$ $gs(,wy)=f y \, m \, n w y$ ‘the Sea which is on both sides in water’ – an argument criticised by Westendorf. Ecologically, in addition to the blanket statement that there is ‘nothing that is not on it’, the ‘island’ is full of ‘good things’ ($i h.t \, n f r.t$), and $h k n.w$-oil, while other products are mentioned as gifts of the snake, without necessarily originating on the island itself. These products can generally be compared with the exports of Punt, and are thus in keeping with the snake’s identity as the ‘Ruler of Punt’. The isle is also wooded, having a tall tree ($\mathfrak{H} \, k \, \ddot{k} \, \ddot{i} \, i$).

**Discussion:** The operative question concerning this island, given its fictitious content, is whether it was inspired by real-world geography. There are few islands and/or peninsulas in the southern

---

1239 Bradbury, *JARCE* 25, 139-140 reconstructs the itinerary and seasonal sailing conditions of the Shipwrecked Sailor’s voyage.
1241 Lines 47-52, 161ff; see Blackman, *Middle Egyptian Stories*, 43, 46-47.
1242 Derchain-Urtel, *SAK* 1, 100-102.
Red Sea that could inspire such a setting. Vegetated regions in localities such as the Buri Peninsula, Gheden, Dahlak Kebir, Aqiq, or the Farasan Islands could in theory support a similar environment. Wainwright’s suggestion that the island could be identified with Saint John’s Island near Berenike is untenable ecologically and also because the distances travelled, as it is too close to Egypt.\textsuperscript{1244}

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+8.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification:</th>
<th>+Egyptian (1.1+8.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Etymology (I):** This hydronym is an indirect genitive comprising the Semitic loan \( ym \) ‘the sea’, qualified adjectively by ‘\( \epsilon \) ‘great’, joined with the nested phrase \( mw-kd \).\textsuperscript{1245} By the Ramesside period, the word \( ym \) had been regularised in Egyptian, so that it occurred as a standard word for ‘sea, lake’.\textsuperscript{1246} The precise meaning of \( mw-kd \) has provided some difficulties in translation. Most scholars have seen in this phrase a noun antecedent ‘water’ followed by a verbal stem \( kdi \) ‘to go around, to surround’, which functions as an adjectival participle,\textsuperscript{1247} thus meaning something like ‘water that turns’.

The difficulty in analysing the phrase is compounded by the fact that \( mw-kd \) is also applied to the Euphrates, and that it appears independently without \( p\ddash ym \) in a papyrus from the Cairo museum [\textsuperscript{77}]. The \( mw \textit{ pf \textit{kd.w}} \) ‘that water which goes around’ is described as the ‘northern boundary’ of Egypt in the Tombos Stele.\textsuperscript{1248} From this evidence, we can ascertain that \( mw-kd \) was a technical term for waters that flowed counter-directional to the regular north-south current of the Nile. However, another tact is to relate \( P\ddash ym-\epsilon\textit{n(y)-mw-kd} \) [\textsuperscript{77}2] directly to the \( Mw-kd \) as a name for the Euphrates, and thus treat the term as an embedded toponym, ‘The Sea of the Euphrates’, via its connection with the Persian Gulf.\textsuperscript{1249} But, given that the term applies to the two disparate situations of the Euphrates and Red Sea, and that the Egyptians may not have known that Mesopotamia could be accessed by rounding the Arabian Peninsula, it is safer to assume that these are separate terms referring to similar aquatic situations. Translations of ‘inverted-water’,

\textsuperscript{1244} Wainwright, \textit{JEA} 32, 31-38.
\textsuperscript{1245} \textit{Wb}. 1, 78.
\textsuperscript{1246} See Hoch, \textit{Semitic Words}, 52-53, where it is used in Egyptian placenames, e.g. \( P\ddash ym \) ‘Fayum’.
\textsuperscript{1247} \textit{Wb}. 5, 78.
\textsuperscript{1248} In \textit{Urk}. IV, 85.14. C. Vandersleyen, ‘Oublier l’Euphrate’, in C. Cannuyer (ed.), \textit{Acta Orientalia Belgica XI: Les voyages dans les civilisations orientales} (Bruxelles, 1998), 17-25 argues for interpreting this expression as the waters of the Fourth Cataract, where the bend in the Nile creates north-south currents. But, it is clear that the text locates \( mw \textit{ pf \textit{kd}} \) in the north and Syria: \( t\ddash s\ddash r\ddash y\ddash r\ddash fntyw \textit{ t\ddash pn \textit{mb\ddash ty} \textit{ r mw pf kd} \) ‘his southern boundary is at the front of this earth, (his) northern (boundary) is at that inverted-water’.
\textsuperscript{1249} G. Thausing & J. Holaubek, ‘Noch einmal: \( p\ddash ym \) ‘\( \epsilon\) \( n \) \( mw \) \( kd \)’ \textit{GM} 8 (1973), 53-55; M. Görg, ‘Das Ratespiel um \( Mw-kd \)’, \textit{GM} 32 (1979), 21-22.
'Umkehrwasser', or 'whirling-water' all approximate the idea of *kdi* 'to turn'.\footnote{For the Coptic reflexes of κτρ ṭo ‘umkehren’ and καρν ‘wenden’, see Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 70-71.} This point is emphasised by several scholars, who related *kdi* specifically to the confusing currents present in the turbulent Red Sea, which flowed counter to the Nile.\footnote{L. Störk, ‘“pɔ jm ʧ n mw kd” zum dritten?’, *GM* 9 (1974), 39-40; Kitchen, *Orientalia* 40, 190, n. 23; F. Breyer, ‘Punt und die Seefahrer. Zum Nutzen von Logbüchern in der Punt-Diskussion’, in K. Geus & M. Rathmann (eds), *Vermessung der Oikumene* (Berlin, 2013), 313.} Confusing matters is the appearance of a separate placename *Mw-kd* in northern Topographical Lists (where it must refer to the Euphrates),\footnote{KRI II, 210, no. 28 and KRI II, 216, no. 28.} in a papyrus referring to activities on the Red Sea shore [77.3],\footnote{Helck, *JARCE* 6, 148, line 46; 150, line 73.} and in an ostracon listing mainly African names [77.1].\footnote{L. Bongrani, ‘The Punt Expedition of Ramses IIIrd’, in *L'impero ramesside: convegno internazionale in onore di Sergio*, 50. The reading of *mw-kd* from the Stockholm Ostracon is somewhat in doubt, but satisfies the extant traces on the ostracon.} The last two of these references are in Red Sea contexts, which led Bongrani to assume that in these instances *Mw-kd* are toponyms on the coast.\footnote{Bongrani, ‘The Punt Expedition of Ramses IIIrd’, in *L'impero ramesside: convegno internazionale in onore di Sergio*, 50.} As generic terms could be dropped from genitive placenames, it is safer to presume that these Red Sea instances of *Mw-kd* are shortened forms of the full form *P3-ym-r-y-mw-kd*, dropping the generic term (see [49] and [50A]).\footnote{For *mw* as a generic in placenames, see *HWb*, 1343-1344.} The dropping of *pɔ-ym* in the ‘low register’ of documentary texts is quite logical, as *mw* could independently refer to watery expanses, and thus the phrase would be somewhat tautological.\footnote{Breyer, ‘Punt und die Seefahrer. Zum Nutzen von Logbüchern in der Punt-Diskussion’, in Geus & Rathmann (eds), *Vermessung der Oikumene*, 313.} Furthermore, one might note Breyer’s comment on the semantics of the name and its referent area: “*mw-kd* ist auf jeden Fall ein Hydronym und nicht der Name eines Landes, denn welches Land heißt schon „Umkehrwasser“?"\footnote{Following the argument of Kitchen, *Orientalia* 40, 190.} \\ Location (I): The Punt Expedition text of pHarris I [77.2], mentioning a landing near Coptos, indicates that *P3-ym-r-y-mw-kd* could only designate the Red Sea.\footnote{Bongrani, ‘The Punt Expedition of Ramses IIIrd’, in *L'impero ramesside: convegno internazionale in onore di Sergio*, 48-50. For the interpretation of the geography of this text, see [43].} It would seem likely that the term referred to the entirety of the Red Sea known to Egyptians, as no other name for bodies of water are recorded in the pHarris I Punt expedition account.\footnote{Bongrani, ‘The Punt Expedition of Ramses IIIrd’, in *L'impero ramesside: convegno internazionale in onore di Sergio*, 48-50.} Bongrani thought that it might refer to the southerly reaches of the Red Sea, from the Bab el-Mandeb to Wadi Allaqi. However, this theory relies on locating a toponym *Mw-kd* at the Red Sea coast near Wadi Allaqi, an interpretation that is only possible by conflating *Mw-kd* with *Ikyt* in the pCairo letter [77.3].\footnote{Bongrani, ‘The Punt Expedition of Ramses IIIrd’, in *L'impero ramesside: convegno internazionale in onore di Sergio*, 48-50. For the interpretation of the geography of this text, see [43].}
On the basis of Red Sea currents, Hofmann suggested the term could only designate waters north of Tokar, the southernmost port with favourable sailing conditions. Ultimately, there is no reason to suspect that it referred to only a portion of this sea and not its entirety.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.4+4.1+1.4)

**Etymology (I):** Same as above, without the generic ‘great sea’. For comparisons to other toponyms that could drop generic terms, see [49] and [50A].

**Location (I):** In the letter of Ramessesnakht [77.3], the Mw-kd is clearly the Red Sea and the Stockholm African onomasticon [77.1] does little to assist in determining a location. In all probability, the term has the same locational value as Pi-ym-ʕn(y)-mw-kt. If one had to argue for a topographic location based on the pCairo text, it would simply designate the Red Sea littoral in a rather vague manner, similar to how ‘Bahr al-Ahmar’ can refer to ‘Red Sea province’ of modern day Egypt.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.4)

**Etymology (II):** In Semitic loans, ʕ regularly corresponds to the pharyngeal affricate /ʕ/, and as such the word may be reproduced something like /ʕmw/. There is a possibility that ʕ could also render /d/, especially in African loans of the Old and Middle Kingdom, where Egyptian ɗ is almost never employed for writing loanwords. Given the New Kingdom date of this placename, one should favour /ʕ/, as there is no contemporary New Kingdom data for ʕ as /d/.

The pharyngeal affricate /ʕ/ is not a common consonant in African languages, and is unattested in contemporary Beja and exceedingly rare in Agaw. However, it is not implausible that the pharyngeal affricate underwent the shift from ʔ to 0 in Beja, as both of these consonantal shifts

---

1261 Per Störk, GM 9, 39-40.
1262 For ʕ in Semitic loans, see Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 431. Note there is serious debate as to whether ʕ could correspond to /ɗ/, at least in the Old Kingdom, for which see the extensive discussion in Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 99-102; Satzinger, *LingAeg* 5, 141-151 contra Takács, EDE I, 341-342. For a possible Middle Kingdom loan where ʕ reproduces /ɗ/, see Schneider, JAEI 2, 9-11.
are attested diachronically in a number of Cushitic languages from Proto-Cushitic. As an alternative to the above suggestion, if one accepts a historical shift of ʕ > Ø in Beja, is the word omaa ‘east’ reported by Starkey, or the tree ama(b) ‘tamarisk’ which is present in modern Beja toponyms. At least some of these suggestions are under the semantic range of the Proto-Cushitic root *c:aam, as reconstructed by Ehret.

Similar Beja toponyms exist to the modern day. Very close to the goldmines under discussion (see below), there is the placename Bir Amawa (21.2571, 37.0149), while further afield near the Red Sea coast is a similar placename Bir Amaweb (21.2571, 37.0149), with the Beja –b suffix. Amawa, then, is a productive lexeme in Beja toponymy, probably related to the above ama ‘tamarisk’. It should be noted that the Beja word is a reflex of the Afroasiatic root ʕmw ‘plant’, found also in the Egyptian lexicon of the New Kingdom as ʕm.w(t). On at least one occasion, the toponym ʕmw and this botanical term seem to have been conflated, and it is not precisely clear whether ʕm.w(t) is a loanword into Egyptian and/or if it refers to a similar plant like tamarisk. This botanical interpretation seems to be the most promising etymology.

Further confusing the situation is the placename ʕm3w found in the Old Kingdom biography of Iny. The orthography differs in the use of the eye-glyph as part of the verb m33

1265 One might also note that a native of Wadi Allaqi is called ‘nytn (Zibelius-Chen, Nubisches Sprachmaterial, 101), pointing to the the existence of the consonant /ʕ/ in local languages of the area in the second millennium BCE, although this rather isolated instance of this phoneme is troubling. For the comparative phonology of Cushitic languages see the table in C. Ehret, ‘Linguistic Archaeology’, African Archaeological Review 29 (2012), 116.

1266 L. Reinisch, Die Saho-Sprache (Wien, 1889), 63. For the lemmes, see Blažek, Belab und Bibel 2, 369; Reinisch, Wörterbuch der Bedauye-Sprache, 16, 164. This word for ‘east’ is probably related to the word ‘am noted by Reinisch as ‘aufsteigen’, for which see Blažek, Belab und Bibel 3, 409. For the use of ama ‘tree’ in the modern toponym Amah, see Bechhaus-Gerst, Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 61, 160. In Afar, the term qamay (q=/ʕ/ in Afar) refers to the tree Delonix elata; see D. Morin, Dictionnaire Afar-Francais (Paris, 2012), 159. This root is also present in Ethiosemitic ‘m tree, forest’, see Hudson, Northeast African Semitic, 110.

1267 C. Ehret, ‘Proto-Cushitic Reconstruction’, SUGIA 8 (1987), 113. One may duly doubt whether these semantically diverse lexemes (‘to rise, swell; point; tip; thorn’) originate from the same root.

1268 Wb. 168, 186; Orel & Stolbova, Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary, 240.

1269 The fact that the word could be spelt variably as ʕm3, or ʕm3, and dates to the New Kingdom and later could point to a loanword. It could also be an indigenous Egyptian root inherited from Afroasiatic and simply written in the updated orthography of the New Kingdom.

1270 M. Marcolin & A. Espinel, ‘The Sixth Dynasty Biographic Inscriptions of Iny: More Pieces to the Puzzle’, in M. Barta, F. Coppens & J. Krejčí (eds), Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2010 (Prague, 2011), 591. In addition to this placename, the toponym is also compared with the placename ‘Amurru or th root hmy ‘to protect’. But, there is no evidence for interpreting ʕ as zero or ʕ as /ʔ/ or /ħ/ in the Old Kingdom. One might instead think of Semitic ʕmr ‘ashes, dust, cut grain’ (Halayqa, A
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‘to see’. The general context of the inscription of Iny, where most of the known placenames are Asionic (\(\text{Kpn} \text{ ‘Byblos’,} \text{ Hnty-š ‘Lebanon’,} \text{ R₃-h₃.t ‘Delta-mouth’}), indicate that this \(\text{Šm₃w}\) is probably a Levantine placename. Therefore, perhaps Iny’s \(\text{Šm₃w}\) is related to another Asionic context.

**Location (II):** All sources are in agreement that \(\text{Šm₃w}\) is a gold-mining region and some texts show that it is associated with Punt [78.1-11]. Thus, the likely location of this placename can be narrowed down to some extent. Based on the inscription mentioning \(\text{Šm₃w}\) at Sabu [78.12], near Kerma, Vercoult located \(\text{Šm₃w}\) around the Third cataract, while Posener extended this to include the deserts between the Third Cataract and Port Sudan.\(^{1273}\) Kitchen and O’Connor rejected the Nilotic extent of \(\text{Šm₃w}\), both reasoning that a Third Cataract location is too close to Egyptian interests for \(\text{Šm₃w}\)-gold to be included in Puntite trade, and instead located \(\text{Šm₃w}\) in the desert east of Abu Hamed and Berber (Kitchen) or the Third Cataract (O’Connor).\(^{1274}\) Perhaps the reason for the Sabu inscription in the Third Cataract was the presence of a route going due east to the Gebel Nigeim gold area and/or Kurgus, avoiding part of the bend in the river.\(^{1275}\) The existence of such a route seems likely when one takes into account the Kerma Classique fortress in the area (17 km east of the Nile).\(^{1276}\) Due to the location of the Sabu inscription, the Castiglionis suspected that the region due east of Kerma at Abu Siha was the location of \(\text{Šm₃w}\).\(^{1277}\) Meeks is the only authority who disagrees with a location east of Upper Nubia, instead equating \(\text{Šm₃w}\) with Midian, concluding that it was a medial land between Asia and Punt (which he locates in Arabia).\(^{1278}\) The key piece of evidence for Meeks is an inscription from the tomb of Qenamun, which mentions a land \(\text{Šm₃w}\) in association with \(\text{Nhrn ‘Naharin’}\).\(^{1279}\) This orthography does not match any known writings of \(\text{Šm₃w}\), and is almost certainly to be connected with the phonetically identical \(\text{Šm₃w ‘Asiatic’}, \text{ proximally associated with the geographical area of Naharin in the Levant. Furthermore, the inclusion of \(\text{Šm₃w}\) in the list of southern mining regions and Kush should leave no


\(^{1275}\) Such routes along with their mines are documented in Castiglioni, Castiglioni & Bonnet, ‘The Gold Mines of the Kingdom of Kerma’, in Godlewski & Lajtar (eds), *Between the Cataracts*, 1, 263-70; Manzo, *BMSAES* 18, 102.

\(^{1276}\) Bonnet & Reinaud, *Genèe, nouvelle série* 41, 31-32.


\(^{1279}\) For the text and reliefs see Davies, *The Tomb of Ken-Amun at Thebes*, pl. 22; *Urk. IV*, 1393 10-13: \(\text{wrr.yt [‘h₃j n.y] h₅m₃w r₃-n₃.w r₃-n₃.w m Ti-n₃.f h₃.t n.t Nhrn ‘The fighting chariot of his majesty, the one of the Aamu, it’s wood was brought back from God’s-Land, upon the hill-country of Naharin’}\. See also Hallmann, *Tributszenen des Neuen Reiches*, 193 n. 1315.
doubt to the general Nubian nature of this placename. Meeks uses a text from Medinet Habu [78.9] which mentions Tfr (the origin of Lapis Lazuli), R3-š3wt (Sinai) and ʿmw in one sentence to imply that ʿmw is in the Levant. However, the text does not necessarily imply that any of these locations are proximal, but rather delineates some of the costly products that could be obtained from the breadth of God’s-Land (Tj-nfr), a term that encompassed all easterly regions between Punt and Syria.1281

The infrequent mention of ʿmw in Egyptian sources suggests that it was generally beyond the reach of Egyptian mining expeditions which ventured to Wadi Allaqi or Wadi Gabgaba from their bases in Lower and Upper Nubia.1282 The only gold-mines that would offer such a medial position between the Allaqi region and Punt would be the mines of Onib and Oshib, in the Red Sea Hills in the region west of Suakin and Port Sudan.1283 As the Sabu inscription [78.12] is in the Kerma region, the likelihood is that ʿmw represents a gold source much further south and east than Kerma. The chronological distribution of ʿmw in texts also makes sense for this location, as references to ʿmw only occur from Hatshepsut until Ramesses III, when Egyptian hegemony in Nubia was at its greatest extent, allowing Egyptians to reach new gold sources on their southernmost periphery.

The exhaustive surveys of Klemm and Klemm have identified New Kingdom era goldmines in this district, which stretch from Gebel el-Nigeim, approximately 80 km from the Nile at Hagr el-Merwa to Khor Nubt, approximately 300km to the east.1284 Such a region would explain how ʿmw-gold could reach markets on both the Nile Valley and further southeast in Punt. Kitchen inferred the existence of this substance in Puntite trade meant that Amu was proximal to this country.1285 Power remarks that, in the Islamic period, this region was one of the major regions of the ninth century CE ‘gold-rush’, and the coastal ports of the area owed their existence to gold

1280 For the sequential logic in the list of mining regions, see Vercoutter, Kush 7, 130-131; J. Osing, ‘Strukturen in Fremdländerlisten’, JEA 68 (1982), 79-80 and, more recently, Legrand, ‘La liste dite “des regions minieres”’, in El-Saeed, El-Mahfouz & Megahed (eds), Festschrift Abdel Monem Abdel Haleem Sayed, 327-334.
1281 KRI V, 328. For the geography of God’s-Land, see Cooper, BACE 22, 52-55.
1282 Zibelius, AOVN, 99.
1283 For these goldfields and their access routes, see Klemm, Klemm & Murr, African Earth Sciences 33, 654; Manzo, BMSAES 18, 82, fig. 24. Parenthetically, one should note that the goldfields of the Third and Fourth Cataracts could also be candidates here, but they are known under the names of ‘Gold of Kush’ or ‘Gold of Nsw.t-wty’ (Gebel Barkal) in texts, for which see Vercoutter, Kush 7, 129-132. Furthermore, it is doubtful that Egyptians would have been happy for ʿmw-gold to be traded back to them via Punt if this goldfield was located on the Nubian Nile, as pointed out in Kitchen ‘Further thoughts on Punt and its Neighbours’, in Leahy & Tait (eds), Studies on Ancient Egypt in Honour H.S. Smith, 174-177.
1284 Mines exhibiting New Kingdom style grinding mills include Negeim, Aliakateb, Wadi Amur, Khor Nubt and Ganait see Klemm & Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 372, 375, 378, 384, 489-495.
found in the hinterland. The unique product of mw in the Punt Expedition [78.1], nbw w’d ‘green gold’, is usually thought to refer to gold with a high copper or silver content, but Falk instead suggested that it simply reads as ‘gold and malachite of Amu’. While the proximity of Punt and Amu seems certain because of the Punt Expedition Text, pragmatically, one may doubt that Egyptians would have been aware of its origin and labelled it as ‘of Amu’ if it was traded through Puntites. Rather, this text might suggest that Egyptians directly procured the ‘Amu-malachite’ from the environs of Amu on the return or outgoing voyage to Punt, thus placing Amu close to the Red Sea shore.

Several Ptolemaic texts also make reference to the placename mw. A parallel text from Edfu and Athribis delineating the different types of aromatics used in temple rituals mentions mw’tyw-resin of mw, a connection that is consistent with the earlier texts coupling mw and Punt. A text from Kom Ombo groups mw together with the placename Isdrnn/Isdt. A similar name, Isdrt, occurs in the narrative of the fourth century BCE stele of Nastasen, where the Nubian ruler describes the itinerary of his journey from Meroë to Napata. From this text, Isdrt can either be on the river between Meroë and Napata, as favoured by older authorities, or an overland area in the Bayuda desert between Meroë and Gebel Barkal. As Wainwright argued, a location for Isdrt at the confluence of the Atbara and the Nile does not necessarily invalidate either of these suggestions. From here Nastasen could have travelled the overland route to Napata, or the longer
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1286 Power, Chroniques Yéménites 15, 92-110.
1287 Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals, 35-36 surmises that the substance ‘would most naturally refer to gold with a fairly high admixture of silver, and traces of copper, which would render it a green or greenish-grey colour’. See also Balanda, JARCE 42, 33-34, who suggests nbw w’d is a gloss for leucite (dfm).
1288 See Falk, GM 238, 51-55. The substance w’d is known from a number of texts as an independent term for a mineral usually translated as ‘malachite’. Likewise, Falk notes that nbw of mw in the Punt Expedition Text, written as w’mw (p. 51-53) (possibly nbwy), a more cupric gold than regular nbw. S. Bojowald, ‘Zur Bedeutung der Eigenschaft w’d beim nbw – Gold’, DE 65 (2012), 3-7 cites alternatives, reading w’d as ‘fresh gold’ (including a possible semantic shift in w’d to mean ‘red’) or a mistake for hdl-nbw ‘white gold’.
1289 Chermette, Goyon, SAK 23, 61f.
1290 J. de Morgan, Kom Ombos (Vienna, 1909), II, 235 rd. l. n=l mwn hr Isdrnn mn.ty n kl(=k) gr bȋy.w=m ‘he gave Amu to him with Isedreset, the two-mountains for your ka and your wonders’. Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals, 217 notes that the word is probably a mistake for the placename mw, and hence one should follow de Morgan’s transcription of mw, instead of the Berlin Wörterbuch’s mw (Wb. 1, 185). For Isdrt on the Stele of Nastasen as Isdrnn, see Urk. III, 143 and Zibelius, AOVN, 92. Zibelius leaves open the possibility that the water ripples function as a determinative for lst, a Merotic-Nubian word for water. An Istn is otherwise known as a source of silver
route around the Nile and Abu Hamed. Thus while not explicit, these Ptolemaic texts continue the tradition of locating mw in a region contiguous with Upper Nubia near the Fifth Cataract region.

It may be that the modern placename Bir Amawa (21.2571, 37.0149) is the later reflex of this placename. It lies within the goldfields east of the Fifth Cataract and the well here is close to New Kingdom mining operations at Aliakateb (7 km), Wadi Amur (15 km), and Khor Nubt (37 km) (see Fig. 23). Bonnet and Reinold found Second millennium BCE pottery and figurines at nearby Khor Ariab and Bir Ajam. This general region for mw matches all the relevant locational criteria.

Figure 23: Ancient sites around the goldfields east of the Fifth Cataract.

Discussion: In the context of the discussion of mw, it is important to note the placename Nmy in the Punt Expedition Text at Deir el-Bahri, known only in the phrase [wr]w n.w Nmyw. It has been suggested that this toponym is merely a mistake for mw, a toponym which
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1292 Klemm & Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 608.
1293 Bonnet & Reinold, Genève, nouvelle série 41, 31-32.
1294 Urk. IV, 333.8. O’Connor, JEA 73, 113 n. 66 also reconstructs the placename in the lacuna in Urk. IV, 331.8: Iwn.twy T-sty n.w Hn.t-hn-nfr h3s.t nb.t rs.yt n.w [Nmy] ‘the Iuntiu nomads of Ta-sety and Khent-hen-nefer and all the southern foreign-countries of Nemy’. While O’Connor has understandably included Nmy due to its earlier inclusion in the captions of prostrating foreign chiefs (Naville, Deir el-Bahari III, pl. 76), this logic does not exclusively hold given that Hn.t-hn-nfr is not extant in the list of chiefs and a more general toponym like ‘Kush’ could be equally valid, as the sense of the text is a general rubric for southern regions. For a text where all these toponyms (Kš, Hn.t-hn-nfr, T-sty) are found in sequence, see the mining regions list in Vercoutter, Kush 7, 130-131.
also makes its debut in the texts at Deir el-Bahri.\textsuperscript{1295} The graphic similarity of $\nu\nu$ and $\nu\nu$ in hieratic increases the likelihood for such an error, and one must note the generally high frequency of orthographic errors in writing placenames.\textsuperscript{1296}

It is not implausible that any Punt fleet could also access $\nu\nu$ on outbound or return trips, when the expedition may have halted at a medial port between Egypt and Punt in the area of Port Sudan or Suakin.\textsuperscript{1297} Indeed, Manzo suggests that the ‘mining region’ of $\nu\nu$\textsuperscript{84} in Middle Kingdom expeditions may reflect exactly the same region as $\nu\nu$ in the New Kingdom.\textsuperscript{1298} If this is the case, then it is possible that Egyptians accessed $\nu\nu$ by both the sea and land, but the location of $\nu\nu$\textsuperscript{82} is lacking almost any secure data.

**Classification:** +Cushitic? (7.1)

\[79\] [\[\text{Wid-wr-ib.ty}\] ]

**Etymology (I):** This hydronym is a noun, $\text{Wid-wr}$, qualified by $\text{ib.ty}$ ‘eastern’, an adjective derived from $\text{ib.t}$ ‘east’ (see [1]). The sense of $\text{Wid-wr}$ is a long debated problem in lexicography, but it is clear that it refers to large bodies of water, including the Red Sea.\textsuperscript{1299}

**Location (I):** The placename is found only in the cosmographic discourse of The Book of the Day [79.1] where it is the seat of the $\text{bnt.y}$-baboons and the ‘eastern souls’.\textsuperscript{1300} In this text the ‘Eastern Ocean’ is associated with Wetenet [81], Punt [84], and the eastern horizon ($\text{ib.t-ib.t}$). Thus, there can be little doubt that it is the oldest specific term for the Red Sea in Egyptian documents.\textsuperscript{1301} As a comparison, the same text also mentions the $\text{Wid-wr-mh.tyt}$ ‘Mediterranean’ which is connected with Byblos and $\text{Kftyw}$ ‘Crete’.\textsuperscript{1302}

**Discussion:** As the location of the mythical $\text{bnt.y}$-baboons, it is clear that this placename, while most likely the on Red Sea, is situated in a cosmographic sense. The Red Sea would have been known for baboon populations, and thus this mythical allusion could be one based on real

\textsuperscript{1296} For a list of these errors, see Edel, *SAK* 4, 94-96.
\textsuperscript{1297} Manzo, *BMSAES* 18, 84.
\textsuperscript{1298} Manzo, *BMSAES* 18, 84.
\textsuperscript{1299} See n. 1402.
\textsuperscript{1300} For the $\text{b.i.w-ib.tyw}$, also called $\text{bnt.yw}$, see J. Assmann, *Der König als Sonnenpriester* (Glückstadt, 1970), 48-50.
\textsuperscript{1301} M. Müller-Roth, *Das Buch vom Tage* (Fribourg, 2008), 162. Müller-Roth also proposes that this ocean is equally understood as part of the mythological $\text{Sn-wr}$, the ocean that surrounds the earth.
\textsuperscript{1302} See Müller-Roth, *Das Buch vom Tage*, 293.
observations and inspirations. 1303 A very similar passage occurs in a Third Intermediate Period mythological papyrus belonging to Djedkhonsuifankh. 1304 A comparable term W3d-wr-inn.t(y) exists in a Third Intermediate mythological text, although what body of water it designates is a mystery. 1305

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.4+3.2)

**Etymology (II):** Even though the word is only attested in the New Kingdom, the orthography is more reminiscent of the Old or Middle Kingdom, before the advent of ‘group-writing’. This suggests that the word is either a pre-New Kingdom loanword, or actually a native Egyptian word. While a root wkm is not registered in Egyptian lexicons, there is a Middle Kingdom personal name Wkm(.t). 1306 Thus, one might postulate a rare Egyptian root wkm, but its meaning is elusive. Chassinat thought that wkm might mean ‘to supply, provide’, based on its appearance in two Ptolemaic texts. 1307 In Demotic, there is a word wkm translated as ‘fruit’ or ‘Gefäß’. 1308 It is also worth considering a connection to the placename By-wkm/By-wgm (Bwgm) in Graeco-Roman hieroglyphic texts and Demotic literature, which would assume an Egyptian compound based on bw/by ‘place’. 1309 The graphemes w and k are usually incompatible in Egyptian roots, 1310 but whether this alone indicates that Wkm.t is a foreign loanword is somewhat speculative. A connection with the root wgm ‘to grind, powder’ makes sense, as this word is used in one text with km.yt ‘gum’, the only known product of Wkm.t, but examples of a shift of k > g remains

1303 For baboons and the Red Sea, see the placenames Wetenet [81] and Punt [84].
1304 A. Piankoff & N. Rambova, *Mythological Papyri* (New York, 1957), 157, pl. 19: iw hpr.w=r n m Br.n.tw n[n] rh.tw mdw=n in {hnm} <hnm.t?> hr hst.t Wn.t r(n(=) w3d-wr hr lb.t(y)t ⟨Their (the ennead) forms (are) as bentiu-monkeys, their speech not being known by the <sunpeople ?> upon the hill-country, Wetenet is (it’s) name (in) the ocean upon the east⟩.
1305 D. Meeks, *Mythes et légendes du Delta d’apres le papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.84* (Le Caire, 2006), pl. 10. It might refer to a portion of the Mediterranean adjacent to Libya – although it is plausible that by this period that Egyptians had some knowledge of the African coast of the Atlantic through intermediaries.
1306 See Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*, I, 87. Wkm also occurs as a personal name (?) in Sinai no. 90 and no. 500; see Gardiner, Peet & Černý, *The Inscriptions of the Sinai*, I, pl. 25, pl. 89.
1307 É. Chassinat, *Le mystère d’Osiris au mois de Khoiak*, II, 662, n. 6. Such a meaning could also be predicted if it is related to the Afroasiatic root *kum* ‘to take, get’, for which see Orel & Stolbova, *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*, 326; C. Ehret, *Reconstructing Proto-Afroasiatic (Proto-Afrasian): Vowels, Tone, Consonants, and Vocabulary* (Berkely, 1995), 198. This would require a metathesis through the Law of Belova, where medial u/i in Afroasiatic roots becomes anlaut Egyptian w/i in Egyptian reflexes.
1309 For the differing orthographies, see *GDG* II, 20.
elusive in Middle Egyptian. The connection with the root *wkm* giving the sense of ‘to provide’ might be the preferable option. The auslaut –*t* is easily explained as a *nomen loci*, ‘providing(-place)’ or a more abstract meaning, ‘the-providing-one’.

**Location (II):** The placename is found only on one stele from Sinai [80.1], where it is the location of *km.yt* ‘gum’, in a text which also mentions *Pwnt* [84] and *Wtn.t* [81]. As the substance *km.yt* is almost universally a product of Punt in Egyptian texts, and because the text also mentions other Red Sea localities, one can be fairly certain that *Wkm.t* is located somewhere along the Red Sea. This placename also occurs in the much later mineral lists at Edfu (ключение), where it is the origin of *wl/t* ‘malachite’. Schiaparelli thought that *wl/d* here might mean ‘emerald’ and hence be a reference to the emerald mines at Sikait. Given the Ptolemaic date of the Edfu inscriptions, it is possible that *wl/t* could mean emerald in this text, as emerald was only exploited in this period and later. These criteria do not readily point to a specific location. Its occurrence on a Sinai Stele with *Pwnt* and *Wtn.t* perhaps suggests another Red Sea littoral locality, probably north of *Wtn.t*. This is also broadly in line with postulated locations for the Demotic *Bwgm* (see Excursus II. IV).

**Classification:** +Egyptian (5.1?)

![81] Wtn.t

**Etymology (II):** The orthographic alternation between *Wtn.t* and *Wtn.t* simply reflects the merging of the palatals, although it is surprising that the oldest attested writing preserves *t* not *t*, as one would expect the opposite. In Egyptian orthography, the grapheme *t* was sometimes written where one expects *t*, in a process that has been called ‘hypercorrection’, which is generally considered a phenomenon of Late Egyptian. The *Wtn.t* of the topographical lists

---

1311 Wb. 1, 377 and Wilson, *A Ptolemaic Lexikon*, 270. Could *k* have shifted to *g* in Egyptian roots when in the environment of *w*? For the complexities of Egyptian velars, see Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 107-114.


1316 Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 125; K. Jansen-Winkeln, *Spätmittelägyptische Grammatik* (Wiesbaden, 1996), 38-39; Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 40. This phenomenon may have occurred much earlier. In the Heqanakhpt papyri of the early Middle Kingdom, there is an example of *dbn* ‘deben-weight’ hypercorrected to *dn*, see Allen, *Heqanakhpt Papyri*, 82, pl. 11, line 1. Such hypercorrections must have only become prevalent after the palatal fronting of *t* and *d* in the early Middle Kingdom.
could be related to this process, but is more likely an error based on hieratic copying.\(^{1317}\) If the toponym is a foreign-word, and treated as such by Egyptians, one would not expect palatal fronting to take place (cf. \textit{Mdj} [24]), but if it was an Egyptian word, or treated as an Egyptian word, then one can easily see how orthographic confusion between \textit{t} and \textit{t} could take place. On balance, from the orthography of the earliest texts, the likelihood is that the placename was written originally as \textit{Wtn.t}. The problem with this scenario, however, is that one has to ascribe all writings with \textit{t} as hypercorrections, possibly influenced by copying errors and manuscript traditions. A writing of \textit{Imt-Wnt} was purportedly read by Posener in an Execration Text,\(^{1318}\) but the writing is far too illegible to be sure of this reconstruction.

Aufrère suggested an Egyptian compound, \textit{w-tn} ‘la region élevée’,\(^{1319}\) but this would be semantically strange (and unparalleled), as Egyptians already had other words for ‘highlands’ (\textit{dhw}, \textit{h\textbackslash{s}t}, \textit{hr.t}). Another Egyptian possibility is the verb \textit{wtn} ‘to pierce, to tunnel’.\(^{1320}\) This word is used in the Ramesside tomb robbery papyri for the action of tunnelling into a tomb, so it would be semantically unsuitable for the etymology of a choronym.\(^{1321}\) There have been arguments equating this placename with similar names in Near Eastern literature. Federico de Romanis, following the much earlier suggestion of Brugsch, equated \textit{Wtn.t} with the placename \textit{\textbf{\textbar}tn} of Ezekiel 27, 19. This name is grouped with Uzal (the biblical name for Sana‘a, Yemen) in the list of Tyre’s trading partners, a connection also cited by Tomkins, who equated \textit{Wtn.t} with specific sites in Yemen and the Arabian coast.\(^{1322}\) While this suggestion is plausible on phonetic grounds, on locational criteria it hardly seems to be a good match, as \textit{Wtn.t} never seems to have produced iron or wine in Egyptian sources, nor are African products such as baboons or ebony mentioned in the texts. If one entertains an African etymology, there are plausible Cushitic words in \textit{wdn} ‘heart’, present in Agaw, Afar, and Somali, or the root \textit{wdm/wn} ‘uncultivated land, pasture’ present in

\(^{1317}\) Edel, SAK 4, 83, 94-96 gives an example of the reverse of this process in the name \textit{Dwh} > \textit{Twh} [117].

\(^{1318}\) Posener, \textit{Princes et pays d’Asie et de Nubie}, 60. The transcription \textbackslash{\textbackslash} is visible.

\(^{1319}\) Aufrère, \textit{L’univers minéral dans la pensée égyptienne}, II, 757.

\(^{1320}\) See \textit{Wb}. 1, 380; Lesko, \textit{A Dictionary of Late Egyptian}, I, 117; \textit{HWb}, 224.

\(^{1321}\) J. Capart, A. Gardiner & B. van de Walle, ‘New Light on the ramesiside Tomb-Robberies’, JEA 22 (1936), 172.

\(^{1322}\) F. de Romanis, \textit{Cassia, Cinnamomo, Ossidiana} (Roma, 1996), 59-61. This equation was also related by Tomkins, who considered \textit{Wtn.t} to refer to the Southern Yemeni place \textit{\textbackslash{\textbackslash}Udein} (العدين), while the similar toponym \textit{Wdn.t} is treated as a separate placename standing for a placename (\textit{Widan}) on the Arabian coast north of Jizan; see H. Tomkins, ‘Remarks on Mr. Flinders Petrie’s Collection of Ethnographic Types from the Monuments of Egypt’, \textit{The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland} 18 (1889), 217-219. The relevant passage in Ezekiel provides many problems in translation and logic; see for example M. Elat, ‘Iron Exports from Uzal (Ezekiel XXVII 19)’, \textit{Vetus Testamentum} 33 (1983), 323-330 where \textit{w\textbackslash{\textbackslash}dn} is equated with the Cilician-Greek \textit{Danaoi}. This translation is rejected in D. Block, \textit{The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48} (Grand Rapids, 1998), II, 67 n. 91, who follows the emendations of A. Millard ‘Ezekiel XXVII. 19: The Wine trade of Damascus’ \textit{Journal of Semitic Studies} 7 (1962), 202, where the word is associated with the Akkadian \textit{danna} referring to a type of wine-jar.
Cushitic and Ethiosemitic.\textsuperscript{1323} Provided there is Semitic influence on the African coast, one can also cite appropriate Semitic roots like ESA \textit{wtn} ‘field’, \textit{wdn} ‘valley’ or \textit{wtn} ‘perpetually flowing’.\textsuperscript{1324} Indeed, the Semitic root \textit{wtn} ‘to flow’ in all probability has an Egyptian cognate in the form of the enigmatic \textit{wtn.\textwtn} from the Pyramid and Coffin Texts.\textsuperscript{1325} Given the fact that the toponym \textit{Wtn.t} is known to be on the coast, and that it appeared in the lexicon as early as the First Intermediate Period, if not before, the best explanation for the toponym is a deverbal from this reconstructed Egyptian root \textit{wtn} ‘to flow’. The suffix \textit{-t} would designate a nominal form, ‘flowing-one’, perhaps referring to a marine environment or river.

**Location (II):** A physical, as opposed to purely cosmographic, location for We tenet is supported by several historical texts from the First Intermediate Period and later [81.1, 81.4, 81.7]. The inscription from the tomb of Setka [81.1] makes reference to ebony from Wetenet, as does an inscription in the Sinai [81.7]. Furthermore, the Sinai inscription refers to the ‘cutting’ (§\text{\texteins}) of trees, so it is clear that Egyptians obtained ebony directly from Wetenet and not through trade. The suggestions of Tomkins, Aufrère, and Chassinat regarding a South Arabian \textit{Wtn.t} can probably therefore be ruled out due to the absence of ebony in the Arabian Peninsula.\textsuperscript{1326} \textit{Wtn.t} has been placed at various points on the East African coast,\textsuperscript{1327} ‘south-east’ of Egypt (Meeks),\textsuperscript{1328} ‘beyond Punt’ (Dixon),\textsuperscript{1329} or the Egyptian Red Sea coast near Quseir (Zyhlarz).\textsuperscript{1330} Kitchen was much more specific and put \textit{Wtn.t} ‘west of Trinkitat’,\textsuperscript{1331} which would refer to the highlands of Erkowit.

\textsuperscript{1323} For \textit{wdn} ‘heart’, see L. Reinisch, \textit{Wörterbuch der Bilin-Sprache} (Wien, 1887), 353. Cushitic \textit{wdm/\textit{wdn}} ‘uncultivated land’ is reported in Leslau, \textit{Etymological Dictionary of Gurage}, III, 643, with reflexes in Highland and Lowland Cushitic as well as Agaw, but Awngi is the only registered Agaw language with the \textit{n} instead of \textit{m}.

\textsuperscript{1324} For these roots and Semitic comparanda, see Zammit, \textit{A Comparative Lexical Study of Qur`\textasciiacute;nic Arabic}, 427, 436; Beeston, Ghul, Müller & Ryckmans, \textit{Sabaic Dictionary}, 156, 165; Lipinski, \textit{On the skirts of Canaan}, 263-264.

\textsuperscript{1325} The Egyptian word \textit{wtn.w} may be treated either as a Semitic-Egyptian isogloss or an early Semitic loan, as this word is moribund by Middle and Late Egyptian; for a discussion of the term, see R. El-Sayed, ‘A propos de spells 407 et 408 des Texts Sarcophages’, \textit{RdE} 26 (1974), 75-76 n. 12. The Semitic cognates of this root include Hebrew ‘\textit{\textm\textn}\textit{tn}’ ‘flow’, Arabic \textit{watana} ‘every-flowing’, and ESA \textit{wtn} ‘perpetual rain’, see Zammit, \textit{A Comparative Lexical Study of Qur`\textasciiacute;nic Arabic}, 427.

\textsuperscript{1326} Aufrère, \textit{L'universe minéral dans la pensée égyptienne}, II, 757 n. a, following Chassinat, \textit{Le mystère d’Osisr au mois de Khoiak II}, 456-457.


\textsuperscript{1329} D. Dixon, \textit{The Ebony Trade of Ancient Egypt} (London, 1961), 32-33.

\textsuperscript{1330} Zyhlarz, \textit{Kush} 6, 23.

Conceivably, what Egyptians designated by ḫbny was African Blackwood (*Dalbergia melanoxylon*) or perhaps *Diospyros mespiliformis*, but there is difficulty in identifying different species in the archaeological record. The distribution of these woods in Africa show that the closest stands were probably in the Eritrean lowlands, with Dixon reporting stands of *D. mespiliformis* at Erkowit. However, with changing ecological conditions and the possibility of over-exploitation in antiquity, it is dangerous to assume that ebony was not more widespread in the second millennium BCE than it is today. Not incidentally, baboons are known to eat the fruit of *D. mespiliformis*, as well as dwell on its branches. Thus, the connection between ebony and baboons in mythological texts [81.3, 81.8, 81.12, 81.13] may be based on real ecological conditions. In texts, Egyptian ḫbny had uses beyond its timber, and it may be these clues that assist with some identifications. In pEbers, the ḫpꜣ ‘navel’ of ḫbny is used for an ailment of the eye, while the kmy.t ‘gum’ of ḫbny is used in the embalming ritual. The medicinal use would concord well with many of the species of *Diospyros*, which have antibiotic properties. In reference to its use in embalming, it is worth noting too that the resin of *D. mespiliformis* is used in contemporary West Africa to repair pottery. The balance of this evidence may suggest that Egyptian ebony, as per Dixon’s thesis, could also include *D. mespiliformis*, as well as the commonly cited *D. melanoxylon*.

The mention of Wetenet at Serabit el-Khadim, [81.7] near the Red Sea, further suggests that Wetent area was accessed via this contiguous body of water, as opposed to travelling through Nubia and the Upper Nile. Today, baboons are found on the coast as far north as Tokar. That
the land was on the Red Sea is more explicitly stated in The Book of the Day [81.13], where it is described as being on the \( Wdwr-3lb.ty \) ‘the Eastern Great Green’, the Red Sea (see [79]). This would seem to rule out any inland region, and perhaps recommend the coast in an ecologically favourable area around Suakin or Tokar. A more finite localisation for Wetenet is impossible until one can reliably plot ancient stands of ebony (which generally need >400mm of annual rainfall).\(^\text{1340}\) It is important to note that such a location would place Wetenet within the environs of Punt, a not wholly unexpected scenario given that ebony and baboons were also obtained from this land.

The cosmographic allusions to Wetenet [81.2, 81.8, 81.12], as the origin of the morning sun Khepri, are very similar to Punt’s mythic allusions as the source of the sun in the south-eastern sky.\(^\text{1341}\) While the interpretation of the Topographical Lists is unclear, Wetenet is the next ‘headword’ after Punt [81.5–6, 81.9–11, 81.14], suggesting this region is near Punt or a separate entity on the Red Sea coast. Later Ptolemaic sources continue to mention Wetenet in temple literature, being grouped with \( Md\), \( Pwnt\), \( Km\ tyr\), and \( Bwgm\) in separate texts at Edfu.\(^\text{1342}\) The \( Km\ tyr\) are a little known ethneme particular to Ptolemaic temple texts. It could simply be rendered as ‘the gum-people’, the word being a nisbe deriving from the toponym \( km\ t\) \( =\) ‘gum-land’, itself deriving from \( km\ yt\) or \( km\ t\) ‘gum, resin’.\(^\text{1343}\) In summary, \( Wtn.t\) probably designated a coastal region of the Red Sea in Eastern Sudan.

**Discussion:** The placename is more frequently found in religious literature, where it is associated with the sun-god and solar-rising. This motif is also shared with other related south-eastern

---


\(^\text{1341}\) For Punt as the locus of solar birth, see the caption of the *Book of Nut* next to the \( 3h.t-3lb.t\) ‘eastern horizon’: \( wmn \ ntr \ pn \ m \ g\(y\) = \( r\)sy-\( 3lb.ty \ hr-s\) Pwnt ‘this god exists in it’s south-eastern side, behind Punt’; see O. Neugebauer & R. Parker, *Egyptian Astronomical Texts* (London, 1960–1969), I, 45 and A. von Lieven, *Grundriss des Laufes der Sterne*, 49, 374. The Book of the Dead attestation [85.15] is an allusion to morning sun rising from the east as a youthful child, and the lion is a common solar topos; see J. Darnell, *The Enigmatic Netherworld Books of the Solar-Osirian Unity* (Göttingen, 2004), 143, 319.


\(^\text{1343}\) *Wb.* 5, 38. See also G. Takács ‘Proto-Afro-Asiatic Origin of “Gum”?’, *BASOR* 63 (2000), 96–99 who notes Chadic parallels for the Egyptian word. Another possible line of inquiry may be a connection to Egyptian \( km\) ‘to hammer out (metal)’ (*Wb.* 5, 33), with a regular loss of \( i\) by the Middle Kingdom. This is perhaps similar to the English expression ‘to tap’ in reference to extracting resin from incense bearing trees.
placenames such as Punt, Medja, and God’s-Land. Thus, the nisbe Wtn.ty ‘he-of-Wetenet’ describes the sun-god as he dawns from the southeast.\textsuperscript{1344} This is explicit in the Litany of Re, where Re in his form of Khepri, the morning sun, is called the Wtn.ty ‘he of Wetenet’ [81.12] and in a text announcing baboons of Wtn.t ‘who foretell Re’ at dawn [81.8].

**Classification:** +Egyptian (5.1)

\[81A\] Iw.w-Wtn.tyw

**Etymology (I):** Same as above, but a nisbe-ethne me. The generic term is the plural of iw ‘island’.\textsuperscript{1345}

**Location (II):** The notion of the ‘islands of the Wtn.tyw’ in the Poetical Stele [81.4] is perplexing, especially as it is grouped with the Libyan Thm.w.\textsuperscript{1346} This grouping may be attributable to a geographic error or poetic license, but if it does designate Wtn.t as islands, the only peopled archipelago would be the Dahlak islands or the group near Aqiq and Tokar.\textsuperscript{1347} Ancient remains are known on Dahlak Archipelago, Aqiq Kebir, and Er-Rih, although generally date to later periods.\textsuperscript{1348}

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+6.4)

\[82\] Bi\(\beta\)-Pwnt

**Etymology (II):** The toponym is a direct or indirect [82.6] genitive comprised of the generic element bi\(\beta\) and the toponym Punt [84]. As discussed in the entry Bi\(\beta\).w [55], there are essentially two plausible etymologies for this placename: 1) a relation to bi\(\beta\).(w) ‘mine’, the consensus


\textsuperscript{1345} Wb. 1, 47.

\textsuperscript{1346} For the geographic logic in the text, consult Oising, *JEA* 68, 77-79. The rubric of ‘land of the west’ in line 16 is given to the Aegean toponyms of Kftyw and Isy, which might be explained by the western maritime routes Aegean peoples used to access Egypt, see B. Kemp & S. Merrillees, *Minoan Pottery in Second Millennium Egypt* (Mainz, 1980), 268-269, 281-282.


position of most Egyptologists,\(^\text{1349}\) or 2) following Balanda and Gundacker, a relation to bi\(\tilde{a}l\) ‘to marvel’ and translate it something like ‘wondrous country’\(^\text{1350}\). Not one of the writings of Bi\(\tilde{a}\)-Pwnt has a -\(w\) morph as witnessed in Bi\(\tilde{a}\).w ‘Sinai’. For the name Pwnt see [84].

**Location (III):** This placename is known only in Old and Middle Kingdom texts. It is generally considered that Bi\(\tilde{a}\)-Pwnt ‘Mine of Punt’ was an integral and undifferentiated part of Punt, while older scholarship considered it as two separate toponyms, ‘Sinai and Punt’.\(^\text{1351}\) The latter of these suggestions was cast aside when the writing Bi\(\tilde{a}\) n\((y)\) Pwnt was noted on the stele of Imeru [82.6], proving a genitival relationship.\(^\text{1352}\) A stele at Mersa Gawasis [82.4] mentions two separate expeditions commanded by different individuals, one to Punt and the other to Bia-Punt, and thus it seems likely that ships took different routes to reach these places.\(^\text{1353}\) Bia-Punt was therefore a different maritime destination to Punt. If, as the name suggests, it is to be taken as a ‘mine’ or mining region, a number of possibilities in the auriferous zones in the Red Sea Hills of Sudan or the Anseba region are possible.\(^\text{1354}\) There are also goldworkings further south at Ona culture sites near Asmara.\(^\text{1355}\) The term Bi\(\tilde{a}\)-Pwnt disappears in the New Kingdom and Manzo accounts for this by suggesting that it occupied a similar space to \(amw\), which, if correct, would put Bi\(\tilde{a}\)-Pwnt on the coasts around Suakin-Port Sudan.\(^\text{1356}\) For the meantime, this remains the most attractive theory, although gold-regions further south in Eritrea cannot be excluded.

Given the alternative outbound voyages mentioned in [82.4], it might be possible to give two varying locations of Punt and Bia-Punt. Thus, if Amenhotep’s voyage to Pwnt is ‘African’, leaving southwards from Mersa Gawasis, then it is not impossible to see in Nebsu’s Bi\(\tilde{a}\)-Pwnt a differing route leaving Mersa Gawasis eastwards towards Arabia.\(^\text{1357}\) This theory satisfies both

---


\(^{1350}\) Balanda, *JARCE* 42, 36; Gundacker, *LingAeg* 19, 49 n. 114.

\(^{1351}\) That is, a conjunction; see *GDG* II, 12; Gardiner, *JEA* 4, 36 n. 4.

\(^{1352}\) Sayed, *RdÉ* 29, 17.

\(^{1353}\) R. Pirelli, ‘Two new stelae from Mersa Gawasis’, *RdÉ* 58 (2007), 89-97. Both Pwnt and Bi\(\tilde{a}\)-Pwnt also occur in Harkhuf’s biography.


\(^{1356}\) Manzo, *BMSAES* 18, 84.

\(^{1357}\) The feasibility of Egyptian’s sailing on ‘blue water’ routes, i.e. not coasting, has not been studied extensively. It would be an approximately 240 km journey across the Red Sea from Mersa Gawasis to the Arabian coast near Al-Wajh. Some scholars have maintained the existence of a direct blue-water route from Crete to Egypt (but not Egypt to Crete), see Wachsmann, *Seagoing Ships and Seamanship in the Bronze Age Levant*, 298; Kemp & Merrillees, *Minoan Pottery in Second Millennium Egypt*, 268ff. Egyptian vessels were certainly capable of sailing the 120 km of open ocean between Cyprus and the Levantine littoral since at least the Middle Kingdom; see Marcus, *A&L* 17, 145-146.
etymologies of biA, as Arabia is both far and known for deposits of gold, silver, and copper.\textsuperscript{1358} This hypothesis would also concord well with references to the ‘two shores’ of Punt hr gs.wy wid-wr and the two ‘God’s-Lands’ (T3.wy-ntr) in the Punt Expedition of pHarris I.\textsuperscript{1359} This must remain a rather speculative notion, however, at least until surveys suggest the presence of Egyptians on the Arabian coast.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (8.1+7.1)

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Brhiw} */brhyw/ ~ */bdyw/\textsuperscript{1360}
\end{itemize}

**Etymology (III):** Gardiner was unsure whether to read this toponym as \textit{Brhsw} or \textit{Brhiw}, but the latter seems more likely.\textsuperscript{1360} This toponym (or ethnonym) occurs in this period only in the Onomasticon of Amenemope \textsuperscript{[83.1]},\textsuperscript{1361} and seems to be the early variant of the later Demotic \textit{Brhmwt}, Greek βλέμμυες, and Coptic θαμογ.\textsuperscript{1362} In this early instance, it is not entirely clear if the lexeme is a placename or an ethnome. The name occurs in the ‘placename and people’ section of the onomasticon, between no. 286 \textit{Sngr} ‘Babylon’ and a section beginning with African placenames (nos. 288-294). The scribe of the Onomasticon seems to have at times jumped from placenames to ethnica in this list, including those of the Sea Peoples (\textit{Tkr, Mswš, Plst}). The ethnic meaning of \textit{Brhiw} might be inferred from later instances of the term; there is the expression ūṣ.t \textit{Brhw} ‘foreign-land of Belhu’ from the Stele of Anlamani at Kawa and a personal name T(i)-\textit{Brhmt} ‘The Blemmy-woman’.\textsuperscript{1363} Whatever the case, the onomasticon is moving through areas in a geographic progression, and it seems that this term may have behaved as both an ethnic and topographic descriptor, as is common with nomadic peoples.

\textsuperscript{1358} This approaches the theory of Balanda, who understood biA as ‘wondrous’; see \textit{JARCE} 42, 34-36. See also the options outlined in Gundacker, ‘On the Etymology of the Egyptian Crown name mrsw.t’, \textit{LingAeg} 19 (2011), 49 n. 114. For goldmining in Pre-Islamic Arabia, see n. 1228.


\textsuperscript{1360} Gardiner read ; see \textit{AEO} I, 212. The traces in the papyri (\textit{AEO} III, pl. 10, line 9) suggest reading a yodh.

\textsuperscript{1361} \textit{AEO} I, 212; L. Törökö, \textit{The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of Napatan-Meroitic Civilization} (Leiden, 1997), 39.

\textsuperscript{1362} \textit{GDG} II, 3; Zibellius, \textit{AOVN}, 108. \textit{Brhm} in Demotic documents is summarised in J. Černý, ‘Some Coptic etymologies III’, \textit{BIFAO} 57 (1958), 203-204.

\textsuperscript{1363} J. Leclant & J. Yoyotte, ‘Notes d’histoire et de civilisation éthiopiennes: À propos d’un ouvrage récent’, \textit{BIFAO} 51 (1952), 29-31. For later Nubian texts mentioning \textit{Brhw} see also \textit{FHN} I, 220 and \textit{FHN} II, 613.
The difference in these writings is the auslaut –m which Černý explained as referring to the people, as opposed to the place.1364 This morph can be explained diachronically. One notes that the earlier examples have no –m while all Demotic, Greek, and Coptic instances preserve the auslaut m. Any etymological connection with the Arabic term Beja has no phonetic support.1365 Behrens explained this later suffix –m as a shift from the Beja accusative –b, but this was strongly opposed by Zaborski (for good linguistic reasons) who explained ‘Blemmy’ from Beja bal(ami) ‘nomad, inhabitant of the desert’.1366 While these adequately explained the later forms, and Zaborski points to the passive suffix –m making use of a hypothetical verb bal ‘be dry’, it is difficult to see how this could explain the orthography in this onomasticon.1367 But Gauthier raised the possibility that ʒ is merely a mistake for m, which hypothetically would make Zaborski’s supposition possible.1368 For this to be true, one would also have to explain another scribal error in the writing of Brhw at Kawa. Therefore, the suffix -m must be a secondary addition to an original toponym or ethnonym Brhw.

Given the many realisations of Egyptian r in loanwords as /l/, /r/, /d/, or even /ɖ/, other possibilities might be entertained.1369 The Beja ethnic term, Balawi, now referring to Arabs or non-Bejas, is possible.1370 The modern autonym for Beja is biɖa/bedəuye with a retroflex plosive [ɖ], and linguists have noted that the absence of this sound in Egyptian meant that scribes probably approximated this sound with r, for instance in the transcriptions of the toponym Meroë, Brwt/Mrwi /mɖwj/.1371 If this had been the case in this loan, one could possibly reconstruct Brhiw as */bɖ(h)yw/, matching the modern autonym of the Beja, bedəuye.1372 But, as Brhiw is the likely
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1364 Černý, BIFAO 57, 203-204. See also EDE II, 266-268.

1365 Egyptian rh ≠ Arabic ʒ /dʒ~/g/. See the extensive discussion in EDE I, 811-813. Also noted in H. Barnard, ‘Additional remarks on Blemmyes, Beja and Eastern Desert Ware’, Ä&L 17 (2007), 28.

1366 Zaborski, BzS 4, 169-177. Zaborski also notes Vycichl’s arguments connecting the word to Arabic Ballama ‘speakers of an incomprehensible language’. On semantic grounds R. Pierce ‘A Blemmy by any other name…: a study in Greek ethnography’, in H. Barnard & K. Duistermaat (eds), The History of the Peoples of the Eastern Desert, 226-237 doubts this etymology.

1367 Zaborski, BzS 4, 169-177.

1368 GDG II, 3.

1369 Egyptian r could also render Semitic /d/, see Hoch, Semitic Words, 406.


1372 For this word, see Reinisch, Wörterbuch der Bedaue-Sprache, 44. The h may be attributed to a retroflex digraph rh or attributable to the volatile ‘coda-h’ in Beja, for which consult Wedekind, ‘An Update on Beja: from phonology to Text Studies’, in Voigt (ed.), Akten des 7. Internationalen Semitohamitistenkongresses Berlin, 2004, 165-184.
the ancestor of Coptic ⲫⲧⲡϯ, the lambda would be a strange realisation of [d], unless the name was subject to mispronunciation in Egyptian after it was encoded as \textit{Brh(m)w}. This theory is speculative, but avoids the problem of the suffix \textit{–m}.

**Location (III):** The text of the Onomasticon [83.1] provides almost no assistance in locating the respective placenames.\textsuperscript{1373} \textit{Brhiw}’s position between \textit{Sngr} ‘Babylon’ and Nubian toponyms (\textit{Trwi, Krt, Skr, Tr-grss}) vaguely concord with the Eastern Desert location of the ‘Blemmyes’ in later traditions. In the Stele of Anlamani from Kawa, the next chronological instance after the Onomasticon, the Nubian King orders a campaign against the \textit{Brhw}.\textsuperscript{1374} The text provides few details about the \textit{Brhw}, other than enumerating that there was a ‘great bloodbath’ and that they had cattle. These \textit{Brhw} may have occupied a similar region to the \textit{Mdh(y)} and may have spoken similar languages, although it could equally be a toponym referring broadly to the Atbai.

**Classification:** +Unknown (7.1)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{[84]} &  \textbf{Pwnt} & \textit{*/pʰwnt/} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

**Etymology (III):** Despite over a century of scholarship, no convincing origin for the word \textit{Pwnt} has been found. The only suggested etymon was Swahili \textit{Pwani} meaning ‘coast’, ‘dry-place’, but there are plenty of reasons to doubt this on morphological and historical grounds.\textsuperscript{1375} Given the likely African location, one is left with either a Cushitic or perhaps (Ethio)semitic etymology. Egyptian \textit{p} could represent a /p/ or, given it is likely to be aspirated /pʰ/, it could possibly represent /f/ in a target language. The lack of the phonemic /p/ in South Semitic (Arabic, ESA) is an apparent problem, as noted by Kitchen. But /p/ is also extremely rare in East African languages, and is only encountered in Ethiosemitic from Greek loanwords.\textsuperscript{1376} The Ethiosemitic Gurage group does have labialised [tʰ], an allophone of [pʰ], as an ‘innovative’ phonological feature.\textsuperscript{1377} This leaves three options, either \textit{w} functions as a vowel /puːnt/, or \textit{w} was part of a labialised [pʰ]

\textsuperscript{1373} AEO III, 212.
\textsuperscript{1374} For the transcription, see M. Macadam, \textit{The temples of Kawa} (London, 1949), pl. 15-16. The text is translated in \textit{FHN} I, 221-222.
\textsuperscript{1375} C. Meinhof, ‘\textit{Pwani}’ \textit{Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen Sprachen} 32 (1941-42), 300-312. This was already rejected by Wainwright, ‘161. [Early Foreign Trade in East Africa]’, \textit{Man} 47 (1947), 147 n. 1 and G. Huntingford, ‘22. [Early Foreign Trade in East Africa]’, \textit{Man} 48 (1948), 24 on morphological grounds, as the word \textit{pwan}i is derived from \textit{pwa} ‘to be dry’ and the locative suffix –\textit{ni}. See also \textit{EDE} II, 433-434 and El-Sayed, \textit{Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz}, 196. There is no data for Bantu languages any further north than Kenya, especially at such an early date.
\textsuperscript{1376} Or in Coptic loans, see Leslau, \textit{Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez}, 414-416.
\textsuperscript{1377} Leslau, \textit{Etymological Dictionary of Gurage}, III, xii. W. Leslau, \textit{Gurage Studies} (Wiesbaden, 1992), 37 considers that the ‘rounded labial’ was once a feature of Amharic.
consonant /p"V_nt/, or itself an independent consonant /pVw(V)n(V)t/. The fact that there is a later vocalised group-writing Pwnt [84.92] seems to suggest the first group is /pV/, leaving –wnt as consonants. The loss of final t in Pwn [84.61, 84.79, 84.82, 84.90] is probably attributable to the loss of final t in spoken Late Egyptian. At the other end of this spectrum, there is the Pw"n in the Demotic mythological cycle of The Myth of the Sun’s Eye, which also suggests a vocalisation of /pVwVnV/. If the word still exists in a Cushitic or Ethiosemitic language spoken on the Red Sea, /p/ will have shifted to /b/ or /f/ or was simply misheard by Egyptians for another labial. In Ethiosemitic and Semitic, there is the root fnw ‘send, separate, outside’ which has diverse reflexes in daughter languages. Hudson cites such meanings as Ge'ez fənот ‘road, way’, Tigre fäna ‘depart’, and Gurage f'an ‘toward’. A similar root seems to exist in Cushitic with meanings such as ‘extend’ and ‘middle’: Beja fenin ‘to extend’, Saho-Afar fan ‘middle, Zwischenraum’, and faan ‘chose étendue’. Since –t is a common suffix in these languages, all these suggestions are prima facie possible. But, given the possibility of Egyptian n corresponding to /l/, there is also Afar bula ‘Stadt, Dorf’. Another tact, based on the connection of aromatics to this toponym, would be to seek an etymon based on incense. A possibility here lies in the Ethiosemitic/Cushitic root pvN/fVn ‘nose’, which becomes ‘Duft’ in Beja, also present in Agaw as fin/fun ‘schnüffeln’. If this is the chosen etymon it could easily have entered Egyptian via an intermediary language between Egypt and Punt.

Provided that Semitic languages played a role as a lingua franca in the Red Sea region before their migration to the Horn of Africa, one could cite a number of Semitic and South Semitic possibilities. The Sabaic personal name fnw ‘long-haired’ would aptly describe a region inhabited by ‘bearded people’, hbs.tyw in Egyptian sources. If geography had been a motivator, then
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1378 The phoneme [p"] is not reconstructed in Proto-Cushitic; see Ehret, ‘The Primary Branches of Cushitic: Seriating the diagnostic sound change rules’, in Bengston (ed.), In Hot Pursuit of Language in Prehistory, 157-158.

1379 CDD P, 10:1 (17). In Roman Demotic, ayin becomes unstable and is often a non-etymological addition, for which see Peust, Egyptian Phonology, 102-103.


1381 Leslau, Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez, 163; Hudson, Northeast African Semitic, 150-151. For Sabaic cognate, see Beeston, Ghul, Müller & Ryckmans, Sabaic Dictionary, 45.

1382 Hudson & Blench, A Dictionary of Beja, 42; Reinsch, Die Saho-Sprache, 133-134; Parker, Afar-English Dictionary, 86; Morin, Dictionnaire Afar-Francais, 383. Note that Leslau, Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez, 163 suggests that the Cushitic lexemes may originally stem from the Ethiosemitic root fnw ‘to separate’.

1383 For Egyptian n representing /l/, see Hoch, Semitic Words, 432 and Takács EDE I, 132-136. The most striking example is Kpny/Kbny for Semitic Gubla.

1384 See Orel & Stolbova, Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary, 182. For the Beja and Agaw etymons, see Reinsch, Wörterbuch der Bedaave-Sprache, 79, 272; Reinsch, Wörterbuch der Die Bilen-Sprache, 122.

1385 Harding, An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions, 472.
Sabaic *Fnwtm* (< *fnwt*) ‘palm-grove’ is a toponym attested in ESA records from the first millennium BCE.\footnote{Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions*, 472; Beeston, Ghul, Müller & Ryckmans, *Sabaic Dictionary*, 45. For the meaning ‘secondary canal’, i.e. a canal emanating from a major canal, see A. Beeston, ‘Sayhadic Divine Designations’, *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 21 (1991), 5 n. 11.} This suggestion is the closest phonetic parallels thus far posited, requiring a simple metathesis.

Later reflexes of the placename *Pwnt* have been suggested in a number of sources. The classical placename Opone (*Οπωνη*), likely to designate the Somali peninsula of Ras Xaafun, has been proposed by some scholars to designate Punt, but this has generally been rejected due to the extreme distance from Egypt.\footnote{W. Vycichl, ‘Punt, Opone, Hafun – das Weihrauchland der alten Ägypter?’, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 13 (1967), 45-46.} The Ophir of Biblical Hebrew has also been connected with Punt, which seems possible based on their mutual Red Sea locations and sources of gold and aromatics.\footnote{For a comprehensive discussion on Ophir, see Lipinski, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, 191-202 who, however, ultimately places Ophir against the consensus on the Mediterranean of the Maghreb. M. Görg, ‘Ophir, Tarschisch und Atlantis: einige Gedanken zur symbolischen Topographie’, *Biblische Notizen* 15 (1981), 76-86 suggested an Egyptian origin from *hw-pr.t* ‘island which comes forth’. This is ultimately unnecessary in light of the Semitic root *pr* ‘dust, soil, earth’; cf. Halayqa, *A Comparative Lexicon of Ugaritic and Canaanite*, 87. Notably here, Kitchen equated Ophir with the goldfields of the Madh adh-Dhahab see K. Kitchen, *On the Reliability of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, 2003), 118.} El-Daly notes that the medieval Arab geographers Al-Maghribi and Yaqut mention a placename called *Bunta* (possible enounced *Punta* given the Arabic /b/ for /p/) on the Red Sea.\footnote{O. El-Daly, ‘Punt in the Geographical Dictionary of the Moslem traveller Yaqut’, *DE* 54 (2002), 61.}

**Location (II):** The location of Punt is a complex issue and the subject of a great number of articles and monographs. One must recognise here not only the primary sources, but also the historiographical methods and traditions by which scholars localised this elusive placename. While much effort has been spent on locating Punt itself, surprisingly little has been said regarding what exactly the philologist and archaeologist are seeking in their respective ‘Punts’. No archaeological material has been definitively labelled as ‘Puntite’ and given the large geographic expanse it seems unlikely that Puntite culture is politically, materially, or linguistically homogenous, but rather represents a number of different groups in the southern Red Sea.

The location of Punt in early Egyptological literature was generally based on the assumption that the myrrh-bearing Punt was equivalent to the aromatic land par excellence of classical texts, which were located in Arabia and Somalia. This tendency was at least true until the latter half of the twentieth century, when scholars began to collate many of the relevant texts, and subsequently gained an appreciation for the regional archaeology of East Africa. Works and contributions by...
Brugsch, Petrie, Herzog, and Alliot belong to this early tradition, in which Punt was located anywhere from Equatorial Africa to Somalia and Arabia. The work of von Bissing was instrumental in locating Punt, arguing for nautical expeditions to Punt on the Red Sea. A second phase of scholarship, typified by works of Herzog and Posener, brought more rigour to the task, and attempted to match many geographic details in texts and representations with local conditions. Nibbi, in several articles, attacked the consensus and tried to locate Punt in the Sinai, based on circumstantial evidence, and her theories can be prima facie rejected on the basis of textual evidence at Mersa Gawasis.

While there have been a number of revisionist arguments on the location of Punt, scholarly Egyptology has more or less reached a broad consensus as to its location. This was based initially on the arguments of Kitchen in his seminal article ‘Punt and how to get there’, in which he demonstrated a general location in Eastern Sudan and Eritrea on the Red Sea, a view he repeated in several subsequent publications. Later research has more or less expounded upon this general view, confirming the assessment that Punt lay somewhere in coastal East Africa and was accessed by the Red Sea. Fattovich’s welcome archaeological observations give this theory a more objective grounding, with surveys identifying some of the possible loci of ancient resources associated with Puntite commerce in Eastern Sudan and Eritrea (see Excursus I. X).

Thus Fattovich in 1996, could, without much hyperbole, state that the problem of the location of Punt was ‘basically solved’. What was meant by this statement was rather that the broad territorial confines of Punt have been located, but no scholar is sure of the location of Puntite harbours, the extent of trade inland, or whether Arabia was also a constituent part of Punt. This seems to be chiefly what Meeks is alluding to when he states ‘le débat, en fait, est loin d’être clos’. In two

---

subsequent articles, Meeks offered extensive arguments for locating Punt in Arabia. A number of scholars have incorporated Meek’s location into their arguments, expressing the view that Punt may have designated both the African and Arabian shores of the Red Sea. There are still, then, problems related to the precise location of Puntite harbours. Until archaeological surveys identify Egyptian objects in second millennium BCE coastal sites along the Red Sea, these debates will remain open.

Within this debate the so-called ‘Punt-reliefs’ at the Middle Terrace at Deir el-Bahri occupy an important and unparalleled source of geographic information, in that they visually depict the Puntite landscape. However, they are both a unique blessing for the geographical details of Punt, and an interpretational curse, since their fragmentary nature leaves many questions open concerning their relationship to the toponym. O’Connor’s interpretation of the narrative supports the notion that some of the geography and trade goods were connected more generally to Irem and ‘Nemy’, rather than Punt, thus making the scene a generalised tableau of Nubian tribute. It is important in the context of the localisation of Punt to make sure that geographic details in the Punt reliefs accord with Punt in the texts, and to separate the debate on the location of Punt from the more specific issue of where Hatshepsut’s expedition landed in Punt.

Based on the material at Mersa Gawasis, it is now impossible to argue against a Red Sea location for Punt. Already before the discovery of Mersa Gawasis, scholars had conjectured from Henu’s inscription, and isolated stele at nearby Wadi Gasus, that there was a Puntite harbour in the area east of Coptos. Thus, all theories positing an exclusively inland Punt should be abandoned. These non-Red Sea locations mainly stemmed from earlier scholars’ misunderstanding of wAD-wr in these texts, suggesting that this term could also designate the waters of the Nile to the exclusion of larger bodies of water. The Punt reliefs had been a debatable datum on Red Sea access to
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1400 O’Connor, JARCE 73, 112-118. See also S. Harvey, ‘Interpreting Punt: Geographic Cultural and Artistic Landscapes’, in O’Connor & Quirke (eds), Mysterious Lands, 85ff.
1401 Kitchen, Orientalia 40, 188. In light of this, the locations espoused by C. Vandersleyen, ‘Pount sur le Nil’, DE 12 (1988), 75-80 and Herzog, Punt, 83, are now untenable.
Punt, but the depiction of saltwater fauna points unquestionably to Hatshepsut’s fleet using the Red Sea.\textsuperscript{1403}

Textual data indicates that Punt must have been a rather large entity. On occasion the phrase $\text{hjs.wt Pwn}$ ‘foreign-lands of Punt’ is used [84.33, 84.56, 84.78, 84.83]. The rather large expanse of Punt is also suggested in the Topographical List of Thutmose III [84.38], where 24 placenames follow the toponym, usually interpreted as meaning that there were 24 places known to Egyptians inside Punt. The many resources exported by Punt to Egypt is indicative of a rather large trading catchment. The archaeology at Mersa Gawasis still leaves many questions unanswered regarding Puntite commerce. Most pressing is the fact that no New Kingdom material has been found at the site, a problem which is all the more perplexing as Ramesses III’s Punt expedition recorded in pHarris I seems to have similarly travelled on the Red Sea, arriving on the Red Sea coast of Coptos (see [40]).

Explicit mention of the access route to Punt is only found in the Deir el Bahri text. These routes can be inferred from a question the Puntites ask the Egyptians on how they approached Punt [84.33]:

\begin{align*}
\text{in-iw h3i.n} & = n \ hr \ w3.t \ hrt \\
\text{in-iw skd.n} & = n \ hr \ mw \ htr t \\
\text{Did you descend on the upper-road?} \\
\text{(Or) did you travel upon water (and) upon land?}
\end{align*}

Leaving aside the issues of whether the Puntites’ questions were a rhetorical device of the Egyptians, or actual translated or paraphrased speech,\textsuperscript{1404} in both cases they demonstrate that the Egyptians or Puntites were aware of two access routes to Punt; one by water (\textit{mw}) and land (\textit{t}t), and another by the \textit{w3.t hrt} ‘upper-road’. The route ‘upon water and upon land’ refers to a maritime expedition to Punt. Given the finds at Mersa Gawasis, it is tempting to see in this expression a reference to an overland route from the Nile to the Red Sea (\textit{hr t}t) and the journey down the Red Sea coast (\textit{hr mw}). The expression \textit{w3.t hrt} ‘upper road’ is usually found in the context of the heavenly journey of the sun-god,\textsuperscript{1405} but here must refer to routes which required traversing mountain paths in the Eastern Desert and Atbai. A dual route to Punt is also alluded to in the Speos Artemidos inscription where Punt is accessed by the ‘two-paths’ (\textit{w3.ty}) [84.36].\textsuperscript{1406}

\textsuperscript{1403} See Danelius & Steinitz, \textit{JEA} 53, 15-24.
\textsuperscript{1404} For the issue of paraphrased and translated foreign speech in Egyptian texts, see Liszka, \textit{A Study of the Medjay and Pangrave as an ethnic group and as Mercenaries}, 163 n. 718, 274-275.
\textsuperscript{1405} For \textit{w3.t-hrt} as a heavenly path in solar theology, see Assmann, \textit{Der Konig als Sonnenpriester}, 21, 30. \textit{Urk. IV}, 385.
There is less convincing data in support of the overland route than the maritime route. The overland route is inferred from a series of circumstantial data and textual allusions, that when combined, suggest that Punt could be accessed by the Eastern Desert and Nubia. Indeed, this route was actually favoured over the maritime route by many scholars. Bradbury suggested, ultimately on little data, that this trade took place through a supposed Egyptian frontier market at Kurgus, which handled traffic down the Atbara River. The most compelling document for an overland route is the text from the tomb of Sobeknakht at El-Kab, where Punt occurs in an alliance with contiguous Eastern Desert and Nubian peoples of Medjay and Kush, indicating that Punt could access neighbouring Nubian polities further inland. But the question remains whether such overland routes were used by Egyptians. Darnell inferred from a stele at Gebel Tingar (west of Aswan), which mentions Punt and its products, that Punt could be accessed from a route leading south of Aswan. Although the stele is so fragmentary that its textual purpose is uncertain. Precisely where the left the Nile Valley for Punt is also problematic. One might entertain: 1) a route leaving the Wadi Allaqi/Korosko Road and tending toward the southern Atbai; 2) a route following the Nile as far south as Kurgus or Abu Hamed then striking east towards the coast; or 3) going south as far as the Atbara confluence and following this river to the region of Kassala (Fig. 24). The latter two routes may have used the Korosko Road or the Nile to reach Upper Nubia.


1408 Davies, Sudan & Nubia 7, 52-54.

1409 See J. Darnell & D. Darnell, Theban Desert Road Survey (Chicago, 2002), I, 100. For the fragmentary stele, see J. de Morgan et al, Catalogue des monuments et inscriptions de l’Égypte antique 1: Haute Égypte I: De la frontière de Nubie à Kom Ombos (Vienna, 1894), 126 and also the reconstruction in Espinel, Abriendo los caminos de Punt, 381.
Archaeologically there is no apparent evidence for pervasive Egyptian contact in the hinterland of the Southern Atbai. Some Egyptian sherds have been found in Gash group contexts around the Gash and Barka rivers, but these do not occur in numbers that would suggest constant or direct Egyptian contact.\textsuperscript{1410} That being said, nearby goldmining operations in the Red Sea Hills at sites such as Aliakateb have characteristics typical of New Kingdom exploitation, and could be situated halfway between the Nile and Punt.\textsuperscript{1411} Phillips proposes a route following the Gash River from Nubia towards the Aksumite heartland.\textsuperscript{1412} Manzo, commenting on the spatial distribution of second millennium BCE ceramics of Eastern Sudan, notes the possibility of a direct route through the Eastern Desert, the ‘Korosko Road’, leading south towards the Kassala area.\textsuperscript{1413}

The specifics of this overland route are wholly unknown. Assuming Egyptians reached a ‘Punt’ somewhere in the Eritrean-Sudanese Lowlands, this route would have been a rather arduous affair, involving a c. 400 km route from Egypt’s nearest Nubian outpost at Kurgus. Scholars have suggested that this route was the more frequent, and the maritime route was only engaged when

\textsuperscript{1411} Klemm & Klemm, \textit{Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia}, 372-374.
\textsuperscript{1413} Manzo, \textit{BMSAES} 18, 82.
overland routes were blocked by hostile Nubians. However, contrary to this assessment, the Aksha/Amara text points to the use of the maritime route under Ramesses II [84.72], likewise in the Sinai inscription of Amenhotep III [84.55]. As such there were other factors at play besides Egyptian control in Upper Nubia in Puntite trading cycles, and it is difficult to see why Egyptians would travel over such expansive and possibly hostile territory to reach Punt when a relatively clear way by sea was available to them. But the questions of the Puntites suggest that both routes were a distinct possibility. One might even say that since the overland route is mentioned first it is the more regularly attested access route to Punt. This inland route, probably dominated by Nubian intermediaries, may explain the unique statement in Hatshepsut’s Punt expedition referring to secondary trade ‘from one to another’.

Hatshepsut’s expedition on sea is emphasised as more beneficial than the costly intermediary trade conducted inland. It is stressed here as such nautical journeys ceased approximately 300 years ago in the Twelfth Dynasty. Indeed, a pressing problem concerning the inland road is the lack of textual remains in Nubia that refer to Punt. Not one of the many graffiti or rock stele from sites such as Sehel, Lower Nubia, or Hagr el-Merwa mention expeditions to Punt, but rather indicate engagements and trade with peoples from Ikyt, KS, Miw, amw, and Irm.

The weight of evidence suggests that the Red Sea coast was the region sought by Egyptian expeditions leaving Mersa Gawasis, and was thus prima facie Punt. The ecology of incense bearing trees (see [85]) narrows down the area to the shores of Sudan and Eritrea on the African
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1415 Urk. IV, 344.8-345.2.
1416 The last Middle Kingdom Punt expedition to take place at Mersa Gawasis dates to Amenemhat IV; see E. Mahfouz, ‘New Epigraphic material from Wadi Gawasis’, in Talat & Mahfouz (eds), *Red Sea in Pharaonic Times*, 122-123.
coast. The most northern parameter is probably the region of Suakin and Tokar in Sudan, \(^{1417}\) where the northernmost reaches of ebony and *Commiphora* may be found in the coastal ranges. Conceivably the Punt visited by Egyptians was located as far south as Eritrea. \(^{1418}\) It is worth mentioning here that Egyptians had no precise geographical awareness beyond Punt, as the sun was said to come into being ‘behind Punt’. \(^{1419}\) Sailing further south beyond Tokar towards the Gulf of Zula would have bought the Egyptians into contact with more lucrative markets, which had trade connections with the Hamasien Plateau and the Ethiopian Highlands. The hinterland of Punt could plausibly have stretched anywhere behind this coast, including the catchments of the Gash, Baraka, and Anseba rivers.

While the majority of theories cite the African coast as the likely location, there is no reason to preclude the Arabian Tihama from the sphere of Punt, especially as Arabian ceramic assemblages were identified at Mersa Gawasis. Indeed, it seems quite likely that whatever trade items the Egyptians envisioned coming from Punt, these could have derived from the southern coasts of the Arabian Peninsula. Keall comments that, in light of the links between both coasts of the Red Sea, ‘We may see the people of the Tihama as related to the people of Punt, culturally speaking, though not necessarily as part of their polity’. \(^{1420}\) A number of contemporary scholars such as Meeks have championed an Arabian hypothesis for Punt, and several scholars such as Balanda, Bongrani, and Tallet have favoured locating Punt in both Africa and Arabia. \(^{1421}\) But, as Kitchen stresses, it is difficult in light of the Sobeknakht text mentioning a Punt-Medjay-Kush alliance to argue that Punt was completely Arabian, as Arabian Puntites are hardly likely to have joined a Nubian alliance. \(^{1422}\) Indeed, some of Meeks arguments for an Arabian Punt must be questioned. The instances of ‘Punt’ in the Asiatic Topographical Lists \([84.51, 84.68-9]\) are almost definitely an orthographic mistake for similarly pronounced \(Pwnw\) ‘Feinan’, as the northern

---

\(^{1417}\) Some authors place Punt slightly further north; Kitchen, *Orientalia* 40, 202 prefers Port Sudan, while Cozzolino, ‘The land of Pwnw’, in *Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egitologia*, II, 397 puts its at ‘Ajdip’ (presumably meaning Aidhab).


‘Punt’ occurs alongside Edomite localities like Phr ‘Pella’ and Shasu. The argument that Punt was ‘east’ of Egypt, as opposed to ‘south’, is part of a recurrent cosmic topos whereby Punt, Medjay, and Wetnet were all associated with solar birth in the southeast. Therefore, up until the Ramesside Period, most data points to an African Punt, but with the important distinction that if ‘Punt’ did not include both sides of the Red Sea, its trade networks may have included Arabian produce. Egyptian texts relate little in the way of specific terminology to the geo-political situation of the Red Sea, so it is best to envisage ‘Punt’ as encompassing all those lands in the southern Red Sea where exotic produce could be obtained.

Discussion: The first attested Punt expedition is under Sahure [84.1]. There is circumstantial evidence for Egyptian expeditions to Punt before this date, based on imports of ‘nt.y-trees and other iconographic data. More specifically, it seems that Punt expeditions were mounted in the late Old Kingdom [84.3-5], early Middle Kingdom [84.15-19, 84.21-22], mid-New Kingdom under Hatshepsut and Thutmosis III [84.33, 84.39, 84.41-45, 84.45], as well as Amenhotep III [84.52-55], Horemheb [84.60-61], Ramesses II [84.72], and Ramesses III [84.83]. It is this hiatus between the Middle and New Kingdom voyages that is referenced to in the Hatshepsut Punt Expedition when it is stated that Punt was not directly visited since the time of ‘the kings who were before’. Passing references to Punt in other reigns suggest that trade with Punt could be quite regular, even if it was not always conducted by Egyptian officials on expeditions. In this light, it is important to note that some Puntites in the mid- and late Middle Kingdom even seem to have lived in Egypt [84.23-27]. However, it is dangerous to generalise on the nature of trade relations purely from the textual record. For instance, texts reveal little about the regularity of Egyptian-Nubian trade besides vague references to in.w ‘products, tribute’, but the assumption must be that exchange between these centres was a regular occurrence.

To purely investigate Punt as a physical location would be to ignore the major reason for its inclusion in a number of texts, where it seems to be a topos for the exotic. Fortunately, a number of scholars, such as Nutz, Martinssen, Davies, and Assmann, have explored this literary and

---

1423 For the identification of Ti-Šls.w-Pwnw on the Amara West Topographical List (KRI II, 216. 45) with ‘Feinan’, see Görg, Biblische Notizen 19, 15-21. For these lists see also E. Edel, ‘Die Ortsnamenlisten in den Tempeln von Aksha, Amarah und Soleb’, Biblische Notizen 11 (1980), 63-79.

1424 See von Lieven, Grundriss Des Laufes der Sterne, 49, 374.

1425 Tallet, RdÉ 64, 190 cites some circumstantial evidence for an earlier Fourth Dynasty Punt voyage, including a relief of a Puntite (identified as a Nh3.y) from the tomb of Seshat-hotep. El Awady, Abusir XVI, 70 suggests a voyage under Sneferu due to the depiction of a myrrh-tree on a fragmentary block from his valley temple. See also Martinssen, ‘„Ich gebe dir ganz Punt“. Ein Expeditionsziel im religiös-politischen Kontext’, in Kloth, Martin & Pardey (eds), Es werde niedergelegt als Schriftstück: Festschrift für Hartwig Altenmüller zum 65. Geburtstag, 264-265.


1427 Schneider, Ausländer in Ägypten während des Mittleren Reiches und der Hyksoszeit, II, 100-104; H. Fischer, Egyptian Titles of the Middle Kingdom (New York, 1997), 18.
mythological Punt. From the Middle Kingdom and onwards, Pwnt appears in a variety of fictional tales [84.12-14], magical texts [84.76-77, 84.97], and love songs [84.94-96]. In love songs, Punt is an exotic motif evoked by ‘the scents of Punt’ or ‘the birds of Punt’. The ‘birds of Punt’ is perhaps a reference to knowledge of migratory birds – something echoed not only in the love songs but also in Hathoric contexts in New Kingdom stele (CG 34057 and Or. Inst 8798) where migratory swallows pick 'nt.y-incense in ‘God’s-Land’. The use of ‘the ruler of Punt’ in the Shipwrecked Sailor [84.14] is based on two levels of meaning. The first, as Enmarch points out, are the similarities of this text with the genre of expedition reports, and thus Punt - and its landscapes - is a real destination of expeditions, which is aptly suited to communicate the feeling of being marooned in exotic lands. It also has inherently mythological and cosmic associations, with ‘the ruler of Punt’ being a supernatural snake, dwelling at the edge of Egypt’s horizon, the ‘unknown’ land and the luxuriant garden abode of gods. Thus ‘Punt’ was a well-understood symbol for an exotic and distant land – an entity equally real as it is imagined.

Its use as a placename in fictional literature and narratives is paralleled by its use in religious literature, and it is the same attributes that are communicated here. Its great distance, exotic products, and association with the solar east are the features of Punt which undoubtedly led theologians to evoke Punt in religious texts. The most revealing of these texts is the Book of Nut [84.66], where the sun is stated to come into being from ‘southeast behind Punt’. Punt was the extremity of Egyptian geographic knowledge to the southeast, and remained in this paradigm well into the Graeco-Roman period when Punt was incorporated into the Demotic Myth of the Sun’s Eye. Hymns laud Punt and its aromatics, or connect it to solar themes [84.7, 84.30, 84.32, 84.59, 84.74, 84.80, 84.86, 84.90, 84.92], as well as the domains of particular gods like Amun-Re, Min, Mut or even the king. The association of aromatics with the scent of divinity surely assisted in these allusions to the divine nature of Punt. Several texts make reference to various gods dwelling in Punt and its gardens [84.33, 84.39, 84.59]. These associations too, may ultimately lie

1429 In addition to the texts included in the appendix, one should also note Kitchen’s reconstruction (Poetry of Ancient Egypt, 417) of oHermitage 1125, where in the lacuna of line 1 he adds ‘birds (of Punt)’. The ostracon is cut off here so one cannot be sure if this reconstruction is correct.
1432 See line 148: m tAw n rH sw rmt ‘the distant land that Egyptians do not know’. For the gardens of Punt, see Betro, ‘Il giardino del dio’, in Avanzini (ed) Profumi d’Arabia, 461-472.
1433 For Punt in this text, see W. Spiegelberg, Der ägyptische Mythus vom Sonnenauge (Strassburg, 1917), pl. 6, l. 2; pl. 11, l. 11; pl. 16, l. 4. While this document is Roman in date, the allusions contained in this mythological tract are essentially a continuation of many earlier mythological traditions. See, for instance, Darnell, SAK 22, 47-94.
in environmental realities, and it is telling that all mythic and religious attestations to Pwnt post-date the earliest known Egyptian expedition to Punt in the reign of Sahure.

**Classification:** +Unknown (7.1)

[85] [85]

**Etymology (I):** The word $ht.yw$ is derived from $ht.w$ ‘dais, terrace’.\footnote{Wb. 3, 348.} But here the term refers to the physical environment, as it does in other phrases like $Ht.yw-n.w$ ‘Terraces of Cedar’ and $Ht.yw-Mfk3.t$ ‘Terraces of Turquoise’,\footnote{For the ‘Terraces of Cedar’ in the Gebel Barkal Stele, see Urk. IV, 1241.14; for another instance on the barque shrine text of Thutmose III, see C. Nims, ‘Thutmose III’s Benefactions to Amon’, in G. Kadish (ed.), Studies in Honor of John A. Wilson (Chicago, 1969), 70-71 line 8.} and thus must refer to a kind of ‘mountain-range’ or ‘slopes’, rather than an artificially terraced hillside. For the origin of $nt.y$-resin and trees, see Excursus I. 1.

**Location (II):** The placename is known only from the Punt Expedition of Hatshepsut. This text suggests that only Hatshepsut’s expedition penetrated Punt far enough to reach these ‘terraces’, but Sahure’s expedition is also known to have directly harvested aromatics from Punt.\footnote{El Awady, Abusir XVI, 161-171.} From Hatshepsut’s text one can conclude that the terraces are within Punt, near the coast ($hr\ gs.wy\ wjd-wr$), that it is a sacred-region, and that it was the precise goal of the expedition\footnote{Hassan, An Illustrated Guide to the Plants of Erkowit, 16. Boswellia today only occurs in the Eritrean western lowlands.} [85.1]. On analogy with $Ht.yw-n.w$ ‘Terraces of cedar’ or $Ht.yw-Mfk3.t$ ‘Terraces of Turquoise’, the $Ht.yw-nt.y$ must refer to a mountainous area. The conception is that $nt.y$-trees grew on the hillsides of such a mountain range. As resinous species of Commiphora are known as far north as Erkowit, one could hypothetically locate these ‘terraces’ anywhere south of here,\footnote{Serpico & White, ‘Resins, amber and bitumen’, in Nicholson & Shaw (eds), Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology, 442.} which would put them parallel to the coast between Tokar and Adulis or their respective hinterlands (see Fig. 25). Indeed, stands of Commiphora gileadensis have even been reported as far north as Gebel Elba.\footnote{Serpico & White, ‘Resins, amber and bitumen’, in Nicholson & Shaw (eds), Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology, 442.} Data for Boswellia on the coast is not readily forthcoming.

**Classification:** +Egyptian (1.1+1.7)

---

1434 Wb. 3, 348.
1436 El Awady, Abusir XVI, 161-171.
Figure 25: Possible inspiration for the Egyptian ‘Myrrh Terraces’, *Boswellia papyrifera* growing on hillsides in Dembalas, Upper Baraka Valley, after Schweinfurth, *Vegetationstypen aus der Kolonie Eritrea*, pl. 58.
Figure 26: Placenames in the Southern Atbai and further Red Sea.
Excursus I: The Diagnostic Resources and Archaeology of Punt

Since Rolf Herzog’s monograph on Punt, it has become de rigueur to frame the location of Punt as the sum of all its resources. Using resources alone to locate a placename is a problematic method, as it does not necessarily hold that all the resources associated with Punt originate in the land of Punt, but could instead be the result of intermediary trade. From an archaeological perspective the work of Fattovich in the Red Sea region has shown that the Afro-Arab circuit in the third and second millennium BCE was more than capable of transporting and accruing exotic products. While proximity to these products seems advantageous for Punt’s location, it is not necessary to find an area, as some scholars have, that contains all or many of the products obtained from Punt. Axiomatically, such an indefinite expanse given to the term Pwnt suggests that these resources could be obtained from a rather wide area through trade.

I. I ‘nt.yw/snd.y and the Botanic Identity of Egyptian Fragrances

The only product that is definitively and enduringly mentioned as originating in Punt itself is the aromatic substance ‘nt.y/snd.y, first mentioned in the reign of Sahure [84.1]. The fact that it is native to Punt is confirmed by the appellation ‘Myrrh terraces’ [85] in Hatshepsut’s expedition, in addition to the reliefs which depict myrrh trees being brought back to Egypt. There is no scholarly consensus on the botanic identity of ‘nt.y. Indeed, archaeologists have reported finds of both Boswellia and Commiphora in pharaonic contexts, but none of these samples have been followed up, or chemically identified with an individual species. Chemical analyses by Goyon et al. have been conducted on resinous samples from the Middle Kingdom and in a vase from Dahshur, in which they identified some compounds as mainly comprising myrrh, i.e. the resin of Commiphora.1441

1440 See de Vartavan & Asensi Amorós, Codex of Ancient Egyptian Plant Remains, 51, 81-82 where a sample of Commiphora myrrha is cited at Montuhotep II’s tomb and also Commiphora gileadensis (opobalsamum) at an unspecified location in Thebes. Boswellia carterii was also identified at Montuhotep’s tomb and an unknown Boswellia species in Tutankhamun’s tomb. In Nubia, resins of Commiphora gileadensis have been identified at Meroë and an unknown species of Boswellia at Qasr Ibrim, but both these entries belong to later periods; see M. Baldi, ’Aromatic essences in Ancient Nubia: the Sacredness of Perfumes and Incense in the Meroitic Kingdom’, Journal of Intercultural and Interdisciplinary Archaeology 1 (2014), 82. A recent study on the chemical compounds in an aromatics workshop in Crete yielded no compound that could certainly originate from Red Sea aromatics (except perhaps Camphor which occurs in high amounts in Boswellia), see A. Koh, Wreathed in Ancient Cloud: Reconstructing a Late Bronze Age Aegean workshop of Aromata (Saarbrücken, 2008), 57.
1441 See J.-C. Goyon, G. Archier, S. Coen & C. Vieillescaz ‘Contribution de la chimie analytique à l’étude de vestiges de la XIIe ou XIIIe dynastie égyptienne’, SAK 27 (1999), 107-121.
Authorities have generally identified ‘nt.y with species of either the genus *Boswellia* or *Commiphora*, the two well-known aromatic producing species that grow in East Africa and Arabia.1442 Both of these species have such a wide distribution that, unless precise species are identified, these identifications are not overly helpful in locating Punt. Also confusing the situation is the fact that ‘nt.y-resin in Egyptian texts is known to have also arrived in Egypt from the Levant.1443 It therefore does not necessarily follow, and is probably taxonomically simplistic, to expect that ‘nt.y refers to the resin of a single species of *Boswellia* or *Commiphora*, especially when both these species were foreign to Egyptians. By far the most detailed Egyptian treatise on aromatics is a list found at Edfu and Athribis temples.1444 These texts refer to the different varieties of aromatic resins used in temple rituals, but reveal little on the botanical identity of the aromatics and are much more focused on the characteristics of the resulting resinous substances.

The mention of ‘nd.y as opposed to ‘nt.y in earlier texts, notably the reliefs of Sahure and other Old Kingdom tomb inscriptions, might be due to the confusion of stops *t* and *d* in Egyptian loanwords (see also [84.70, 84.72]).1445 Although, in his discussion on the Sahure reliefs showing ‘nd.y-trees, El Awady makes reference to a hitherto overlooked etymology for ‘nt.y, namely a connection with ‘n.t ‘adze’, an implement presumably used for tapping incense bearing trees.1446 El Awady goes on to stress the differentiation of ‘nt.y and ‘nd.y, highlighting the difference in depiction of these trees on Sahure’s reliefs at Abusir and Hatshepsut’s reliefs at Deir el-Bahri, and thus would label ‘nt.y ‘myrrh’, and ‘nd.y ‘frankincense’. But one must take into account the rather stereotypical manner in which the myrrh trees are painted to resemble the hieroglyph for tree (see Fig. 27). Furthermore, the etymology of ‘adze’ can only apply to ‘nt.y and not ‘nd.y, unless we presuppose an unattested ‘nd ‘adze’, which shifted to ‘nd and then ‘nt.1447 The supposed


1443 The earliest mention of Byblos ‘nt.y is probably an inscription from the First Intermediate Period in the tomb of Setka at Qubbet el Hawa; see Edel, Seyfried & Vieler, *Die Felsgräbernekropole der Qubbet el Hawa bei Assuan*, I, III, 1743–744, pl. 82. Saleh, *Bibliotheca Orientalia* 42, 370-382 mentions other instances of myrrh coming from the Levant (*Rtw*), and assesses a Sinai inscription of Panhesy as referring to incense trade via Arabia. For an assessment of the archaeological and textual evidence for the transhipment of myrrh via the Levant, see M. Artzy, ‘Incense, Camels and Collared Rim-Jars: Desert Trade Routes and Maritime Outlets in the Second Millennium’, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 13 (2007), 121-140.

1444 Chermette & Goyon, *SAK* 23, 61-79. A number of these aromatics have foreign names although one cannot be certain from what regions these specific resins originate, making lexical identification difficult.

1445 *Urk*. I, 60. 4.

1446 El Awady, *Abusir XVI*, 255. For the ‘nt adze or pick, see *CDME*, 43; *HWb*, 142 and Janssen, *Commodity Prices*, 321. If the root is ‘nt and not ‘n.t it is possible it could be cognate with Ge’ez ‘anatátabántata ‘scratch’ (Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez*, 65, 238).

1447 There is the word of ‘nd ‘unguent’, see *Wb.* 1, 208. For these sound shifts see Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 123-125. A similar set of hypothetical consonantal shifts have been proposed for *tp ‘head*
difference in the depiction of myrrh in the Old Kingdom Abusir and New Kingdom Deir el-Bahri reliefs may be explained by a predisposition of the artist, with Kitchen noting the stereotypical nature of the trees at Deir el-Bahri and their similarity to the tree-hieroglyph. If the etymology from ‘adze’ is accepted, it might merely mean any highly prized tapped resin. If this is the case, the reasoning behind glossing ‘\textit{ant.y} species as specifically \textit{Commiphora} or \textit{Boswellia} is thus arbitrary.

Figure 27: Myrrh Trees in Egyptian Art: From Left to Right, Sneferu’s Valley Temple (Edel, in der Manuelian (ed.), \textit{Studies in honor of William Kelly Simpson}, 201); Sahure’s Valley Temple (El Awady, \textit{Abusir XVI}, pl. 5); Theban Tomb (TT67) (Davies, \textit{JE 47}, pl. 4); and two trees from Deir el-Bahri (Naville, \textit{Deir el-Bahri}, III, pl. 74, 78).

The common translation of ‘\textit{ant.y} as ‘myrrh’, i.e. the resin of \textit{Commiphora}, is purely motivated by tradition and a presumed equivalence with the Semitic and biblical myrrh. Banti and Contini note that the word may survive in the sixth century CE lexicon of Hesychius as \textit{ἀέντιον} where the Greek gloss has \textit{Αἰγύπτιον σμυρνιον} ‘Egyptian myrrh’. Dioscorides in \textit{Materia Medica} mentions \textit{σμύρνα} as a tree which ‘grows in Arabia and resembles Egyptian acacia’ and goes on to mention several different species of \textit{σμύρνα}. Demotic texts still preserve ‘\textit{nt.w}, but it is not

\begin{itemize}


\item Dioscorides of Anazarbus, \textit{De materia medica} (trans. L. Beck), (Hildesheim, 2005), 45.
\end{itemize}
known whether this equates exactly to ‘myrrh’, and the term ‘nt.yw has no obvious Coptic reflex, probably replaced by Demotic \( hry/\text{hl} \) ‘myrrh’, hence Coptic \( \text{σμύρνα} \) ‘myrrh’. These words may provide an indication that Egyptian ‘nt.y (later \( \text{ἀέντιον} \)) equals \( \text{σμύρνα} \), thus corresponding to the resin of Commiphora, but there is great possibility for confusion in the botanical terminology in the millennia between the pharaonic period and the late antique glosses. Furthermore, there is no indication as to what exact species of Commiphora were designated by the general term ‘myrrh’. In this context, identifying precise botanical species, which may assist with the localisation of Punt’s ‘nt.yw-trees, is fraught with difficulties.

Most Egyptologists have looked to the Punt reliefs at Deir el-Bahri, in addition to New Kingdom tomb reliefs, and the recently published Sahure causeway reliefs, for the botanical identity of ‘nt.y. Here, one can identify diversity in the depictions of the trees, bearing foliage or being leafless, and it is therefore possible that the precise trees are different in each expedition, or encountered in different seasons. The trees’ colour and foliage would originally have been painted, and, as this colouration is now lost in most representations, we are missing a vital botanical indicator.

Sahure’s and Sneferu’s trees appear closer to Boswellia, and the New Kingdom trees at Deir el-Bahri, when depicted in enough detail, seem closer to Boswellia (Fig. 27). The longitudinal leaves, and the fanning shape of the tree, appear more reminiscent of Boswellia species than Commiphora. The additional fact that ‘nt.y-trees were cut and replanted in Egypt has also entered into botanical debates, but this in itself is a vague criterion to differentiate species of ‘nt.y, and it is not known whether this horticultural venture was successful (in the short or long term). Several authorities explicitly state the unlikelihood of any precise identification, or the possibility that ‘nt.y represented a number of aromatic species. Indeed, if the etymological

---


1455 Naville, The Temple of Deir el Bahari, III, pl. 78-79.

1456 Noting R. Steuer, ‘Stacte in Egyptian Antiquity’, JAOS 63 (1943), 283, who exclaims this enterprise ‘had no lasting success in Egypt’.

1457 Dixon, JEA 55, 55-65 refrains from preferring one species over another. A similar conclusion is followed in Kitchen, Orientalia 40, 185.

connection with adze is accepted, then ʼnt.y simply designates any resinous substance that was ‘scratched’ from trees.

The relevant texts do not describe in any detail the nature of ʼnt.y. Ecologically, one may say that it grew on mountain-sides, ḥt.yw [84.33], but also on fields, ḥḥ.wt [84.36]. It was a type of tree (nḥt) [84.36, 84.43, 84.72] whose resin was sometimes denoted as wḏ ‘fresh’ or perhaps ‘green’ [84.15, 84.33, 84.36, 84.39]. Dixon logically suggested that Egyptians would have travelled no further south than required in order to source ʼnt.y, and that over-exploitation of this resource might have compelled them to visit multiple localities to obtain aromatics. Commiphora gileadensis has been reported as far north as Gebel Elba, but sustained populations are only likely further south at Suakin, although its ancient distribution is largely dependent on changes in rainfall patterns. Egyptian expeditions reaching further south towards Adulis could have brought Egyptians into contact with Boswellia papyrifera. As such, at least for coastal expeditions like that of Hatshepsut and presumably also of Sahure, one should err on locating ʼnt.y groves in the regions between Tokar and Adulis, where higher rainfall and the proximity of mountains to the coast allowed easy access to aromatics.

I. II snTr ‘incense’ and mnnn ‘bitumen’

It has recently been argued by Baum that, as well as designating resin of the Pistacia, the substance snTr ‘to cause to be divine’ could also refer to Boswellia. Both these trees occur throughout all of Sahelian Africa and so their occurrence at Punt [84.14, 84.33] is not overly helpful as a diagnostic resource. The substance mnnn is known in later traditions to refer to ‘bitumen’, but Harris settled with a broad definition of ‘resin’ as bitumen was not used before the Graeco-Roman period. This view should be reviewed in light of Harrell’s identification of a bitumen mummy from as early as 900 BCE, and thus mnnn in Ramesside texts might indeed

---


1460 Dixon, JEA 55, 46 astutely remarks ‘it seems reasonable to assume that the expeditions would not have ventured further afield than was absolutely necessary in order to obtain ʼntyw of the desired quality in sufficient quantity as cheaply as possible.’


1462 The study of this plant’s distribution in Eritrea, see W. Ogbazghi, The distribution and regeneration of Boswellia papyrifera (Del.) Hochst. in Er eritrea (Wageningen, 2001) who stated that the species was absent along the northern coast of Eritrea. The map in Manzo, Echanges et contacts le long du Nil et de la Mer Rouge dans l’époque protohistorique, 135 shows a pocket of growth just west of the Gulf of Zula.

1463 Baum, RdÉ 45, 30-31, 38; de Vartavan, Bulletin of Parthian and Mixed Oriental Studies 2, 76-78.

1464 See Harris, Lexicographical Studies, 173. Based on the Coptic reflex of μολον, the word is likely to be reconstructed as mnn, not mnnn, see EDE III, 297-298.
mean bitumen.\textsuperscript{1465} In pHarris I [\textbf{84.84}] ‘good-mmnn’ is obtained in large quantities from Punt, and from other contexts mmnn is known to have come from Coptos and Syria.\textsuperscript{1466} The location of such bitumen deposits in the southern Red Sea remains a mystery.

\textbf{I. III nbw w\textit{id} \textit{mw} ‘gold and malachite of Amu’}

The expression \textit{nbw w\textit{id} \textit{mw}} [\textbf{84.33}] is generally interpreted as ‘Green-gold of Amu’. But it has been recently interpreted by Falk as ‘Gold (and) malachite of Amu’.\textsuperscript{1467} Gold is well known in the Eastern Sudan, and recent work in the Asmara region has recorded gold-workings as old as the early first millennium BCE.\textsuperscript{1468} Hypothetically, Puntite gold [\textbf{84.1, 84.87}] could have come from almost anywhere from the Khor Baraka on the Eritrean-Sudanese border and/or the highlands around Asmara. As there have been very few geoarchaeological surveys in these regions, it is impossible to be more precise about the spatial and chronological distribution of gold-mining in Eritrea and Ethiopia. The Anseba region near Keren and Agordat of Northern Eritrea is also a known auriferous zone, but there is no evidence yet of ancient workings here (Fig. 28).\textsuperscript{1469} It is unlikely that Egyptians directly mined gold in Punt and local trade-networks probably brought the gold down from the highlands towards Nubia or the Red Sea coast.

\textsuperscript{1465} J. Harrell & D. Lewan, ‘Sources of mummy bitumen in ancient Egypt and Palestine’, \textit{Archaeometry} 44 (2002), 285-293.
\textsuperscript{1466} Aufrère, \textit{BIFAO} 84, 2.
\textsuperscript{1467} Falk, \textit{GM} 238, 57-58.
\textsuperscript{1468} The Asmara gold-workings seem to be connected with the nascent Ona-Culture, see R. Schmidt, D. Habtemichael & M. Curtis, ‘Ancient goldmining north of Asmara: a focus on Hara hot’, in Schmidt, Curtis & Teka (eds), \textit{Archaeology of Eritrea}, 179-187.
I. IV *msdm.t* ‘*galena*’

The eye-paint *msdm.t* is a known Puntite product [84.33]. It is generally maintained that the substance refers to galena, the main constituent of Egyptian kohl. While galena sources do occur further south in Sudan and Eritrea, there is no reason *a priori* to geologically identify Puntite *msdm.t* as ‘*galena*’ when other mineral substances could also have replicated its use as an eye-paint. Provided there is some latitude in the mineral specificity of *msdm.t*, it may also refer to antimony, of which there are known deposits in Eritrea.

I. V *k3-km* ‘*obsidian (?)*’

This substance is a product of Punt in the Punt reliefs of Hatshepsut and Theban tombs [84.33]. Its geological identity is somewhat of a mystery, but it is considered to be some sort of black-stone. If *mnw-km* were not Harris’s chosen term for obsidian, one might be inclined to identify *k3-km* with this stone. Indeed, as *k3-km* is exclusively known in Puntite contexts (unlike *mnw-km*), this material must be somewhat geologically unique to this region. This fits with the distribution of obsidian quite well, as obsidian deposits are only known in Eritrea.

---

1471 Ogden, *JEA* 62, 141-142.
1472 *Urk.* IV, 335; 1096. For depictions, see Norman de Garis Davies, *The Tomb of Puyemrê at Thebes* (New York, 1922), pl. 32; See Nina de Garis Davies & Norman de Garis Davies, *The Tombs of Menkheperasonb, Amenmose, and Another*, pl. 9.
1474 Harris, *Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals*, 110-111. As Harris states, *mnw-km* occurs in the contexts of Aswan, Retjenu and Wadi el-Hudi; for the latter site, see the commentary of the text in Seyfried, *Beiträge zu den Expeditionen des Mittleren Reiches in die Ost-Wüste*, 69. As geological sources of obsidian occur at none of these sites *mnw-km* cannot be obsidian.
Ethiopia and Yemen (Fig. 29). New Kingdom obsidian objects are rare, but have been documented and chemically matched to Eritrean, and less often, Yemeni, sources.1475

Figure 29: Distribution of obsidian sources and sites with shaped microliths, after Khalidi, ‘Holocene Obsidian Exchange in the Red Sea Region’ in Petraglia & Rose (eds), The Evolution of Human Populations in Arabia (2010), 81.

1475 See R. Tykot, ‘The Geological Source of an Obsidian Ear (04.1941) from the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston’, Rde 47 (1996), 177-179. The tests were unable to differentiate African and Arabian sources, but Tykot (p. 179) quotes one Eighteenth Dynasty object that was chemically identified with an obsidian source at Arafali (Gulf of Zula).
I. VI hbny ‘ebony’

For a discussion of the ebony species of Dalberiga melanoxylon and Diospyros mespiliformis see Wtn.t [81]. Puntite ebony logs, labelled as hbny, are depicted in the Punt reliefs at Deir el-Bahri [84.33], the tomb of Puyemre (TT 39) [84.44], and perhaps Rekhmire (TT100).1476 The ebony shrine at Deir el-Bahri was specifically said to be procured from the tp.w-h3s.t ‘best of the hill-countries’, suggesting that this ebony was directly felled from Punt.1477 The excavations at Mersa Gawasis have identified both Diospyros as well as D. Melanoxylon in local charcoal deposits.1478

I. VII ti-šps

This botanical product comes from Punt in a number of texts [84.31, 84.33, 84.63, 84.70]. Usually translated as ‘noble/costly-wood’, it is thought by some scholars to be identical with cinnamon, cassia or camphor.1479 A depiction of this wood/bark is found in the tomb of Rekhmire where it has the appearance of long thin sticks, although this does not really assist in any botanical identification. This product could also be obtained from Nubia (Ittr), presumably somewhere along the Nubian Nile. As botanical identification of this product is the subject of extensive debate, this plant product does not assist in locating Punt.

I. VIII šs(3).yt/hs(3).yt

This is a Puntite product known from the Punt Expedition of Hatshepsut [84.33]. It seems likely that these words are identical and related to one and the same substance, with the alternation of h and š being easily explainable by Egyptian phonetic laws.1480 Without delving too much into the issue, there is sufficient debate as to whether this word can be confidently ascribed to any botanical substance, and Harris argues strongly for green frit, plausibly of a mineral origin.1481 This word has been the subject of much conjecture, on its etymology, its connection with the

1476 Naville, Deir el-Bahari III, pl. 78; Davies, Tomb of Puyemrê at Thebes I, pl. 32; Davies, JEA 28, pl. 5; Dixon, The Ebony trade of Ancient Egypt, 52-55 has a list of other ebony depictions.
1477 Naville, Deir el Bahari II, pl. 27. D. melanoxylon is still widespread through the Eritrean Lowlands, see S. Connelly & N. Wilson, ‘Report on the preliminary study of the riverine forests of the Western Lowlands of Eritrea’ [online-manuscript] (1996).
Greek botanical term Κασσία, as well as its position as an exotic import from East Africa or Arabia. Furthermore, as the suffix -yt appears to be an Egyptian morphological ending, it is probable that the word is an extension of an Egyptian verbal root $hsj\!/\!jyj$. There is a verbal root $hsj$ ‘be unanointed’, which could be a so-called antonymic root related to this word.

I. IX Exotic Fauna

Punt was inhabited by baboons [84.33], leopards [84.31, 84.33], and in the Deir el-Bahri reliefs there are depictions of rhinoceroses and giraffes. Rhinoceroses and elephants are mentioned in the area of Adulis in the classical Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, while elephants were still found in the Khor Baraka in the nineteenth century. Giraffes (mmi) are a Puntite import in the Shipwrecked Sailor and a giraffe-head is depicted in the Punt reliefs. There is very little data on giraffe distributions, and depictions of this animal in rock art are not reliable indicators of their ancient habitation. In the nineteenth century, rhinoceroses were reported as far north as the Sakanhelt plain on the Red Sea coast (just north of Port Sudan), so any point south of here could have had rhinoceros populations. Chemical analysis has also assisted in this debate, and ongoing scientific research conducted by Dominy has matched some oxygen isotopes of baboon mummies in Egypt with baboon populations in Eritrea. The distribution of all these animals is likely to have changed drastically since the second millennium BCE, but the presence of all of them at Punt does somewhat negate an Arabian location.

1482 See, primarily, the discussion in de Romanis, Cassia, Cinnamomo, Ossidiana, 33-71. M. Bukharin, ‘Coastal Arabia and the adjacent sea-basins in the Periplus of the Erythrean Sea (Trade, Geography and Navigation)’, in M.-F. Boussac, J-F. Salles & J.-B. Yon (eds), Autour du Périple de la mer Érythrée (Lyon, 2012), 184-185 connected the term ultimately to Ge'ez kwasaya ‘to separate’, see also J.-C. Goyon, ‘Remarques sur l’ouvrage de F. de romanis, Cassia, cinnamomo, ossidiana’, in Boussac, Salles & Yon (eds), Autour du Périple de la mer Érythrée, 651-655. It should be noted that the first instance of this term is from the Fourth Dynasty (see the examples in El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 241), which would be rather early for a foreign etymology.

1483 Wb. 3, 400. Wilson, Ptolemaic Lexikon, 749 also records a botanical term $jyj\!/\!yj$, referring to an unknown plant. For antonymic roots (opposite semantic pairs), see G. Takács, ‘Materials for the Semantic Opposition in Egyptian and Afrasian’ Folia Orientalia 33 (1997), 143-162.

1484 PME, 4:9-12. For elephants in the Tokar region, see Hinkel, The Archaeological Map of Sudan VI: The Red Sea Coast and Northern Ethiopian Frontier, 36, 304.

1485 For mmi, see El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 208; EDE III, 220-221. In Theban Tombs, giraffes are typically connected with Nubians rather than Puntites, see Hallmann, Tributzenen des Neuen Reiches, 13, 75, 106, 214, 219, 231.

1486 For giraffes in Eastern Desert rock art, see Hinkel, The Archaeological Map of Sudan VI: The Red Sea Coast and Northern Ethiopian Frontier, 182, 287, 359. The only comprehensive study on their distribution is in the Sudanese Western Desert, with $^{14}C$ dates ranging to the late New Kingdom; see H.-J. Pachur & N. Altmann, Die Ost Sahara in Spästantur (Berlin, 2006), 499-503. Giraffe remains have been recorded in ancient contexts at Kassala, for which see R. Fattovich, A. Marks & A. Mohammed-Ali, ‘The Archaeology of the Eastern Sahel, Sudan: preliminary results’, African Archaeological Review 2 (1984), 184.

1487 Hinkel, The Archaeological Map of Sudan VI: The Red Sea Coast and Northern Ethiopian Frontier, 177.

1488 Nathaniel Dominy (Personal Communication).
**I. X The Archaeological Punt**

Given the textual material mentioning Punt at Mersa Gawasis [84.17-19, 84.21-22], there can be no doubt that Egyptians used this port to access Punt. All textual material can be dated to the early Middle Kingdom, and the ceramic record covers the period from the late Old Kingdom until the late Middle Kingdom. One of the most pertinent discoveries at the site is the presence of foreign ceramics. Some of these can be associated with South Arabian Tihama and Ma'layba cultures, as well as ceramics from the Gash group in the Atbai. Exotic sherds at Mersa Gawasis have also been compared with wares from the lowest layers of Adulis, as well as Asa Koma in Djibouti. Middle Nubian ceramics are also present at Mersa Gawasis, but these could equally be attributed to local habitation or use in Egyptian expeditions rather than coastal trade. Obsidian and ebony, two items which must have been sourced from the southern Red Sea, were found by the excavators at this harbour. Such exotic imports surely point to material obtained from Punt-bound expeditions, but the multiple origins of the ceramic assemblages makes it difficult to specifically locate Punt based on archaeological material. Indeed, most of the exotic materials at Mersa Gawasis seem more African than Arabian. The archaeology and ceramic typology of the southern Red Sea is still an emerging field, and there is debate on the degree of connectivity between the cultures on the opposing shores of the southern Red Sea.

The Egyptians may have obtained Puntite produce directly from expeditions to both the Sudanese-Eritrean coast and the Arabian Coast. However, local trade networks could have also accrued such material at established emporiums, meaning that Egyptians did not have to physically travel to the Arabian coast to receive Arabian products. One also cannot deny another option, namely that in many instances local non-Egyptian traffic was responsible for shipping these goods to Mersa Gawasis. Later New Kingdom tomb scenes (TT 89, TT143) suggest that Puntite craft sailed up the Red Sea to the Egyptian coast east of Coptos. Scholars have noted that Red Sea trade probably had its genesis well before Egyptian mentions of Punt in the Old Kingdom, and it is likely that goods such as obsidian were the result of the Red Sea trade as early

---

1492 These debates are summarised in P. Magee, *The Archaeology of Prehistoric Arabia* (Cambridge, 2014), 143.
as the Naqada period.\textsuperscript{1494} Such indirect trade is reflected in Hatshepsut’s Punt Expedition Text, where wonders were brought to Egypt $m\ w\ n\ w\ ‘$from one to another’.\textsuperscript{1495} In this model, the Egyptian state merely tapped into established trade networks, perhaps motivated by the innovation of the sail (Naqada IIc/d) which allowed long distance maritime voyages.\textsuperscript{1496} Thus, Punt trade may have been quite a regular occurrence, even in periods where there is no historical documentation for such trade.

Conceivably, the ‘archaeological Punt’ could encompass many cultures of the southern Red Sea. Second millennium BCE sites in the African coast include those at Asa Koma in Djibouti and the so-called ‘Adulitan’ culture in Eritrea.\textsuperscript{1497} In the highlands around Asmara, the Ona Culture emerged around 1000 BCE. It may have played a role in the Ramesside ‘Punt’, but not earlier.\textsuperscript{1498} Fattovich even suggests a superficial similarity between Ona Culture ceramics and an image of Puntite pottery from TT 143 (see Fig. 30).\textsuperscript{1499} The necks of the jars seem similar, but the earliest Ona Culture material is dated to the terminus of the second millennium, while TT143 is roughly dated to Amenhotep II (c. 1400 BCE). These pots are also identical in form to New Kingdom ovoid jars, so it is likely that they were artistic interpolations depicting New Kingdom vases.\textsuperscript{1500}

\textsuperscript{1494} Boivin, Blench & Fuller, ‘Archaeological, linguistic and historical sources on ancient seafaring: a multidisciplinary approach to the study of early maritime contact and exchange in the Arabian peninsula’, in Petraglia & Rose (eds), The evolution of human populations in Arabia: paleoenvironments prehistory and genetics, 260.

\textsuperscript{1495} Urk. IV, 344.12.


\textsuperscript{1498} For an introduction to the Ona culture, see Munro-Hay & Tringali, Rassegna di Studi Etiopici 35, 135-170.

\textsuperscript{1499} Fattovich, Beiträge zur Sudanforschung 6, 23.

\textsuperscript{1500} I am indebted to Aaron de Souza for assistance with this ceramic identification.
The archaeology of key centres on the African coast is still unknown. Ecological niches in the Tokar-Baraka region and further north in the Suakin-Erkowit area may yet reveal other urban or semi-urban nodes involved in Puntite trade. Further inland it seems likely that the regional centre of Kassala and the Gash region may have been an intermediary between the coast and the Nile Valley, and may have itself been in the environs of what Egyptians termed Punt.\textsuperscript{1501} This is perhaps the most archaeologically complex site in the Atbai, with finds such as sealings and mortuary stele that indicate the development of an embryonic administrative complex. But, coastal missions from Egypt would have no need to travel so far inland to obtain exotic goods.

As evidenced by South Arabian ceramics at Mersa Gawasis, it is possible that South Arabian cultures were part of the Puntite area. These sherds were identified as belonging to the Sabir/Malay’ba culture, a coastal complex which stretched from Aden as far north as Jizan and

\textsuperscript{1501} Fattovich, \textit{Beiträge zur Sudanforschung} 6, 15; Phillips, \textit{Journal of African History} 38, 439-441.
the Farasan Islands. This culture has both megalithic architecture and copper smelting, exhibiting a level of societal complexity. It is as yet unclear if Egyptians actually visited the Arabian coast, as no Egyptian objects have been found in such deposits. If they did, it would seem more likely that they would visit the shores of Farasan and the Jizan area rather than rounding the Bab el-Mandeb for the major Sabir sites near Aden. Durrani considers some Bronze Age sites on the Farasan Islands as related to the Sabir culture, and the well-excavated sites of Sih or Al-Midamman on the nearby coast would also be suitable ports of entry. For the moment, second millennium BC cultures on the Arabian coast north of Jizan are relative terra incognita for archaeology, and thus any plausible connections between this area and Egyptians is completely hypothetical. Nevertheless, the mineral wealth available in this region may have made it a somewhat lucrative venture for an expedition.

Can we be more specific as to the location of Hatshepsut’s Puntite harbour? The Hatshepsut text makes a number of locational references which may help. Notably, the fleet rests at hr gs.wy w3d-wr ‘on both sides of the sea’ and near the Ht.yw-snt.yw ‘terraces of myrrh’. These two passages support two conclusions, namely 1) that the Puntite port was on both sides of a body of water and 2) that it was in proximity to hillsides on which Commiphora or Boswellia grew. The phrase gs.wy w3d-wr was interpreted by Breasted and Kitchen as a false idiomatic dual ‘on the side’, but a number of scholars have correctly deduced its meaning as ‘both sides of the ocean’, which is what the Egyptian dual in fact suggests. This has been favourably compared to the statements in pHarris I and elsewhere, which also used a morphological dual in discussing Punt in relation to the T3.wy-ntr ‘the two lands of god’.

---

1502 For the geographical spread of these cultures, see Vogt & Sedov, Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies 28, 261-270. See n. 215 for references to Arabian and African ceramics at Mersa Gawasis.

1503 See Keall, Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies 28, 139-147.


1505 For the archaeological potential of the region, consult Parr, Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy 4, 48-58 and the surveys of Hester et al., Atal 8, 115-141; Ingraham et al., Atal 5, 59-84.

1506 Badawy, ZÄS 103, 4; Balanda, JARCE 42, 40–41; D. Warburton, State and Economy in Ancient Egypt: Fiscal Vocabulary of the New Kingdom (Fribourg, 1997), 214 n. 686; C. Cannuyer, La Girafe dans l’Égypte ancienne et le verbe: etude de lexicographie et de symbolique animalière (Brussels, 2010), 151ff.

Although there has been some debate as to what degree the artistic representations of the Puntite landscape is contaminated with Egyptian artistic conceptions,\textsuperscript{1508} it is still safe to assume that at least some of the Puntite landscape must have been inspired by direct or indirect observation from members of Hatshepsut’s Punt Expedition. Especially revealing are the raised pile dwellings of the Puntite housing. While these have been interpreted as similar to the dwellings made in the Bahr el-Ghazal province of Southern Sudan,\textsuperscript{1509} there is no reason to suggest that pile-dwellings could not also occur anywhere as a solution against seasonal flooding. Thus, the Puntite harbour could be located within the watershed of a flooding river-system on the Sudanese-Eritrean coast. A number of sites on the coast are capable of flooding, including the Tokar Delta (Khor Baraka) and the Gulf of Zula (Haddas River).\textsuperscript{1510} The Gulf of Zula would provide easy access to most Puntite resources, being located at the head of a route that led to the Ethiopian Highlands and the Aksumite heartland, and near the coastal ranges which could provide aromatics. The well-watered region of the Tokar Delta was considered a part of Punt by many scholars.\textsuperscript{1511} The Tokar region would satisfy most criteria, also providing easy access to the Baraka and Anseba rivers. Apart from Crowfoot’s and Fattovich’s reconnoitres further to the east in Aqiq,\textsuperscript{1512} there have been no systematic surveys in the Tokar Delta for archaeological remains. It would be quite surprising if a watershed of this size did not yield archaeological material.

Archaeological surveys in the Gulf of Zula have yet to identify any unequivocal mass of third or second millennium BCE remains, despite some surface surveys. Paribeni suspected Pre-Aksumite remains from one of his trenches at Adulis, but the much more recent Southampton survey was unable to identify any pre-Aksumite remains.\textsuperscript{1513} A reassessment of the pottery from early layers at Adulis has identified a possible second millennium BCE ceramic tradition, typified by a black-

\textsuperscript{1508} On this idealised image, consult Harvey, ‘Interpreting Punt: Geographic Cultural and Artistic Landscapes’, in O’Connor & Quirke (eds), \textit{Mysterious Lands}, 89-91.

\textsuperscript{1509} Herzog, \textit{Punt}, 69-71.

\textsuperscript{1510} For the Tokar Delta, see C. Crossland, \textit{Desert and Water Gardens of the Red Sea} (Cambridge, 1913), 151. For ancient artificial irrigation in the Gulf of Zula, see U. Brunner, ‘Water Management and Settlements in Ancient Eritrea’, in Raunig & Wenig (eds), \textit{Afrikas Horn}, 31-32. On the Haddas River, one may note the report of Charles Beke: ‘During the rains in the upper country, the floods of the Hadas and of its large tributary the Aligaddi (with respect which river shall have to trouble you with a few remarks on some other occasion), find their way down into the sea, and often render the river itself impassable’, see H. James, \textit{Routes in Abyssinia} (London, 1867), 184. Additionally, Henry Salt reported that the locals had indicated that the ruins of Adulis had succumbed to floods; see H. Salt, \textit{A Voyage to Abyssinia} (London, 1814), 452.

\textsuperscript{1511} Kitchen, \textit{Orientalia} 40, 203 cites coastal Punt from Port Sudan to Mersa Ibrahim (north of Massawa). See also Fattovich, \textit{CRIPEL} 26, 87-97; Bradbury, \textit{JARCE} 33, 43 n. 33 and I. Hofmann, ‘\textit{b3 jm} \textit{f1 n mw kd}’, \textit{GM} 4 (1973), 19-22.


grey ware, although unequivocal evidence for this date is still wanting. It should be noted that some local ‘Adulitan’ ceramics were favourably compared to one second millennium BCE sherds found at Mersa Gawasis, and other second millennium BCE traditions in the Tihama and Djibouti, indicating that Adulis may have been involved in exchange circuits long before the Graeco-Roman period.

---

Chapter 6: Toponomastica: Toponyms from the Topographical Lists and Execration Texts

6.1 Egyptian Toponomastica

Lists of Egyptian toponyms, ‘toponomastica’, are difficult to analyse, as the texts themselves do not readily assist in locating a toponym, with the localisation of toponyms being dependent upon the identification of a set logic in a list. Such ‘lists’ are relatively common in Egyptian history, and there are a number of well-established corpora such as the Middle Kingdom Execration Texts and the New Kingdom Topographical Lists. The most problematic documents here are the ‘African’ or ‘Southern’ portions of the Topographical Lists of the New Kingdom, whose placenames are usually unattested elsewhere.\(^{1515}\) Furthermore, the manuscript tradition of these lists has not been established. The earliest list dates to Thutmose I, but it is the list of Thutmose III that is the most comprehensive, and is unparalleled thereafter.\(^{1516}\) This list should therefore be the foundation for any study of African placenames in the New Kingdom.

Indeed, much like many Egyptian corpora, it is possible that these documents were compiled, added to, and edited with much greater frequency than had hitherto been thought. Given the high frequency of errors in the Topographical Lists, born out of confusion between similarly-shaped signs on a hieratic crib, the monumental epigraphy contains many divergent errors from the original transcription of the toponym. While no Hauptvorlage has been discovered, older ‘lists’ such as the Execration Texts, and other documents where the king ritually destroys the enemies of Egypt, have been proposed as the forerunners of the New Kingdom lists by Martinez.\(^{1517}\) That such lists had probably existed for some time is suggested by the abbreviated list of approximately 11 names that occur on a stele of Senwosret I at Buhen.\(^{1518}\) Indeed, some of these

---


\(^{1518}\) For the stele, see Smith, The Fortress of Buhen: The inscriptions, pl. 69. Analysis of the toponyms is contained in Edel, ‘Beiträge zu den Afrikanischen Ländernamen’, in Apelt, Endesfelder & Wenig (eds), Studia in honorem Fritz Hintze, 89-91. Other toponyms occurring in both Middle Kingdom and New Kingdom lists are Ibts and Tm; see A. Minault-Gordon, ‘À propos des listes des Pays du Sud au
places in this list are reproduced in the New Kingdom lists. Contemporary New Kingdom documents in the form of a fragmentary ration-list of Levantine cities (pHermitage 1116A) or the Stockholm Ostraca of Nubian onomastica paint a picture of a practical use for listing foreign names in documentary texts. Indeed, it may be that the lists were constructed from a mix of documentary texts derived from the records of diplomatic, military or other state affairs. Some Topographical Lists were treated as ‘collections’ of foreign places, the caption to some lists uses the word shw ‘collection, summary’. The list of Sheshonq even has a mistake where the first placename is read mi.tt ‘copy’, presumably a word that was included on a drafting document, which the ancient epigrapher mistakenly thought was a toponym.

6.1.1 Geographic Issues

It is much easier to match placenames in Asiatic Lists, both in the Execration Texts and the New Kingdom Topographical Lists, due to the existence of cognate names in Ugaritic, Akkadian (especially the Amarna letters), and biblical texts. Indeed, many places found in the ‘Northern Lists’ still exist under a similar name to the present day, such as Akko, Aleppo, and Damascus. Thus, most analyses of the Topographical lists are based on Egyptians’ encounters with their neighbours in Syria-Palestine, not Nubia. But it is worth summarising the key arguments on the organisation and logic of the Northern Lists as a point of entry to the African lists. Many scholars have suspected that the Northern Lists may represent some sort of conspectus or itinerary, but this cannot be proven for the list as a whole, only for shorter sections. The argument that the list represented excerpts from the Day-Book of military campaigns was in vogue for some time, but scholars have questioned both the general existence of the Day-Books in military expeditions (outside Thutmosis III’s campaigns), and the use of already conquered locations in the lists. Wilson instead emphasises the apotropaic function and genesis of these lists, which neatly explains how some territories that were politically Egyptian, like Mh.w ‘Lower Egypt’, could be included in some copies, as these Egyptian places could still interrupt cosmic order. The lists were therefore not designed to be a geographic conspectus, even if they originated in such a

---


1521 There is still difficulties in identifying many toponyms in this list, see chiefly Ahituv, *Canaanite Toponyms*, passim.


1523 Wilson, *The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I into Palestine*, 42-43. The same logic operates for the Execration Texts where it seems that even Egyptians were included as potential threats to order; see now Y. Koenig, ‘The image of the foreigner in the magical texts of ancient Egypt’, in P. Kousoulis & K. Magliveras (eds), *Moving across borders: foreign relations, religion and cultural interactions in the ancient Mediterranean* (Leuven, 2007), 223-225.
tradition, but they were rather collections of places which could disrupt order. It is true that certain lists are stated to be the product of a particular campaign, such as Thutmosis III’s Megiddo campaign, but the Southern Lists do not contain such specific narrative captions.

Redford, noting the propensity of seemingly non-toponymic generic landmarks in the Semitic names of the Northern Lists, interprets the list as a scribal itinerary, whereby a messenger notes various toponyms and features along a given route. A short list at Kom el-Hettan has been identified as a short Aegean itinerary arranged in a circuit. But, the itinerary schema only applies to short sections of the list. The the longer lists may, then, be comprised of shorter itineraries, with no mark of where these individual lists begin or end. Problems abound even in this view, as the geographic order even in the Northern Lists seems particularly garbled, as if there had been mistakes in either the manuscript tradition or codification of an original list. Wilson therefore adopts a rather dynamic approach, and allows the lists to be constructed from an onomastic tradition and military records, also identifying that in some cases the artists may have needed to just fill name-rings and epigraphic space on the monument, and thus the resulting lists were not always easily interpretable geographic gazetteers.

The triumphal reliefs were probably not intended to provide historical information about the campaigns of the king. Instead, their purpose was to depict the pharaoh as victorious over the whole world and to magically enact the defeat of the people and places listed. When these reliefs are mined for historical information, therefore, they are being used for a purpose other than that for which they were built.

Indeed, it seems quite plausible that the list represented a specific temple ritual, much like the Execration Texts.

---

1524 Thutmosis III specifically exclaims in the caption to the list: ‘A collection of the foreign-lands of Retjenu which his majesty shut up in the town of vile Megiddo’; see Urk. IV, 700.4-5.
1525 The paradigmatic document for Redford is pAnastasi I’s satirical letter, in which the recipient is berated for his lack of knowledge of Syria-Palestine and the Sinai coast; for the text, see H.-W. Fischer-Elfert, Die Satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I (Wiesbaden, 1986), 158-195. There is no such comparable document for the Southern Lists, but one might note such onomastic texts like the pRamesseum Nubian fort list (see Gardiner, JEA 3, 184-192), or even an ostracon in Stockholm whose rubric is rm.w n.y n3 (rm? y) p3 n(y) K3 ‘the names of the [people, places?] of Kush’, which is followed by seven placenames (see Zibelius, AOVN, 197).
1527 Wilson, The Campaign of Pharaoh Shoshenq I into Palestine, 46.
Presumably such ‘itineraries’ as in the northern lists may also exist in the Southern Lists, but no proof has been proffered for this except in the study of Priese, who was, with difficulty, able to compare some names in the African section with itineraries on the Nubian Nile, based on comparisons with Graeco-Roman documents.1529 Federico de Romanis also argued for the existence of a similar itinerary in the Punt section of the Southern List between no. 48 (Pwnt) and no. 66 (Mst, his Myos Hormos), which ‘describes a sea-voyage of the east coast of Africa from Punt to Egypt’.1530 Most scholars have similar interpretations, reading ‘headwords’ in the list as marking new itineraries and geographic regions. The headwords for the Thutmosis III List have been invariably identified as Kš (no. 1), Wswt (no. 24), Pwnt (no. 48), Mdš (no. 78), with each placename presumably beginning a new section of placenames within each region.1531 In the Thutmosis III List, after Mdš, there are some interpretational difficulties, because the list recognisably goes back to an Old Kingdom Nubian placename Ztšt (no. 85) and then Ḥmn.w (no. 88) ‘Libya’. A few placenames after no. 88 have been identified as Puntite by O’Connor, based on a reading of a fragmentary stele at Bubastis, but there is nothing in this text that would secure a Puntite location.1532 The final section of the Thutmosis III List has some placenames that are in Egyptian, unlike the rest of the list, and it is difficult to know where to place these names. Both O’Connor and Priese placed some of these names in the Eastern Desert, but some have also been placed in the Western Desert.1533 No. 91 Tp-nḥb ‘head of El-Kab’ suggests a region east or west of El-Kab, no. 92 Bšš is usually located with the solar east, no. 108 Bšk.t [20] has been placed in the Eastern Desert or Libya by various scholars, while no. 111 was equated with Mersa Gawasis (see [40]). Thus, placenames from no. 48-85 are directly relevant to this dataset as they probably are all to be located in the Atbai. The logic of the list after no. 85 is completely unknown and could be Libyan; therefore these names will not be treated here.

1530 de Romanis, Cassia, Cinnamomo, Ossidiana, 152.
1531 Espinel, Abriendo los caminos de Punt, 417-418 summarises the different interpretations of this list amongst Egyptologists. See also K.-H. Priese, ‘ʿrm und ʿjm, das Land Irama: Ein Beitrag zur Topographie des Sudan im Altertum’, Altorient Forschungen 1 (1974), 36.
1533 See Priese, Altorient Forschungen 1, 36; O’Connor, ‘Egypt, 1552-664 BC’, in Clark (ed.), The Cambridge History of Africa, I, 931. For a Libyan interpretation for some of these names, see Säve-Söderbergh, Ägypten und Nubien, 161-162.
The so-called ‘Supplementary List’, nos. 118-269, an enumeration of toponyms after the initial Southern List, is even more perplexing, as it has very few cognates in other texts and was only copied once thereafter.\textsuperscript{1534} Some names in this list are directly copied from the initial ‘Southern List’ (no. 1-117), but only $Hmyk$ and $Tlh.t$ [11] are known from other non-onomastic texts.\textsuperscript{1535} For this reason, the Supplementary List is not included in this analysis. Later additions after the Thutmosis III list occur throughout the New Kingdom, in the reigns of Thutmosis IV, Amenhotep III, and Ramesses II (see Fig. 31),\textsuperscript{1536} but the stock of names in the Thutmosis III list remains the basis of the lists, particularly the Kush section. There are, however, no assurances that these lists date from the New Kingdom. Indeed, the lack of distinctive New Kingdom digraphs, such as $\text{\textvisiblespace} \text{\textvisiblespace}$, $\text{\textvisiblespace} \text{\textvisiblespace}$, or $\text{\textvisiblespace} \text{\textvisiblespace}$, perhaps suggests an earlier date.

6.1.2 Phonetic Issues

If these lists were the result of the amalgamation of several different sources, there is every possibility that they were compiled by different scribes in different periods. The end result would mean that phonemes like $\text{\textvisiblespace}$, $\text{\textvisiblespace}$, or $\text{\textvisiblespace}$ which underwent shifts could still reflect phonetic values in their ‘conservative’ forms. A comparison of the graphemic frequencies reveals a striking difference in the phonemic inventories of the languages of Kush and the Eastern Desert (Tab. 7). For example, the lack of typical Afroasiatic consonants such as a full set of laryngeals and $\text{\textvisiblespace}$ in the Kush-list accords well with reconstructions of Nilo-Saharan Meroitic.\textsuperscript{1537} But, even after linguistic diversity is taken into account, the graphemic sets are still not readily comparable. The Kush list has a very high frequency for $\text{\textvisiblespace}$, higher than any other consonant. This could be attributable either to common morphemes in Nubian toponyms, or, more likely, the attribution of Egyptian $\text{\textvisiblespace}$ to multiple phonemes in a target language, such as $\text{\textvisiblespace}$, $\text{\textvisiblespace}$, $\text{\textvisiblespace}$ or even the retroflex $\text{\textvisiblespace}$.\textsuperscript{1538}

\textsuperscript{1534} Urk. IV, 801-806. This list was copied only partially at Medinet Habu (KRI V, 98).

\textsuperscript{1535} Urk. IV, 801-806. No. 138, $Bhk$, appears as the name of a dog in Antef’s dog stele, and pAbott 2 (KRI VI, 470.9), where it is is related by commentators to an African loanword for ‘goat’, for cognates, see El-Sayed, Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz, 193; Takács, Bibliotheca Orientalis 70, 572-573. Toponym no. 251, $T$sw, appears to be the Egyptian word for cedar with an $i$-prefix. $Mwk\tilde{k}$ (no. 139) has been compared with the Execration Texts $Mk\tilde{k}$ in Posener, Princes et pays d’Asie et de Nubie, 60. For $Hmyk$ (Third Cataract) and $Tlh.t$ see Zibelius, AOVN, 91, 155.

\textsuperscript{1536} These are listed in O’Connor, ‘Egypt, 1552-664 BC’, in Clark (ed.), The Cambridge History of Africa, I, 932. To this list of additions, one can also add small lists made under Thutmosis IV: (Urk. IV, 1559) and the addition of $Ikt$ in a small list on a statue in M. el-Razik, ‘Luxor Studies’, MDAIK 27 (1971), 222.

\textsuperscript{1537} For the latest groundwork on Meroitic phonology, see Rilly & de Voogt, The Meroitic Language and Writing System, 122; Rilly, Le meroïtique et sa famille linguistique, 375-381.

\textsuperscript{1538} For Egyptian $\text{\textvisiblespace}$ as foreign $\text{\textvisiblespace}$, see Hoch, Semitic Words, 63-64, 406; Quack, GM 130, 76-77. The best example remains $\text{\textvisiblespace}$ for Semitic ‘servant’. This might be proven in African loans if the equation of $Srnyk$ with modern Sedeigna is proven correct; for this toponym, see Zibelius, AOVN, 150-151. See also the examples or $\text{\textvisiblespace}$ for $\text{\textvisiblespace}$ in Zibelius-Chen, Nubisches Sprachmateriel, 19, 25, 224.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant-graphemes</th>
<th>Kush-list (no. 1-23)</th>
<th>Punt, Medja, and Wetenet list (no. 48-84)</th>
<th>Wawat list (no. 24-47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\grave{a}$</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
<td>16 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i$</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w$</td>
<td>14 (13%)</td>
<td>22 (15%)</td>
<td>22 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
<td>17 (12%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>20 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\dot{h}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\breve{s}$</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\acute{k}$</td>
<td>12 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>12 (11%)</td>
<td>16 (11%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\breve{t}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\breve{d}$</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\breve{d}$</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of graphemic-phonemes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Distribution and frequency of graphemes (consonants and vowels) in the Topographical List of Thutmosis III (Urk. IV, 796-799, no. 1-85)

It is revealing here that $r$ is never found in initial position, mirroring the phonotactics of Meroitic and Eastern Sudanic languages, which do not display initial /r/. Quite distinct from the system employed in the Kush names, the onomastica corresponding to the Atbai (Punt, Medja, and Wetenet) employ only two $r$’s across 145 phonemes. Likewise, the Lower Nubian Wawat names have no $r$’s at all. One cannot argue that a phonemic /r/ or /l/ is absent in all languages from the Atbai and Lower Nubia, and thus this system must have used $\grave{a}$, at least selectively, to represent liquids as it did in the Asiatic sections of the Middle Kingdom Execration Texts. The consequences of this are that the New Kingdom lists are not necessarily original New Kingdom

---

1539 Rilly & de Voogt, *The Meroitic Language and Writing System*, 120.
1540 For Egyptian $\grave{a}$ in the Semitic Execration Texts, see Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 492-495.
productions, as they employ the older realisation of aleph as /r/, agreeing with Zyhlarz’s estimate that these lists belonged to the Middle Kingdom. Another consequence of this comparison, as Satzinger’s analysis of Middle Kingdom onomastica has already revealed, is that there were different systems for transliterating foreign-tongues within the same period. How and why this came about is not clear, but one could suggest that it may be due to distinct schools of interpreters and scribes who transcribed distinct foreign languages in established patterns. In the New Kingdom Topographical Lists, one school transcribed Kush ‘pre-Meroitic’ names using a system reminiscent of the onomasticon of pMoscow 314, while the names from Lower Nubia and the Atbai (Wawat, Punt, and Medjay) were transcribed using another system, which is strangely reminiscent of the one used for Semitic names in the Execration Texts, where /j/ is /r/. These manifold difficulties make etymological analysis of these names extremely difficult, but it is nevertheless attempted here as a groundwork for future research.

6.2 Hapax toponyms from Toponomastica

The toponyms are given in the order they appear in the lists, and exclude placenames in the lists that were analysed in the previous sections (Pwnt, Wnt.t, Md3, Tkty, Tbht). As all of these places are in unknown locations, there is no geographic discussion. Correspondingly, while etymologies from local languages are proposed here, it is difficult to be confident in these solutions given the manifold problems of phonetic reproduction and our lack of awareness of ancient African languages.

6.2.1 The Punt List [86-100]

This subsection of the Thutmosis III list has the phonetic distinction of never using /r/ except twice in the form of /r w/, meaning that aleph was probably selectively used for /r/ or /l/. Phonotactically, the combination of /ʕVh/ in three of the Puntite toponyms is perplexing, given that these homorganic ‘guttural’ phonemes are usually incompatible in the same word (as in Egyptian and Semitic languages). These consonants occur together in some South Semitic

---

1541 A suggestion also made in Zyhlarz, Kush 6, 17.
1543 As a point of comparison, one may note that differing transcription systems are present in English orthographies for identical phonemes in foreign languages, e.g. the velar fricative [x] is ‘kh’ in Arabic transcriptions, whereas both Wade-Giles and Pinyin systems of Mandarin Chinese use ‘h’ for [x].
1544 A direct comparison cannot be made with the African Execration Texts, as in these lists /r/ was regularly used, unlike the Asiatic list, where /j/ is used for /r/; see Satzinger, ‘Das Ägyptisch «Aleph>-Phonem’, in Bietak et al. (eds), Festschrift Gertrud Thausing, 193-194.
languages (Arabic and ESA), as a result of medial -\( w^-\) shifting to \( h \) in some Semitic roots.\(^{1546}\) One might duly entertain the notion, as El-Sayed does with Middle Kingdom African loanwords, that Egyptian \( \dot{c} \) had the value of /d/, or postulate that inlaut -\( h^-\) is an unetymological infix or simply misheard by the Egyptian scribe.\(^{1547}\) If \( \dot{c} \) equated to /d/ in the African Topographical Lists, one would expect to find Egyptian ayin freely occurring in other sections of the list, but it only occurs once in the Wawat-section. However, if Egyptian \( \dot{c} \) is interpreted as a pharyngeal consonant, this would more or less match well with the phonemic repertoires of Lowland East Cushitic and Ethiosemitic, where these phonemes are common.\(^{1548}\) It must also be born in mind that \( h \) is rare in other parts of the Topographical List, being completely absent in the Kush-section, and only on four occasions outside the Punt section. The comparatively high frequency of \( w \) (21%) probably indicates \textit{matres lectionis} for this grapheme.

Since Schiaparelli, most scholars have seen in this section a coastal itinerary from Egypt to East Africa.\(^{1549}\) While there is no extant proof for this conclusion, this remains the most attractive theory. Coastal expeditions to Punt are known since the Old Kingdom, providing an extremely long period in which to develop this expeditionary toponymic repertoire.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{grapheme.png}
\caption{Etymology (III): The initial pharyngeal, followed by \( h \) is problematic. If \( h \) is ignored then Saho-Afar \( \dot{c}la \) (pl. \( \dot{c}lwa \)) 'well, cistern' is a good match,\(^{1550}\) as is Saho-Afar \( \dot{a}ri \) 'Haus' (pl.

---

\(^{1546}\) See the example of Arabic \( \dot{c}hd \) from Canaanite \( \dot{c}wd \) in G. Mendenhall, 'The Bronze Age Roots of Pre-Islamic Arabia', in Abdalla, Al-Sakkar & Mortel (eds), \textit{Second International Symposium on Studies in the History of Arabia: Pre-Islamic Arabia} (Riyadh, 1984), 98.

\(^{1547}\) El-Sayed, \textit{Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz}, 102 notes \( h \) in loanwords might not always represent /\( h^-\)/, but could be employed in digraphs, as a marker of secondary articulation. R. Hetzron, \textit{The Semitic Languages} (New York, 1997), 224 notes the presence of a 'parasitic \( h^-\)' in Epigraphic South Arabian.

\(^{1548}\) This phoneme (and its loss in central Ethiopian languages) is considered an areal phenomenon, see J. Crass, 'Ejectives and pharyngeal fricatives: Two features of the Ethiopian language area', in B. Yimam et al. (eds) \textit{Ethiopian Studies at the End of the Second Millennium. Proceedings of the XIVth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies} (Addis Ababa, 2002), 1686-1688.

\(^{1549}\) Schiaparelli, \textit{La geografia dell’Africa orientale}, 124. This thesis is essentially followed in Zyhlarz, \textit{Kush} 6, 22; de Romanis, \textit{Cassia, Cinnamonomo, Ossidiana}, 150-151.

\(^{1550}\) For this word in modern Afar toponymy, see Morin, \textit{Northeast African Studies} 12, 227-228 and Reinisch, \textit{Saho-Deutsches Wörterbuch}, 62.
‘arawa).\textsuperscript{1551} Harding registers an ESA proper noun ‘hl in Sabaic.\textsuperscript{1552} There is also Sabaic ‘hrw ‘nobles’.\textsuperscript{1553}

\begin{tabular}{l|l|l}
87. & 3msw & */(r)msu:/
\end{tabular}

**Etymology (III):** It has been suggested by Ethiopists that this placename might be connected with the phonetically similar Hamasien highlands around Asmara.\textsuperscript{1554} While plausible, this cannot be recommended phonetically, given the initial aleph for a pharyngeal. Zyhlarz constructed the placename as a corrupted form of Egyptian 3m ‘heat’ making something like 3m-ms(i)-sw ‘heat-bore-it’.\textsuperscript{1555} However, a much better suggestion is to connect it to the Semitic roots rms ‘be wet’ or rmš ‘to touch’.\textsuperscript{1556}

\begin{tabular}{l|l|l}
88. & Mnsiw & */mnsʔu:/
\end{tabular}

**Etymology (III):** Zyhlarz equated this placename with the modern Tigre ethnic group Mansa in the Anseba area (north and east of Keren) in Eritrea.\textsuperscript{1557} This tribe is not documented in ancient sources, and this equation would also require a shift of ‘> c. Alternatively, it is easy to interpret this placename as an m-prefix plus the Semitic tri-radical root nš’.\textsuperscript{1558} Hence the Ge’ez root naš’a ‘rise’ (part. mans’i) is a possibility; although the correspondence of Egyptian s and Ethiosemitic š

\textsuperscript{1551} Reinisch, *Saaho-Sprache*, 65; Morin, *Dictionnaire Afar-Français*, 167.
\textsuperscript{1552} Harding, *Index of Pre-Islamic Proper Names*, 446. In Harding’s index, this is a class E name - ‘construction, temple, house, canal, well, etc’.
\textsuperscript{1553} Beeston, Ghul, Müller & Ryckmans, *Sabaic Dictionary*, 50.
\textsuperscript{1554} See W. Smidt, ‘Hamasa’, in Uhlig (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica* II, 987 and the remarks in S. Hable Sellasse, *Ancient and Medieval Ethiopian History until 1270* (Addis Ababa, 1972), 25. The first occurrence of the name Hamasa (Ge’ez Ḥmšm) is in Ezana’s fourth century CE inscription *RIE* 186; see D. Phillipson, *Foundations of an African Civilisation: Aksum and the Northern Horn* (Suffolk, 2012), 75-76. De Romanis, *Cassia, Cinnamonomo, Ossidiana*, 153 connected 3msw it with the Greek placename Μοσυλόν. Unless we accept that Egyptians sailed as far as the Somali coast, near Cape Gardafuí, this identification seems unlikely. For the location of this placename, see Casson, *PME*, 127-128.
\textsuperscript{1555} Zyhlarz, *Kush* 6, 22-23. Zyhlarz’s logic is generally suspect in these constructions, for which see also Breyer, ‘Äthiopisches in altägyptischen Quellen? Eine Kritische Evaluation’, in H. Elliesie (ed.), *Multidisciplinary Views on the Horn of Africa* (in press).
\textsuperscript{1556} Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez*, 471 quotes a root rmsa ‘be moistened’ and there is Soqotri rmš ‘raft, vessel’ in W. Leslau, *Lexique Soqotri* (Paris, 1938), 401. Arabic has rums ‘to bury, to cover, be immersed in water’, and a nominal form ‘tomb, grave’, as well as ramaša ‘take with fingertips’; see Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, 360. For Safaitic, Minaean and Thamudic names of this root see Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions*, 287.
[I] is conjectural, but *prima facie* it is possible.\textsuperscript{1559} The Arabic word mnš‘ ‘place of origin’ derives from the same root, and has an appropriate meaning for a placename.\textsuperscript{1560}

\begin{itemize}
\item[89.] \textsuperscript{89.} \begin{tabular}{c|c|c}
\textline & ʕwh & */ʕ(r)wh/
\end{tabular}
\end{itemize}

**Etymology (III):** One might compare it to \(\text{h₃w} [86]\), there being the same problem of homorganic pharyngeals. Saho-Afar \(‘\text{arî} (\text{pl. ‘} \text{aruwa} ‘\text{house} ‘\text{ is a particularly promising cognate.}\textsuperscript{1561}

\begin{itemize}
\item[90.] \begin{tabular}{c|c|c}
\textline & \text{Gwʕhw} & */gwʕhw/
\end{tabular}
\end{itemize}

**Etymology (III):** In Afar there is the root \(\text{g₃}‘ \text{‘begraben’, which is perhaps connected with Afar \text{g₃}‘ \text{‘ravine}.}\textsuperscript{1562} There is also the Cushitic root \(\text{g₃vw} (\text{Bilin g₃v}) ‘\text{be high}, i.e ‘\text{highland}, but this would only explain the initial group.\textsuperscript{1563}

\begin{itemize}
\item[91.] \begin{tabular}{c|c|c}
\textline & \text{Mp₃m} & */m₃m/
\end{tabular}
\end{itemize}

**Etymology (III):** Zyhlarz considered this to be a corrupted form of an Egyptian word relating to boat repair. Although he does not identify the word in question, presumably he is referring to \text{md₃h} ‘to hew, carpenter’, a metathesis of \text{Mp₃m}.\textsuperscript{1564} Why an Egyptian scribe would write a placename in this unattested and idiosyncratic manner was not explained, and ultimately seems unlikely, especially as the lemma \text{md₃h} is almost always written as \text{mlt}.\textsuperscript{1565} As this placename is under the Punite heading, an African language seems most likely. A good match would be Ge’ez, Tigre/Trigrinya \text{m₃haz (may) ‘river (waterway)’.}\textsuperscript{1566} One can also point to the \text{m₃haz₃} clan/tribe known from Ezana’s vocalised Ge’ez inscription.\textsuperscript{1567} Additionally, the Semitic root \(‘\text{ḥd/z ‘to take

\begin{itemize}
\item[1559] Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez*, 404. For the root outside Ge’ez, see Hudson, *Northeast African Semitic*, 190.
\item[1561] Reinsch, *Saho-Sprache*, 65.
\item[1564] Zibelius, *AOVN*, 127; Zyhlarz, *Kush* 6, 23 n. 36.
\item[1565] *Wb.* 2, 190; *HWb*, 382.
\item[1566] Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez*, 611. The simplex root is \text{whz ‘to flow} with the Ge’ez nominal \text{m₃-}prefix making ‘river’. This theory assumes a suffix \(-₃m\).
\item[1567] RIE 187.13. The names in this inscription are likely clans, regiments, or honorific family names; see the differing views in, for example O. Crawford, *The Fung Kingdom of Sennar* (Gloucester, 1951), 115 and Hatke, *Aksum and Nubia*, 115 n. 482, 483.
\end{itemize}
(possession)’ is possible (cf. Hebrew mohazah ‘harbour’, Ge’ez məḥáz ‘boundary, confines’), as is Mehri mḥzm ‘waist’. 1568

92. Ṣwhwrw */Ṣ(w)h(w)lu:/

Etymology (III): The phonemes of this word are difficult to analyse. In principal it may be similar to ṣhw [86], but the rw-glyph could stand for /l/ or even /d/. In Afar there is ‘olldə ‘large hole’. 1569 There is Arabic ‘hl ‘sovereign, prince’ (pl. ‘awahil). 1570 Given also the occasional use of Egyptian r for /d/, there is the Arabic/ESA verbal root ‘hd ‘to know’, which has many nominal forms, such as ‘treaty, ally’. 1571 Both ḥd (tribal-name) and ḥl (building name) are proper nouns attested in ESA. 1572

93. Ṣwdm */Ṣ(w)dʒm/

Etymology (III): Even though many writings have ṣ instead of w, this is a hieratic copying error and the latter writing with ṣ [93.5] suggests the reading Ṣwdm. 1573 If one treats the initial i as a glottal-prefix, there are applicable roots in Ethiosemitic ṣm ‘bone’ or ḥd ‘tree, shrub’. 1574 If d was just a variant of d, other possibilities could apply, such as Proto-East Cushitic *ʕwd ‘threshing floor’, 1575 or Ge’ez ḥaddama ‘designate, fix’. 1576 There is also the word wdm ‘plain, field’ in Gurage, which was considered to ultimately derive from ḥwd by Leslau and Hudson. 1577

94. Ṣmtw */mmcw/

Etymology (III): The status of ṣ in African languages is unknown. In Semitic loans, Egyptian ṣ reproduces samekh /ts/. This phoneme is present in Agaw languages, and Weninger has shown

1569 Morin, *Dictionnaire Afar-Français*, 189.
1572 Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions*, 446.
1573 See Edel, *SAK* 4, 94 for orthographic alteration of the birds m and w in the topographical lists.
1576 Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez*, 57.
that Ge’ez š was actually a glottalised affricate \( \tilde{t} s' \).\(^{1578}\) The presence of the palatal č /c/ in Ethiosemitic and Cushitic languages is well documented, but it is unknown when this palatalisation occurred from original k/q or t.\(^{1579}\) Otherwise, one might simply suggest that the variation of t/t in the orthographies is due to a hypercorrection of original t.\(^{1580}\) The segment mm probably suggests an m-prefix.

### Etymology (III):

**Mbw-tw**

*/mb(w)c(w)/

Etymology (III): As one cannot know whether the palatal t is original, the etymology is impossible to ascertain. One may suggest Ge’ez mahšaw ‘place where one sleeps’ or mebyat ‘dwelling, lodging’.\(^{1581}\)

### Etymology (III):

**Wdr-wt'Hmr-wt**

*/wdʒl(w)t/  

Etymology (III): The divergent orthographies of the anlaut grapheme are the result of copying errors from hieratic \( \mid \) and \( \underline{\mid} \).\(^{1582}\) Although impossible to prove, the presence of the quail-chick \( \underline{\mid} \) in most writings favours a reading of wd. On balance, from the variant orthographies it is also possible that the auslaut phoneme was an original /t/ or /c/, making t/t a digraph.\(^{1583}\) Taking the initial glyph as wd, the placename was identified with Adulis by Conti Rossini (his ‘Utulit’), a position also espoused by both Egyptologists and Ethiopists.\(^{1584}\) The difficulty with this

---

1578 Appleyard, *Comparative Dictionary of Agaw*, 13-14. S. Weninger, ‘The sounds of Ge’ez – How to study the Phonetics and Phonology of an Ancient Language’ *Aethiopica* 13 (2010), 79-80 astutely observes that Ge’ez ḳ (š) is often transcribed by τ in Greek transcriptions.

1579 For palatisation in Ethiosemitic, see Leslau, *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage*, III, lvii.

1580 See Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 36, 40.


1582 Cf. \( \underline{\mid} \) (Urk. IV, 798, a+b), \( \underline{\mid} \) (Urk. IV, 798, c), \( \underline{\mid} \) (Urk. IV, 804) \( \underline{\mid} \) (Urk. IV, 1340) \( \underline{\mid} \) (KRI I, 28) \( \underline{\mid} \) (KRI II, 177).

1583 Such a writing might have come about due to confusion as to whether the initial phoneme was a palatal or not, and thus hypercorrected; for this orthographic phenomenon, see Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 40. In principal, this would be similar to how ‘conservative’ writings were maintained along with newer pronunciation of some words, as with r > i in zwr > zwrl; see Ockinga, *Concise Grammar of Middle Egyptian*, 6. This might be observed with palatals like dm ‘to pierce’ > ddm.yt ‘piercer’ (Wb. 5, 449, 635), where d was ‘hypercorrected’ by writing both d and d. This could explain many of Thausing’s d-prefixes as orthographic idioms rather than morphological prefixes, see G. Thausing, ‘Ägyptische Confixe und die ägyptische verbalkonstruktion’, *WZKM* 68 (1941), 20-21.

suggestion is that no one is sure of the actual original vocalisation of Adulis (Gr. Ἄδουλις). Lusini identified this placename with Tigre `addālä ‘to allot’, which, if correct, would nullify any connection to the above Wdrt, given the anlaut pharyngeal. Peust suggested equating this toponym with the Wdrt of Nastasen’s fourth century BCE Stele. If the $d$ was originally $d$, one might suggest Ethiosemitic wâdâl ‘big, fat’. If $d$ remained a palatal, one might speculatively suggest Tigrinya wâşâl ‘stony ground, land which is not arable’, wâšd ‘shut’, or ESA wâšl ‘to arrive, join’. Ultimately, the phonology of this word is too polyvalent to suggest any firm cognates, and $d$ and $t$ could represent palatal or non-palatal values in the New Kingdom orthography.

Etymology (III): Perhaps there is a connection to Arabic štb ‘to cut into slices’ or an ESA tribal name šdâb, although these suggestions are mere speculations, and the name could well be two separate words.

Etymology (III): The first element might be related to a Semitic root `to separate’, for instance Ge’ez šazaya ‘to separate’ or Arabic šazîya ‘to splinter’, but the last two literals ($tm$) can only be explained as suffixes (plural mimation; see Nwhtm [99]). Ge’ez š is reconstructed as a lateral

---

1585 Pliny’s explanation of ‘wanting-in-slaves (δουλη)’ (Pliny, Natural History, VI, 172-173) is a folk etymology. Presumably, the original form in an indigenous language was something like $ʔ$-V-d-V-l with a Greek suffix (-ις). In Koine Greek, $δ$ was a fricative from the first century CE; see F. Gignac, ‘The Pronunciation of Greek Stops in the Papyri’ Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 101 (1970), 200. Depending on when the name was encoded into Greek, it possibly represents a local /v/, /ð/, /z/ or perhaps even /d/. In Semitic placenames, $δ$ usually corresponds to Semitic /d/, but there are also cases of /z/~/ð/; see Elitzur, Placenames of the Holy Land, 167. The connection between Ἄδουλις and the contemporary name Zula (Tigrinya መላ) is also difficult to determine. The name Gabaza on Cosmas’s sixth century CE map of Adulis confirms an Ethiosemitic presence in the region, as this has a good etymology in Ge’ez as ‘riverbank’ (Leslau, Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez, 180).


1587 Peust, Das Napatanische, 249 reads the placename as Wdrt, in contrast to Zibelius’ earlier reading of Dr.t in AOVN, 190. All that is stated in the text is that it was the location of bowmen.

1588 Hudson, North-East African Semitic, 224.

1589 Kane, Tigrinya-English Dictionary, 1812; Beeston, Ghul, Müller & Ryckmans, Sabaic Dictionary, 165. For wâšd, see Wehr, A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, 471. Groom, Arabic Topography and Placenames, 307 registers a meaning for this root as ‘courtyard’.

1590 Wehr, A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, 471; Harding, An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions, 343.

1591 Leslau, Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez, 541; Wehr, A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, 472.
fricative /ɬ/, an extremely close sound to the assumed value of Egyptian š /ʃ/~/ç/. Alternatively, a connection to Arabic šḏw ‘fragrance’ could be entertained.

| 99. | Nwhtm | */nwhm/ |

**Etymology (III):** Zyhlarz explained the toponym as related to the ‘lack of necessities of life’, assuming some Egyptian expression. Foreign etymologies are much more likely. The placename could be connected with the Semitic root *nwh/*h ‘be high, settled, to rest, extend’, perhaps related to Arabic *nawāḥī* ‘outskirts, environment’ or Northwest Semitic *nh* ‘to go down’. A Sabaic toponym *Nhwt/Nhwn* is also attested. The auslaut –*m* may be a morpheme of some description (mimation, nominal-ending et cetera).

| 100. | Hk3wht | */hrwt/ |

**Etymology (III):** Egyptian *k* could represent other velars and there are well attested instances documented by Hoch of it being used for Semitic /g/ and /q/~/k'/.

The opening lexeme may have something to do with Ethiosemitic *ḥql* ‘field’ or Northwest Semitic *ḥqr* ‘enclosure’. There is also Tigre ḥᵃղʳᵃት *ḥgrt* ‘red earth’, attested as a placename, from the root *ḥgr* ‘dye red’. This rendering assumes that *ḥt* is a morphological suffix.

### 6.2.2 The Wetenet List [101-113]

Although it cannot be conclusively proven, it appears that this section may be a Cushitic language, probably Beja. A third of the placenames here have auslaut *t*, which is a common Beja toponymic prefix. Given the proposed location of *Wtn.t* [81] and the sequence in the list, these names

---

1592 Weninger, *Aethiopica* 13, 84.
1594 Zyhlarz, *Kush* 6, 22-23 n. 36. Presumably, what he means here is to interpret the phrase as *n htm*, the negative particle *n* plus the verb *ḥtm* ‘to provide’ (*Wb.* 3, 196-197).
1596 Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions*, 583, 601.
1600 See Bechhaus-Gerst, *Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere* 61, 152-153. This data can also be compared to the later Greek Blemmyan onomastica analysed by Satzinger, ‘The Barbarian Names on the Third-Century Ostraka from Xeron’, in Dijkstra & Fisher (eds), *Inside and Out: Interactions between Rome and the Peoples of on the Arabian and Egyptian Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, 199-214 where –*t* is also a common suffix in personal names.
might lie between Punt and Medja-land. Whether these names derive from a route along the African coast and/or wadis in the Atbai is unknown.

Etymology (III): The interpretation of this toponym is dependent on whether $\beta$ is interpreted as a vowel (or zero) or a liquid $/r/. If the latter, it could be connected with Beja $baram$ ‘wind’, which is common in modern Beja toponymy.\textsuperscript{1601}

Etymology (III): De Romanis connected this placename with $Msti$, which is also found much later in the Thutmosis List (no. 112), reasoning that both these similar names belonged to the Ptolemaic harbour at Muɔs (Ορμος), modern Quseir al-Qadim.\textsuperscript{1602} The identification of the latter as Myos Hormos is bolstered by the fact that the adjoining toponym to $Msti$ is $Zwi$ (no. 112), which commentators have taken to be a form of $S\beta\nu\nu$, the name for Mersa Gawasis [40].\textsuperscript{1603} The only appropriate Beja etymon is $muesti$ ‘anything wet’.\textsuperscript{1604} An Egyptian word $msti$ $H|\text{-}H|\text{-}H$ ‘galley’ (itself a Semitic loan) would also be suitable if some sort of maritime activity took place at the site.\textsuperscript{1605}

Etymology (II): Following El-Sayed’s suggestion, this placename might be identical with the Beja word for ‘wadi’, $\tilde{\alpha}bba$.\textsuperscript{1606}

Etymology (III): Dependent on whether one takes the initial group as the digraph for $\tilde{\alpha}$ or if $\beta$ is independently consonantal, one could suggest a number of etyma. Beja $\tilde{\alpha}rare$ ‘heap of stones’ is a possibility, as is a botanic term ’$\tilde{\alpha}hi$ ‘Tephrosia apollinea’.\textsuperscript{1607}

Etymology (III): Possibilities that suggest themselves include Beja $giig$ ‘Gang, Abreise’ or $k^w\tilde{\alpha}k^w$ ‘water found in shallow hole’ or even Agaw $gug$ ‘road’.\textsuperscript{1608} If $k^w\tilde{\alpha}k$ is chosen, the placename

\textsuperscript{1601} Bechhaus-Gerst, Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere 61, 153.
\textsuperscript{1602} This suggestion was earlier proffered by Zyhlarz, Kush 6, 23-24; Zibelius, AOVN, 129 and de Romanis, Cassia, Cinnamonomo, Ossidiana, 147-150. For the identification of Myos Hormos as Quseir al-Qadim, see D. Nappo, ‘On the location of Leuke Kome’, Journal of Roman Archaeology 23 (2010), 339.
\textsuperscript{1603} See $Z\tilde{i}w.\tilde{w}$ [40] and Urk. IV, 800.
\textsuperscript{1604} Hudson & Blench, A Dictionary of Beja, 119.
\textsuperscript{1605} $Wb.$ 2, 151. Hoch, Semitic Words, no. 201.
\textsuperscript{1606} El-Sayed, SAK 32, 359-360. Note that Blažek, Babel und Bibel 2, 366 identifies a number of Cushitic and Ethiosemitic cognates for $\tilde{\alpha}bba$, such as Bilin $aba$ ‘Zisterne’ which would also make good sense.
\textsuperscript{1607} See Blažek, Babel und Bibel 2, 371-372; Hess, Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen 9, 217.
might relate to the Beja name for Sinkat, Okwak. Alternatively, there could be a connection to the Cushitic root *gog/*kok ‘dry’.\(^{1609}\) An Egyptian origin is also possible if the placename is formed from kki ‘be dark’ and hence a nominal form kk.t ‘dark(-thing)’.\(^{1610}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etymology (III): The orthography appears to be related to an Egyptian hydrographic term sd.t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etymology (III): The toponym appears to be a homophone of Egyptian msH.t ‘crocodile’.(^{1612}) If this is instead a phonetic matching for a foreign word one might note Ge’ez or Arabic msḥ ‘to anoint’.(^{1613}) Zyhlarz connected it with the modern Timsah, itself combined with the definite article Tī-msH.t.(^{1614}) However, the location of Timsah, near Suez, is too far north for this list of African placenames.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etymology (III): Zibelius-Chen considered this might be a mistake or alternate form of the Old Kingdom placename K3bw from Weni’s biography.(^{1615}) El-Sayed convincingly connected this to a Cushitic root for ‘river, valley, basin’, such as Proto-Agaw kər and Beja koriay.(^{1616}) If it is the same as Weni’s K3bw, then perhaps the list may have moved back to the Nile, but we have no way of being sure whether this is the same toponym. Alternatively, this could be a general Cushitic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{1610}\) *Wb.* 5, 144. 

\(^{1611}\) *Wb.* 4, 375. Gardiner in *AEO* I, 8 considers a meaning of ‘cleft’. Ultimately this stems from a verbal stem sd ‘to break’ (*Wb.* 4, 373-375). An instructive Coptic parallel may be eptw ‘Ufer, Rand’ (Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 197), but Fecht (*Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur*, 76) and Westendorf related this to assimilation from sp.t. 

\(^{1612}\) *Wb.* 2, 136. 


\(^{1614}\) Zyhlarz, *Kash* 6, 24 n. 8. 

\(^{1615}\) Zibelius, *AOVN*, 160-161. This would involve a quite logical hieratic error, of which there examples in Edel, *SAK* 4, 94-95. 

word for ‘river-valley’ that could be duplicated in many different toponyms. In contemporary toponymy, there is a modern river called Karora on the Sudanese-Eritrean border.

109. \( T\beta \) \(*/?r:\) 

Etymology (III): For the etymology see \( T\beta t \) [130] below.

110. \( T\ft \) \(*/?\ft:\) 

Etymology (III): In Cushitic and Ethiosemitic, there is the root \(*/?f\) ‘mouth’. In many languages it has a technical geographic meaning, for instance Afar \( af\) ‘edge, shore’. It would be tempting to connect it with the name of the village Afta, on the Haddas River near Adulis. This is the only toponym in the list which contains the Egyptian phoneme \( f\).

111. \( M\beta \) \(*/?m\beta:\) 

Etymology (III): If the toponym is reduced to the root \( m\), there are a number of possibilities, including Lowland East Cushitic (Konso) \( mura\) ‘forest’, Awngi \( muri\) ‘village’ or Beja \( malal\) ‘wilderness’.

112. \( T\in\) \(*/?\in:\) 

Etymology (III): No plausible etymology found. It may be that \( t\) is a digraph for \( /t/\) or \( /c/\).

113. \( H\beta \) \(*/?\beta:\) 

Etymology (III): In Beja there is \( hab\) ‘red earth’. The word could be related to the \( Habab\) (\( \tilde{\beta}\)\( t\)\( f\)) region of Northern Eritrea, or an indentical Tigre word meaning ‘wavy (ground)’.

There is also Ge’ez \( h(y)b\) ‘draw water’.

6.2.3 The Medja List [114-119]

---

1617 See the reflexes listed in H. Fleming, Ongota: a decisive Language in African Prehistory (Wiesbaden, 2006), 104; Leslau, Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez, 8-9; Hudson, Northeast African Semitic, 111.
1618 Morin, Dictionnaire Afar-Français, 80.
1620 See n. 1583.
1621 Blažek, Babel und Bibel 3, 391. This presumes a shift of \( /h/\) to \( /\tilde{z}/\) in Beja.
1622 Littmann & Höfner, Wörterbuch der Tigré-Sprache, 79-80, 683.
1623 Leslau, Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez, 251.
This list begins with the placename *Md’*, and hence all the names are likely to be in the deserts east of Nubia. It is deemed here to end at *Ztw*, a toponym referring to the Upper Nile known from Old Kingdom texts.\footnote{1624} Like the Wetenet section, auslaut *t* seems common in this list.

**Etymology (III):** The toponym has the appearance of the reduplicated bi-radical stem $C_1C_2C_1C_2$ that is common in Afroasiatic languages, usually as a frequentative or intensive.\footnote{1625} It is difficult to adduce if the *t* is to be enounced as a sibilant-affricate $\tilde{\text{k}}s$ (as in Semitic loans) or a palatal /c/, or if it is masking an original /t/ through hypercorrection. In Ge’ez, there is a root $bsbs$ ‘be wet, drenched’ or $bsbs/bt$ ‘mix up, stir’, both of which would make sense as landscape descriptors.\footnote{1626}

**Etymology (III):** The orthography resembles a pluralised form of the Egyptian word for ‘swallow’.\footnote{1627} This is probably a case of phono-semantic matching, where the Egyptian word for swallow sounded similar to a toponym in a foreign-language. The best match that could be found is Tigre *məč̣i* ‘spring’, or Gafat *mun* ‘spring’.\footnote{1628}

**Etymology (III):** It would be tempting to identify this placename with *Tessata* (near Wadi Halfa), of the Nubian itinerary of Juba.\footnote{1629} But, if this is part of the Medja territory in the desert, this would interrupt the apparent progression in the list.

**Etymology (III):** A number of Beja possibilities present themselves, such as *daiw* ‘khor with trees, forest’, *doi* ‘path’, *dhi* ‘ravine’ or *dauha* ‘*Linaria macilent*’ (a flower).\footnote{1630}

---

\footnote{1624}{For the location of *Ztw* in Upper Nubia, see O’Connor, *JARCE* 23, 33, and older Lower Nubian interpretations in Zibelius, *AOFN*, 154.}

\footnote{1625}{In reality, however, this phenomenon is rather common and also occurs in Nilo-Saharan languages; see C. Rubino, ‘Reduplication: Form, function and distribution’, in B. Hurch (ed.), *Studies on Reduplication* (Berlin, 2005), 22-25.}

\footnote{1626}{Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez*, 109, 111; Leslau, *Etymological Dictionary of Gurage*, III, 165. The latter root in some languages has the sense of ‘turbid water’. If one keeps in mind the palatal value of Egyptian *t*, the Tigre reflex for ‘stir’ is *bäč̣äc̣*; see Littmann & Höfner, *Wörterbuch der Tigrē-Sprache*, 300.}

\footnote{1627}{Wh. 2, 68.}

\footnote{1628}{Hudson, *Northeast African Semitic*, 184.}

\footnote{1629}{Zibelius, *AOFN*, 181. Against this theory, one might equate Tessata with *Tstl* = ꞌḥḤḥ ’/| of the stele of Usersatet (*Urk.* IV, 1486.7, 11), although they could well be the same placename with different transcriptions.}
6.2.4 The New List of Louvre A18 [120-129]

In the reign of Amenhotep III, a new segment of the Topographical List appears on a statue now in the Louvre. This list includes placenames known specifically from the Wadi Allaqi area, Ḥkt and Ḥb (Fig. 32 & 33). It is likely that the inclusion of this new segment relates specifically to the campaign of Amenhotep III against Ḥb. Of the new placenames in the list, one cannot be sure if they are all to be located in the Eastern Desert, or of their relative order. Nevertheless, it follows that at least some of them would be within the Atbai, given the inclusion of Ḥkt and Ḥb. In the beginning of the list, on the right side of the statue, however, there is a list that appears nowhere else, but begins with Kṣ and also includes Ḥb. Whether all of these names are in the Eastern Desert and Atbai is thus uncertain. Phonologically, this list employs 3 more than the Thutmosis III lists, suggesting it is used as a vowel. The toponyms and list would thus be a later addition to the corpus of names appearing in the Thutmosis III List. There is no indication that the

---

1630 Blažek, Babel und Bibel 2, 385, 390; Reinisch, Wörterbuch der Bedauye-Sprache, 71; Almkvist, Die Bischari Sprache, 13.
1632 For the latter, see Blažek, Babel und Bibel 3, 374.
1633 Urk. IV, 1659-1661. The statue and its texts were originally published in A. Varille, ‘Fragments d’un colosse d’Aménophis III donnant une liste de pays africains (Louvre A 18 et A 19)’, BIFAO 35 (1935), 161-171.
names from the other section of the list, Ṉrkyhb P̱mykɔ, W̱rky, P̱mɔ̯wɔ, P̱tɔ̯kwy, and P̱rmɔkjɔ, are from the desert.\footnote{Little can be said about these names. P̱rmɔkjɔ */pɔmk/~/p̱ɔmk/ might be Meroitic Apedemk ‘god’, given the correspondence of r for /d/ or /ɖ/. For Apedemak, Meroitic Tprmk, see Zibelius-Chen, Nubisches Sprachmateriel, 18-19 and Rilly & de Voogt, The Meroitic Language and Writing System, 102-103.}

Figure 32: Louvre A18, right side anterior, after Varille, \textit{BIFAO} 35, pl. 3

Figure 33: Louvre A18, right side lateral, after Varille, \textit{BIFAO} 35, pl. 4.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
120. & \begin{tabular}{c}
| \hline
Tirt  \\
\end{tabular} & */tʔrt/  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textbf{Etymology (III):} A similar placename is mentioned in the later Kushite texts of Harsiyo\textit{t}ef (\textemdash \texti{t}, \textemdash \texti{t}) and Nastasen (\texti{t} \texti{t}, \texti{t}); in which it is a sanctuary of Bastet.\footnote{Zibelius, \textit{AOVN}, 179.} Most scholars locate this centre around Napata, and the presence of a temple would mean that it is probably not in the Atbai. Why the placename appears next to \textit{Ikyt}, the name for Wadi Allaqi, is somewhat of a mystery. The etymology could be the Beja feminine definite article, followed by \textit{are} ‘stone, hill’.\footnote{For Beja \textit{are} ‘hill’, see Blažek, \textit{Babel und Bibel} 2, 371-372. This word is also suggested as the etymology of \textit{Tjh}bib \textsuperscript{[10]}.} Another possibility would be to connect it with \textit{ela/era} ‘white’, for which there are good cognates in modern Beja toponymy, such as \textit{Teeira aweib} ‘the place of white-stones’.\footnote{Hudson & Blench, \textit{A Dictionary of Beja}, 9; Bechhaus-Gerst, \textit{Afrikanistische Arbeitspapiere} 61, 157, 161, 167.}

\textsuperscript{(Next in the list is \textit{Ikyt}, see entry \[13\])}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
121. & \begin{tabular}{c}
| \hline
Rb\texti{r}rw  \\
\end{tabular} & */rblu:/  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Etymology (III): This toponym appears in the Kushite campaign of Nastasen as 𓊨𓊑𓊤𓊤𓊣 n. 1. As well as capturing its chief, Rbdn, the campaign yielded spoils of cattle and gold, and thus could be a gold bearing region in the Atbai. It is tempting to connect it with Beja reba ‘mountain’, although this does not explain the auslaut consonant.

| 122. | 𓊨𓊑𓊤𓊤𓊣 | M3kwys */mkws/ |

Etymology (III): No lexical parallels have been identified.

| 123. | 𓊨𓊑𓊤𓊤𓊣 | Mtk3rwhw */mtklh/ |

Etymology (III): No lexical parallels have been identified.

| 124. | 𓊨𓊑𓊤𓊤𓊣 | S3h3b3 */fhb/ |

Etymology (III): A tri-radical root s/š-h-b does not appear in Cushitic lexicons, although it is possible to relate the final -b to the Beja accusative suffix which is common in placenames (see [10]).

| 125. | 𓊨𓊑𓊤𓊤𓊣 | S3b3r */sbl/ |

Etymology (III): No lexical parallels have been identified.

| 126. | 𓊨𓊑𓊤𓊤𓊣 | Rwyttkw */ljtk/ |

Etymology (III): No lexical parallels have been identified.

(The next toponym in the list is ḫbht, which is treated in entry [12])

| 127. | 𓊨𓊑𓊤𓊤𓊣 | Twrsw */trs/ |

Etymology (III): Similar toponyms are recorded in other Nubian placenames, including Trrz from the Harkhuf biography and Trss from other Topographical Lists. A similar name occurs in the Stele of Harsiyoetef, where it is the location of an Amun temple, and thus on the Nile.

| 128. | 𓊨𓊑𓊤𓊤𓊣 | Twršk */?rʃk/ |

Etymology (III): This placename has been considered to be the later form of the Middle Kingdom Execration Text toponym ḫwšk [9]. This is not without its complications, however,

---

1638 As noticed by Varille, *BIFAO* 35, 164 n. 3; Zibelius, *AOVN*, 144. For the translation of the stele, see *FHN* II, 489.
1641 See Zibelius, *AOVN*, 176-177.
namely the difficulties of corresponding \( r \) for \( \\theta \) in Middle Kingdom Execration Texts, where aleph probably represents a vowel.\textsuperscript{1644} Furthermore, the segment \( iw \) would be superfluous for the Middle Kingdom transcription, or must be treated as a secondary \( /ʔu:/ \) prefixed to a root toponym \( /rʃk/ \).

| 129. | | Tknz | */ʔknz/ |

**Etymology (III):** As it appears similar to another Nubian placename, \( Ikn \), some scholars have considered these names as variants. This is ultimately unlikely, as the final \(-z/s\) has not been adequately explained.\textsuperscript{1645} The same locality appears in the Onomasticon of Amenemope next to \( Trgrss \) and \( Thb \), although this is not of much assistance, as both these names are unlocated.\textsuperscript{1646} A connection to \( Knz.t \) cannot be ruled out, especially as the dropping of final \( t \) is recorded in the lists.\textsuperscript{1647}

### 6.2.5 The New \( Tkt \)-List of Ramesses II

Another new list which includes \( Tkt \) is reproduced twice in the portico of the Abydos Temple.\textsuperscript{1648} In this list, however, \( Tkt \) is at sixth position between \( Grss \) (no. 5) and \( Trkrk \) (no. 7), placenames otherwise known from the list of Kushite placenames. It is, therefore, possible that the new placenames of this list (\( Idr, Idrw, Šnk \)) are in the Eastern Desert, but they could just as easily lie elsewhere on the Nubian Nile.\textsuperscript{1649} Likewise, the series of new placenames appearing on Ramesses II’s Amara and Aksha lists cannot be located anywhere specifically, as there is no known placename within these lists that could assist in narrowing their location.\textsuperscript{1650}

### 6.2.6 The Execration Texts

Within the Execration texts, O’Connor located a series of placenames in the Eastern Desert, due to their association with the Medja centres of \( WbAt-spt \) \textsuperscript{[17]} and \( šwšk \) \textsuperscript{[9]}.\textsuperscript{1651} There may well be  

---

\textsuperscript{1643} Priese, *Altorient Forschungen* 1, 39; O’Connor, ‘Egypt, 1552-664 BC’, in Clark (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Africa*, I, 931 n. 3. Twrsk also occurs in the Soleb list; see M. Giorgini, *Soleb V*, pl. 246.


\textsuperscript{1645} See Zibelius, *AOVN*, 95.

\textsuperscript{1646} *AEOI*, 213.

\textsuperscript{1647} In the earlier list of Thutmosis III (*Urk*. IV, 799 no. 86), there is \( Iknz \) with a hypercorrected \( t \).

\textsuperscript{1648} *KRI* II, 192.

\textsuperscript{1649} These toponyms are, however, reminiscent of common Beja geographic vocabulary. \( Idr */ʔdr/ \) could be Beja *adar* (see entry \textsuperscript{[14]}), while \( Šnk */snk/ \) is a good match for Beja *šanki* ‘edge, beach’ or *sink* ‘shoulder’; see Blažek, *Babel und Bibel* 3, 421. But, one might also entertain Nara, *šolko* ‘red’; see Bender, *Analysis of a Barya word-list*, *Anthropological Linguistics* 10 (1968), 18.

\textsuperscript{1650} For the Aksha list, see *KRI* II, 211, 9-12, 15-27 and the slightly different rendition in the Amara list in *KRI* II, 219.

\textsuperscript{1651} See entries \textsuperscript{[9]} and \textsuperscript{[17]}.
other names in these lists that lie within the Eastern Desert, but there is no method by which we might differentiate Eastern Desert placenames from their Nile counterparts.

130.  

**Etymology (III):** The name matches the orthography of Egyptian ḫ3t ‘twig, rod’.\(^{1652}\) If the word is reproducing a similar sounding foreign word, one has to keep in mind the likely vocalic reading of aleph in the Execration Texts.\(^{1653}\) This may well be the same toponym recorded as ḫ3t \([109]\) in the New Kingdom Topographical Lists under the heading of \(\text{Wtn.t}\).\(^{1654}\) Thus, there is good reason to agree with O’Connor and place these names in the Eastern Desert.

131.  

**Etymology (III):** The initial group \(tt\) is only recorded as \(t\) in some writings, perhaps indicating that \(tt\) is a digraph for a single sound /t/ or /c/, but not both. If \(t\) represents a hypercorrection from \(t\), one might propose Beja tikas ‘heel’ or Kunama takása ‘Ebene, Präré’.\(^{1655}\) The ss ending is present in a number of African placenames, presumably meaning it was a suffix in some language.\(^{1656}\)

132.  

**Etymology (III):** The segment \(mg\) was likened by El-Sayed to two other Nubian onomastica, \(Mwgr\) and \(RwS\).\(^{1657}\) If this is encoding a generic term, it could perhaps be Beja magwa ‘shelter from the rain’.\(^{1658}\)

133.  

**Etymology (III):** The placename might be related to Beja ruša ‘rain after bad flood’.\(^{1659}\)

---

\(^{1652}\) *Wb.* 1, 27.

\(^{1653}\) If one interprets it as /t/, there is Beja \(\text{ari}‘\)heap of stones’ or rather \(\text{irra}‘\)vertical bank of khor’; see Blažek, *Babel und Bibel* 2, 371, 373; Hess, *Zeitschrift für Kolonialsprachen* 9, 215.

\(^{1654}\) *Urk.* IV, 799, 73. Zibelius, *AOVN*, 72. The loss of final –t could easily be explained as a scribal Late Egyptianism, whereby final Egyptian \(t\)’s are dropped. This is also recorded in the topographical lists for \(\text{Wtn.t}\) \([81]\).


\(^{1656}\) Zibelius, *AOVN*, 196. It could well be identified with a number of Meroitic suffixes, for which see Rilly & de Voogt, *The Meroitic Language and Writing System*, 62-67.


\(^{1658}\) Hudson-Blench, *A Dictionary of Beja*, 114.

\(^{1659}\) Blažek, *Babel und Bibel* 3, 416.
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Chapter 7: The Toponyms and Labels of the Turin Map

While almost all toponyms in this thesis are anchored in texts, our understanding of the region of Wadi Hammamat and the valleys east of Coptos are aided by the only topographic map produced in Ancient Egypt: pTurin 1879, 1899, and 1869. The mere presence of this map beckons many questions regarding the frequency and use of documents. Most Egyptian representations of space are confined to diagrammatic representations of buildings from tomb scenes, depicting the layout of palaces and temple estates.\textsuperscript{1660} Perhaps more revealing of cartography are the New Kingdom ostraca and papyri which depict tomb plans with appended notes, the most relevant example being the Turin Papyrus that depicts the plan of the tomb of Ramesses IV.\textsuperscript{1661} On the opposite end of this spectrum there are many cosmological maps, theological representations of the universe as embodied by deities such as Geb (the earth), Nut (the sky), and Shu (the air). Such representations are common in Royal Tombs of the New Kingdom and accompany such cosmographic texts as the Book of Nut and the Book of the Day. The so-called Turin Geological Papyri occupies a unique place between these cosmological maps and architectural plans in that it depicts a topographic landscape.

7.1 The Map

This map provides an extraordinary source for this thesis, as it allows one to link some toponyms with a visual depiction of the landscape (Fig. 35). The toponyms that occur in the Turin Papyrus are given a topographic definitiveness due to their placement on the map and the relationship between the visual features and their labels. The reason for treating these placenames as analytically separate from the databank is that they represent a closed corpus, and linguistically, while geographically fixed, are not necessarily in the true sense toponyms, but more aptly ‘labels’. Furthermore, the relationship of these labels to one another is fixed on a unitary understanding of the topography present in the map, and therefore requires a different approach to the discussion of placenames found solely in texts. The document has been the subject of numerous publications, most of which were intent on localising the geography and solving problems of date and authorship.\textsuperscript{1662}

\textsuperscript{1660} For a collection and discussion of such documents, see M. Baud, ‘La représentation de l’espace en Égypte ancienne: cartographie d’un itinéraire d’expédition’, \textit{BIFAO} 90 (1990), 59-62.

\textsuperscript{1661} H. Carter & A. Gardiner, ‘The tomb of Ramesses IV and the Turin Plan of a Royal Tomb’, \textit{JEA} 4 (1917), pl. 29. It is quite possible that the scribe recorded on the verso of this document, Amunnakht, is also the same author of the Turin Map, although he probably never visited the Wadi Hammamat himself; see J. Harrell & Brown, \textit{JARCE} 29, 100-103.

\textsuperscript{1662} The most important reconstructions were A. Gardiner, ‘The map of the gold mines in a Ramesside Papyrus at Turin’, \textit{Cairo Scientific Journal} 8 (1914), 41-56; G. Murray, ‘The Gold Mine of the Turin Papyrus’, \textit{Bulletin de l’Institut d’Égypte} 24 (1941-1942), 81-86 and Goyon, \textit{ASAE} 49, 337-392. For a complete bibliography on this document, see Harrell & Brown, \textit{JARCE} 29, 85 n. 14.
It was Gardiner who recognised that the portion of the map showing the goldmines belonged to the same papyrus as fragments with black hills, which are identified as Bekhen Quarries $\text{Pj-n(y)-bhn.y.}$

This made it all but certain that the map records a section of the Wadi Hammamat, the only region where gold and Bekhen-stone occur in such proximity. Since this study, no one has seriously questioned the Wadi Hammamat location of the map. It has now been conclusively proven that the geography depicted in the papyrus relates to the Wadi Hammamat, with the only serious dissenting opinion being that of Bradbury, who extended the maps boundaries north to Wadi Hammama. Goyon changed the orientation of the map so that the top faced north, but still located all the features in the Wadi Hammamat. The Klemms shifted the axis $180^\circ$ to allow for a ‘bend’ in the Wadi. The reconstruction of the fragments here will follow that of Harrell and Brown’s article, which is the most recent and comprehensive treatment of the papyrus, although they in turn were indebted to Goyon’s transcription of the hieratic.

The differing conclusions of most authors (Fig. 34) demonstrate the manifest difficulties in matching the toponymy to the various known geographic features. Indeed, it seems that all conclusions, to a certain degree, are dependent on 1) aberrations in the curvature of the map and the wadi, or 2) errors by the ancient cartographer. It is thus difficult to satisfactorily match the labels of the map with the geography of the Hammamat region.

---

1665 With the exception of A. Castiglioni, A. Castiglioni & J. Vercoutter, *Das Goldland der Pharaonen*, 149, who cite Wadi Allaqi due to the presence of greywacke and gold in this region.
1666 In Bradbury’s reconstruction, the main stony path is Wadi Hammama, with the Wadi Hammamat being the white east-west path above it; see Bradbury, *JARCE* 25, 150.
1667 See Goyon, *ASAE* 49, 348. Suffice to say, Egyptian ‘maps’ were orientated with the south facing the top. So, for instance, in the *The Book of Nut* the sun always rises in the left side of the scene, in the east, with the left side of Nut being the $\text{3h.t-lb.t}$ ‘eastern horizon’; see von Lieven, *Grundriss des Laufes der Sterne*, II, pl. 2.
Figure 34: Different interpretations of the spatial projection of the Turin Map, after Baud, *BIFA*O 90, 55.
Figure 35: The Turin Map, numbering following Harrell and Brown, *JARCE* 29, 81-105. Photographs courtesy of Dr James Harrell. Note as the right margin of the papyrus has no placenames it is not shown here.
7.2 Toponyms and Geographic labels of the Turin Map [T1-T20]

Presented here is a list of the toponyms and labels from the Turin Map. The numbering follows the system employed by Goyon as well as Harell and Brown, introduced with the letter ‘T’.

| [T1] | T3-mi.t-n.ty-h3>r-p3-y m |

Etymology (I): The toponym is a relative clause with a defined antecedent, t3-mi.t ‘road’. This is qualified by the predicate h3>r p3-ym ‘leads towards the sea’.\textsuperscript{1670} Given the Late Egyptian language of the text, the form of the verb is probably a first present, (hr) plus infinitive.

Location (I): This must be a route leaving the Wadi Hammamat region for the Red Sea. Bradbury identified this road with Wadi el-Sid.\textsuperscript{1671} This is quite possible, as this road does lead to the sea, but Harrell’s suggestion of a wadi northeast of Bir Umm Fawakhir Perhaps better matches its placement on the map.\textsuperscript{1672} This wadi could lead northeast to Wadi Umm Esh el-Zerqa or bend southeast and join Wadi el-Sid and hence the main road to Quseir. The latter route would more or less follow the Roman road (Fig. 36) leading to Quseir al-Qadim.

Figure 36: The Roman road and its towers (dotted line) from Fawakhir towards the Red Sea, after Cuvigny, \textit{La Route de Myos Hormos}, fig. 14.

\textsuperscript{1670} For ym, see entry [77]. For h3>r, see Wb. 3, 227-228.
\textsuperscript{1671} As correctly identified in Bradbury, \textit{JARCE} 25, 148.
\textsuperscript{1672} Harrell & Brown, \textit{JARCE} 29, 94.
Etymology (I): Same as above, with the addition of *ky.t* ‘another’.

Location (II): Given that this road is prefaced with *ky.t* ‘another’, one might wonder whether this was a secondary, less-travelled route to the Red Sea. The position of this odonym has caused problems for scholars. Harrell thought it might be the unnamed wadi parallel to Wadi Atallah, while the Klemms made it Wadi Atallah, with their projected curve in the map.\(^{1673}\) In Harrell’s defence, the map does appear as if this was the correct position of this route, but Egyptians are hardly likely to have traversed this wadi, as it terminates in steep ridges. The only possibility, then, is to push this road further east, and see in it the wadi leaving Fawakhir to the northeast, even if it does not follow the precise projections on the map.

Etymology (I): Bradbury pointed out that the determinatives following *mr* refer to a geographic meaning, and suggested reading *p*\(^{3}\)*-*mr* as ‘the harbour’, rejecting Gardiner’s earlier reading of ‘treasurer’.\(^{1674}\) There is a root *mr* in Egyptian which can designate a variety of geographic etyma: *mri.t* ‘bank, shore, coast’ a deverbative of *mri* ‘to run aground’, and *mr.w* ‘desert, harbour’.\(^{1675}\) The intervening particle is a strangely written. It could be the Late Egyptian possessive prefix as appears in the formation *t*(i)-*n.t-htr ‘one of the yoke’ (chariot worker), which is sometimes written in a haphazard manner.\(^{1676}\)

Location (I): The Klemms considered this to be Wadi Masaq el-Baqar, but for Harrell it is the Wadi Atallah.\(^{1677}\) Harrell’s interpretation makes sense, considering that the Wadi Atallah is geologically a continuation of Wadi Hammamat, and thus undifferentiated on the map. Furthermore, if one agrees with the etymological identification of *p*\(^{3}\)* *mr* as referring to a harbour or coastal site, then the Wadi Atallah would make good sense, for this would be the most direct route between the Wadi Hammamat and Mersa Gawasis. This would have been roughly the route Henu took as he returned to home from Mersa Gawasis via the Wadi Hammamat, see *Wig* [15].

\(^{1673}\) See Harrell & Brown, *JARCE* 29, 94, who admit that this wadi led nowhere.
\(^{1674}\) Bradbury, *JARCE* 25, 150.
\(^{1675}\) *Wb.* 2, 109-110; *EDE* III, 410, 421. Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 99 also connected Coptic *አም* ‘Ufer’ to this word.
\(^{1676}\) *Wb.* 5, 212; Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 53-54.
\(^{1677}\) Harrell & Brown, *JARCE* 29, 93; Klemm & Klemm, ‘Pharaonisicher Goldbergbau im Wadi Sid und der Turiner Minenpapyrus’, in Schoske (ed.), *Akten des Vierten Internationalen Ägyptologen-Kongresses*, II, 86. Mention should also be made of Bradbury’s theory (*JARCE* 25, 150) that this is an east-west route running from Qena to Mersa Gawasis.
**[T4]** \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Dw.w n(w) nbw}
\end{array}
\]

**Etymology (I):** The phrase is an indirect genitive ‘mountains of gold’. The generic \( dw \) is a plural.

**Location (II):** Given the location of [T3], these gold hills must be a range to the west of Wadi Atallah. This could extend towards the goldmines of Atallah itself, where there are New Kingdom workings and an inscription of Ramesses III.\(^ {1678} \)

**[T5]** \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Dw.w n(w) nbw}
\end{array}
\]

**Etymology (I):** Same as T4.

**Location (I):** These ‘mountains’ are goldworkings immediately adjacent to the gold-village in [T6]. The map seems to depict this mountain closer to Fawakhir than the expected Wadi el-Sid, where there are remains of New Kingdom mines.\(^ {1679} \) It is possible that later Graeco-Roman and Byzantine goldmining at Fawakhir destroyed any earlier traces of New Kingdom activity at the site.

**[T6]** \[
\begin{array}{c}
N3-pr.w n(w) T3-wh.yt-b3k-nbw
\end{array}
\]

**Etymology (I):** See \( T3-wh.yt-b3k-nbw \) [18]. This toponym is further compounded with the generic term \( n3 pr.w \) ‘The houses of the gold working settlement’.

**Location (I):** The location of this label is one of the key difficulties of the map. Most scholars put this settlement at Fawakhir due to its position on the map, but the only extant New Kingdom hut remains are further southeast at Wadi el-Sid (see [18]).

**[T7]** \[
\begin{array}{c}
T3 hnm.t
\end{array}
\]

**Etymology (I):** See toponym [37] or [38].

**Location (II):** This label is generally equated with the well at Bir Umm Fawakhir, but it could conceivably be any well structure in this general area as the age of this well is unknown.

**[T8]** \[
\begin{array}{c}
Wd-n(y)-nsw-Mn-M3+t-Rc.w-c.s
\end{array}
\]

---

\(^{1678}\) Klemm & Klemm, *Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia*, 123. The inscription is now vandalised beyond readability.


\(^{1680}\) From the photograph of the papyrus it is presently impossible to read this placename, so Goyon’s transcriptions in *ASAE* 49, 368 or K. Lepsius, *Auswahl der wichtigsten Urkunden des aegyptischen Alterthums* (Leipzig, 1842), pl. 22 are followed here.
Etymology (I): An indirect genitive of \( wD \) ‘stele’ and the royal name Menmaatre (Seti I). 1681

Location (III): As a ‘stele’ (\( wD \)), this locality has generally been identified with the stele-shaped rock inscription dating to Seti I, Wadi Hammamat no. 94. 1682 An issue with this assessment, however, is that the stele on the map is depicted as a white, round-topped and free-standing stele, not a rock inscription. Limestone stelae were occaisonly carried to desert sites from the Nile, as is the case with a stele found at Wadi el-Hudi, 1683 so a similar development could account for the ‘white stele’. No such object has been recorded in Wadi Hammamat, but the extensive reuse and resettlement of the area at Bir Umm Fawakhir may have led to its use in later building materials. Furthermore, on the map, the stele is depicted not near the Bekhen Quarries where Seti’s inscription is located, but closer to Fawakhir.

Etymology (II):

| T9 | T3-mi.t(n.t)-t3-Mnt.y |

Location (II): On the map, the road to Ta-menty seems to be a route leading south from the mining area at El-Sid or Fawakhir. Goyon considered it to be a ‘vallée latérale’ from Wadi Hammamat, while Bradbury suggested a route towards Gebel Zeidoun; Harrell and the Klemms proposed a route near the gold-workers’ huts at Bir Umm Fawakhir. 1684 If these huts [T6] are at Fawakhir then there is little option than to make it a route leaving this area.

| T10 | P3-lhw-n(y)-1mn.w-p3-dw-w\(^b\) |

Etymology (I): See [46] for the toponym \( Dw-w^b \). The architectural term \( hnw \) refers to a shrine or more correctly ‘resting-place’. 1685

---

1681 The word \( wD \) ‘stele’ is usually not written with the papyrus-sign \( \overline{\nu} \) \( wD \), but this was possible in Late Egyptian as aleph was often not pronounced.
1682 A. Gasse, ‘Wadi Hammamat and the Sea from the origins to the end of the New Kingdom’, in Tallet & Mahfouz (eds), Red Sea in Pharaonic Times, 139-140; Goyon, ASAE 49, 364ff.
1685 \( Wb. \) 3, 288.
Location (II): For the location of the $Dw-w^b$, see [46]. This shrine building is difficult to identify as there are no extant constructions dating to this period in the wadi. Gasse identifies it with the Paneion in Wadi Hammamat,\(^{1686}\) while the Klemms cite a hypothetical structure more or less underneath the Byzantine settlement at Bir Umm Fawakhir.\(^{1687}\) It might be worth noting that there is a Ptolemaic Temple near Bir Umm Fawakhir, suggesting that the area was considered a sacred space of some kind.\(^{1688}\) This was noted by Weigall and Weill, with Weill’s map putting it on the eastern side of the wadi, exactly where the shrine building is depicted on the map (Fig. 37).

Etymology (I): The appellation is essentially a relative clause with a subject that is not identical to the antecedent, $dw.w$ ‘mountains’, with $\Rightarrow w$ being resumptive for $dw.w$. In Late Egyptian the

\[ N3-dw.w-n.ty-tw=tw-hr-b3k \]
\[ nbw-im=\Rightarrow hr-lw=\Rightarrow m-p3-iwn.w-d\text{"sr}.t \]
particle *hr* expresses conditionality. This is qualified by another adverbial sentence. The translation would be ‘The mountains in which one works gold, they being the colour red’.

**Location (II):** As these mountains touch the Wadi Hammamat, it is probably to be identified with the hills around Gebel Shehamiya, just south of Fawakhir. New Kingdom workings and ceramics have been found at this site.

| T12 |
| Ni-dw.w-n(.w)-[hd?]-nbw |

**Etymology (II):** Same as [T4], but with a lacuna which was reconstructed by Goyon as *hd* ‘silver’. This label was written upside down in relation to the rest of the inscriptions; perhaps it was a later addition to the map.

**Location (II):** These mountains are further west along the Wadi Hammamat from [T4]. They might represent the mountains just east of Wadi Masaq el-Baqr where there is a shift from the dark-coloured mountains of the Hammamat Series to the lighter coloured the Dokhan Volcanics.

| T13 |
| T3 dhn.t/// |

For etymology and location see [T14].

| T14 |
| T3-dhn.t-ty-Imn.w-im=t |

**Etymology (I):** A relative clause with a determined antecedent (*β-dhn.t*) that is different from the subject of the relative clause (*Imn.w*); *dhn.t* is referred to by the resumptive pronoun *m*. The word *dhn.t* is usually taken to mean ‘ridge’, but the German translation of ‘Felswand’ is closer to its literal connection with *dhn.t* ‘forehead’.

**Location (I):** This ‘cliff’ should be the hill directly above [T10] on the eastern side of Bir Umm Fawakhir. This label seems to act as a gloss for [T13].

| T15 |
| ///kh | */kh/ |

**Etymology (III):** The lacuna makes analysing this placename almost impossible, but it seems certain from the classifiers that the last lexeme refers independently to a placename. The

---

1691 Goyon, *ASAE* 49, 362. The sign is not readable on the available photograph.
1693 *Wb.* 5, 478. See *CDME*, 315; *HWb*, 985.
phonemes represented by \(k\) and \(h\) are usually incompatible in Egyptian roots.\textsuperscript{1694} Given this, and the location in the Eastern Desert, there is every possibility that one is dealing with a foreign placename.\textsuperscript{1695}

**Location (II):** For Goyon, this is Wadi Atallah, but this would seem to conflict with the orientation of the map. Following Harrell, this would indicate a road tending south-southwest from the mining area of El-Sid. Perhaps a better option for this odonym is a route leading south from Wadi el-Sid, ultimately connecting with Wadi Isa, and hence Wadi Qash, Wadi Zeidoun, or Wadi Meniah. Wadi Isa is marked with Old Kingdom inscriptions, and thus is the only known route leading south of the Hammamat and El-Sid region in the pharaonic period.\textsuperscript{1696}

**Etymology (I):** The label is identical to [T4], except with the addition of the plural definite article. The papyrus is cut off at \(nb\), so it is uncertain if there are additional words in the label, or it terminates with \(nb\).

**Location (II):** It is difficult to determine the location of this toponym. Perhaps it is a continuation of gold-bearing zones towards the El-Sid mines or another mountain south and east of Fawakhir. This label is not part of the longer text, as Goyon thought, but is itself a label for an auriferous hill pictured on the papyrus.

**Etymology and Location:** For etymology and location see [47]. The toponym is not given as a label but is part of running text, so its position on the map is irrelevant.

For etymology and location see entries [T6] and [18]. This placename is not a label but is part of running text.

For etymology and location see entry [T17] and [47].

\textsuperscript{1694} Peust, *Egyptian Phonology*, 196-197 includes the consonants \(k\) and \(h\) amongst his list of incompatible consonants in Egyptian roots. Exceptions include \(kh\), \(kbb\) and \(khs\) (Wb. 5, 136-137), all with the semantic range of ‘rage, harm’, as well as \(kh\) ‘snake’ (Wb. 2, 503.5).

\textsuperscript{1695} As a comparison, El-Sayed, *Afrikanischstämmiger Lehnwortschatz*, 282 analysed \(kh\) as Beja *kurib* ‘elephant’, marking the segment \(kh\) as marking an aspirated velar.

\textsuperscript{1696} For a description of this valley and its inscriptions, see Rothe, Miller & Rapp, *Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt*, 32; see Bell, Johnson & Whitcomb, *JNES* 43, 27-46.
Etymology (I): The grammar of this adverbial sentence is similar to [T11]. The second clause begins with the $m$ of predication ‘it being the great mission’. The word $h3.t$ refers to a ‘quarry’, used in other toponyms like [34], [41] and [59]. The name would mean something like ‘The Quarry in which one works, it being the great mission for Bekhen-stone’.

Location (I): This label is put in the dark-part of the map which represents the sedimentary rocks of Wadi Hammamat. The fact that $bhn$-stone is mentioned leaves no doubt that the specific quarry is the metagreywacke quarry in Wadi Hammamat (see [47]).
Figure 39: Inset of Labels near Bir Umm Fawakhir
Excursus II: Toponyms possibly located in the Eastern Desert, South Sinai, and Red Sea.

Previous scholarship has located some names in the wider geographical area discussed in this corpus, but in some cases there is little or unconvincing evidence for their status as toponyms. In other cases, their location in this region is in doubt. For some of these names there is good reason to doubt their existence and/or their relevancy to the geographical area.

II. I ʾṣ-ʾn

This name, surrounded by a walled enclosure on an Early Dynastic label, is possibly connected with Expeditions to the Sinai. Tallet equated the campaign on this label with an action against the ḫwn.tyw on the Palermo Stone, and local Early-Dynastic inscriptions in Wadi ʿAmeyra in the Sinai. The reading of this placename is doubtful, due to the difficulties posed by the Early-Dynastic script and the syntax of the text. Tallet has supposed a noun qualified by an adjective ʾṣ-ʾn ‘Beautiful door’. Another possibility would be a writing of Semitic ʿ(y)n ‘well’, thus reading ‘Door of the well’. The place was a source of ʾṣm.t ‘malachite’ and therefore must be a copper bearing region in the Eastern Desert or South Sinai. As there is no extant classifier, it cannot be certain whether this expression references a placename or something else.

II. II ʾṭ.ṭy-m-ḥb

Černý considered this expression on the Stele of Hawerre from Serabit el-Kadem, which he translates as ‘the eyes are in festival’, to be the name of a mine. This supposition is plausible, as such a name is congruous in light of other mine names in the Sinai. But Iversen points to a very similar expression in another stele from Serabit, ʾṣr.t ḫr ršw ‘the nose is in joy’, thus challenging somewhat the notion that all of these phrases are specifically mine names, rather than statements of efficacy in respect to the mine and the expedition.

1699 Tallet, Archéo-Nil 20, 100.
1700 Tallet, Archéo-Nil 20, 100.
1701 See the Canaanite forms quoted in Halayqa, Comparative Dictionary of Ugaritic and Canaanite, 98.
1702 See the discussion in entry [42].
1703 See Tallet, BIFAO 109, 476.
II. III Ḥṣ.s.t-ʿyn

The placename is mentioned in pHarris I as a site where a well was constructed, along with a fortifying wall. The word is related to the Semitic ʿyn ‘spring’. Morris suggests it is Clyisma, based on the plausible correlation between this text and the late Ramesside material at Clyisma (Kom Al-Qulzoum). Other scholars have suggested one of the wells listed in Seti’s campaign on the North Sinai coast. All of these suggestions remain unverifiable for the time being, but Morris’s is the most plausible. As a caveat, one should note that the phrase ḫmm.t wr.t m Ḥṣ.s.t-ʿyn ‘a great well in the Hill-Country of Ayn’ suggests that the whole region was known under the name ‘Hill-country of Ayn’, and thus a larger region was named after a notable well or spring.

II. IV KwŠw

Due to phonetic correspondences, scholars have generally espoused a connection with biblical Cush (כוש), a supposed Midianite tribe. Confusing the argument somewhat is the view of some Semiticists who see the Hebrew word as related to the Nubian entity Kš. Given the writing of this placename in the Asiatic section of the Execration Texts, it is extremely unlikely that it has anything to do with the Upper Nubian entity ‘Kush’ and instead probably derives from a local Semitic tongue. The placename occurs only in the Middle Kingdom texts of the Story of Sinuhe and the Execration Texts. There remain two equally tenuous theories as to the location of this placename, 1) an equation with the area of Midian, based on an etymological connection to the biblical Cush, or 2) a connection to the Levantine placename Geshur, as espoused by Green. Kitchen adopted the former hypothesis, but later delineated its boundaries as Edom rather than Midian. It must be said that in neither the Execration Texts nor Sinuhe, is there any internal evidence favouring either locations, the texts being of no particular assistance. In Sinuhe KwŠw is mentioned along with Fnḥw ‘Phoenicia’ and Ḫdm (usually placed in the hinterland of Byblos). The Ashmoleon Ostracon edition of Sinuhe replaces KwŠw with a placename B3, found earlier in the Sinuhe narrative, but this substitution should not be interpreted to mean that KwŠw and B3 are

1705 See Hoch, Semitic Words, 59.
1707 Al-Ayedi, The Inscriptions of the Ways of Horus, 102; Grandet, Le Papyrus Harris I, 254 n. 930.
1709 Hidal, Svensk exegetisk årbok 41, 101-103.
1710 See Posener, Princes et pays d’Asie et de Nubie, 88-89.
the same place. Some authorities have seen in the biblical toponym a Midianite placename, while others locate it more generally in the Transjordan, or even equate it with Egyptian ‘Kush’ and locate it in Nubia.

II. V ellation

This placename, found only in the Middle Kingdom inscription of Seankh (Hammamat no. 1), was considered by earlier authorities to refer to the eastern terminus of Wadi Hammamat at Quseir. This assertion was based primarily on the location of the inscription in Wadi Hammamat and a fragmentary Ptolemaic relief found at Quseir which mentions Dwšw, considered to be the Ptolemaic reflex of this earlier name. Hannig was even more specific, citing the ‘östlichen wüste, südlich des 16. oberägyptischen gaues’ as the location of this placename. The text of the inscription does not point to its location, only that it is in the south. Simpson saw no reason to equate Tšw with a Red Sea port, doubting the reading of Dwšw as well as its phonological equation with Tšw. In accordance with this view, there is nothing in the inscription that would locate Tšw in the Eastern Desert, but rather it is probably somewhere in Lower Nubia, the southern limit of where Seankh obtained supplies for his expedition.

II. VI Knz.t

The name is only found in vague mythological contexts, chiefly the Pyramid Texts, and as such is very difficult to locate. In mythologies of the Late Period, it is associated with the placename Bwgm, which also has not been positively identified, but is associated with solar birth in myths relating to the ‘Wandering-goddess’. This may mean that Bugem is located in the southeast.

---

1714 For the location of Tšš and Kdm, see A.-L. Mourad, ‘Remarks on Sinuhe’s Qedem and Yaa’, GM 238 (2013), 78 who proposed locating Yaa and Qedem in the Beqa Valley. The placenames of the New Kingdom copies of Sinuhe seem to have been reinterpreted to contemporary Asiatic examples; Kdm in is changed to Kds ‘Kadesh’ or Kdl. Perhaps the scribes interpreted Kwšš as a mistake for Nubian Kš and therefore replaced it.

1715 Hidal, Svensk exegtsk årsbok 41, 102-103.


1717 HWb, 1405.

1718 Couyat & Montet, Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouadi Hammâmât, 19, 32, pl. 3: ’pr.w) m hnr r dr = hnt Tššw mh.t r Mn’; t-Hwšw prt.kw wtl-d-wr…‘being supplied with young (animals) to its limit, south to Tjaau, north to Menat-Khuft. I went forth to the sea…’.

1719 Simpson, JNES 18, 22-23.

1720 Junker, Onurislegende, 78-80.

1721 Junker, Onurislegende, 73-78. I. Hofmann etymologically associated Bwgm with the word ‘Beja’, ‘Beitrag zur Herkunft der Pfannengräber-Leute’, ZDMG Suplementa I (1969), III, 1120. One might also connect the term to the Bg (Ge’ez version) and Bgm (Sabaic version) of Ezana’s text, which is
and consequently also Knz.t. If Bwgm is identical to the Buge of Renaissance maps (see Fig. 40), it is likely the same location as the Arab port of Aidhab, near the Sudanese border. In Ptolemaic texts, there might be an indication that Knz.t referred to a region beyond Meroë. The etymology of the word is perplexing. Egyptian has a root kns ‘pubic region’, which would make knz.t an abstract noun of knz. While prima facie this appears to be an absurd etymology for a placename, it is worth recalling that in Egyptian mythology the personified sky ‘Nut’ bore the sun between her thighs from the south-eastern sky. Given this south-eastern connection, it might not be impossible to recognise in this toponym a cosmic designator that refers to the thighs of Nut’s celestial body in the south-eastern sky. Koenig connected the term to Ks (an early writing of Ks), which is possible given that both s and n could represent foreign /l/, but the contexts in which the toponyms occur would make this somewhat difficult to accept. On present evidence, Knz.t cannot be located with any degree of certainty, nor is it clear if the term belonged purely to the sphere of mythic cosmography. In this sense it is similar to Bakh (Bhs/Bfh.w) which also belongs almost solely to the cosmographic sphere rather than being realised terrestrially.

Figure 40: The placename Adhad de Buge on the Red Sea coast north of Suakin, from Nicolas Sanson, Carte des trois Arabies: tirée en partie de l’Arabe de Nubie, en partie de divers autres auteurs, Paris, 1654.


1723 Wb. 5, 134. For the various translations, see J. Barns, Five Ramesseum Papyri (Oxford, 1956), 25 n. 3.

1724 In the Book of Nut, it is stated, wnn ntr pn m-gs m-rs-y-i3b.ty hr-s3 Pwnt ‘this god exists in her south-eastern side, behind Punt’; see von Leiven, Grundriß des Laufes der Sterne, 374. Solar birth from the ‘thighs of Nut’ is mentioned in the cosmic tract from Deir el-Bahri and the Amduat; see respectively Karkowski, Deir el-Bahari VI, The Temple of Hatshepsut: The Solar Complex, 212-221 and E. Hornung, Das Amduat: Die Schrift des Verborgenen Raumes (Wiesbaden, 1963), 1, 192.

1725 Koenig, RdÉ 41, 103 n. a.

1726 This term has been equated with both the western and eastern horizons, see n. 665.
II. VII Miw

There have been a number of opinions concerning the location of Miw. Priese originally placed it in Lower Nubia, near Firka, on account of a similar placename Mawa in the itineraries of Yaqubi, Khwarizmi, and Idrisi. However, Klotz has shown that this was due to a confusion of two phonetically similar, but geographically disparate, placenames. Zibelius-Chen and an earlier interpretation of O’Connor had preferred locating Miw much further north in Lower Nubia. A comprehensive study by O’Connor put Miw in the Berber-Shendi reach, while Kemp and Morris placed Miw in the Fourth-Fifth Cataract region (Abu Hamed), and Klotz placed it in the Gash River, which would put it in the region of this corpus.

The first instance of the placename is found in the stele of Emhab during the reign of Kamose, where he boasts of his reaching Miu, as well as Avaris, meaning that he travelled to the furthest southern and northern reaches of Egypt’s newly nascent New Kingdom Empire. In the Armant Stele of Thutmosis III, Miw is described as the location of a rhinoceros hunt, suggesting an extremely southerly location. The Armant text also mentions the erection of a stele in Miw (smn=f wd im ‘he established a stele there’), which is paralleled in the text with a boundary stele established in Ḏḥy ‘Syria’ – the ‘ends’ (ph.wy) of Egypt’s empire. O’Connor debated whether ‘there’ (im) in the text refers to Miw or the previously mentioned &A-sty. One can take opposition to this view in that T3-sty is a rather indeterminate placename and it is therefore not paralleled with the location of the northern stele, which is described very specifically as being erected on the ‘side’ (gs) of the Euphrates River (phr-wr), and not generally located in Naharin. Against the Gash location, one may cite that this is too far from Egyptian interests in Upper Nubia to be a boundary of any kind, and the distribution of rhinoceroses further north in antiquity and modernity meant that it would have been unnecessary to go so far south to hunt them.

1727 Priese, ‘Orte des mittleren Niltals in der Überlieferung bis zum Ende des christlichen Mittelalters’, in Hintze (ed.), Meroitistische Forschungen 1980, 492. For the instances of this toponym, see Zibelius, AOVN, 123. Priese also conflates the placename sml w iw from the Exeption Texts (see AOVN, 120) with this name.
1730 O’Connor, JEA 73, 122-124; Klotz, SAK 39, 236-237. The Eastern Desert location was also espoused in L. Störk, Nashörner (Hamburg, 1977), 260.
1731 For an updated reading of the text and its lexical issues, see Klotz, SAK 39, 235.
1732 Urk. IV, 1246.5.
1733 O’Connor, JEA 73, 123-124.
1734 Wylde reported a wild rhinoceros north of Port Sudan in the nineteenth century; see Hinkel, The Archaeological Map of Sudan VI: The Red Sea Coast and Northern Ethiopian Frontier, 177. H.-Å. Nordström, Neolithic and A-Group sites (Stockholm, 1972), I, 4 and P. Červiček, Felsbilder des Nord-Elbait, Oberägyptens und Unternubiens (Wiesbaden, 1974), 151-152 point to a gradual southwards
In isolation, the Armant stele text is not so helpful in locating Miw. However, Davies correctly identified the boundary stele mentioned in the text as the rock-stele at Kurgus, and thus this area is probably to be identified with Miw.\(^{1735}\) This evidence, coupled with the discovery of another local text that specifically mentions Miw at ‘the boundary of the south’, leaves little doubt that Kurgus was in or near Miw.\(^{1736}\) The instance of an endowment of fields at Miw in the biography of Penniut is probably a different placename identical with the aforementioned \(\text{\textcurrency} \)\(\text{\textcurrency} \text{\textcurrency} \text{\textcurrency} \).\(^{1737}\) There is thus plentiful evidence for Miw being a region in the vicinity of Abu-Hamed and Kurgus.

II. VIII \(\text{Irm}\)

The location of this toponym remains a thorny issue for the historical geography of Nubia. It has generally been equated with the further reaches of the Middle Nile in Butana reach, but locations both east and west of the Middle Nile have also been proposed.\(^{1738}\) Priese’s thesis of equating Yam (\(\text{\textcurrency} \text{\textcurrency} \)) with Irem (\(\text{\textcurrency} \)) should be treated speculatively, for geographic and chronological reasons, despite a phonetic resemblance.\(^{1739}\) Speculatively, Irem could be in the Atbai area, but it could equally be somewhere on the Upper Nile south from the frontier at Kurgus.\(^{1740}\) The Irem campaign of Seti I mentions the plundering (\(\text{\textcurrency} \text{\textcurrency} \)) of five different wells,\(^{1741}\) and so access to the region presumably required traversing a desert-route. But, there are many possibilities for desert routes in Nubia that avoided the Nile altogether, such as roads going west towards Darfur and Kordofan, the Meheila road to Napata, the Wadi Abu Dom crossing the Bayuda Desert, or even the retreat of the rhino and other large mammals from Lower Nubia and Egypt in the third millennium BCE, given the earlier depictions of this animal in Upper Egyptian rock art.


\(^{1736}\) Davies, Sudan & Nubia 5, 52.

\(^{1737}\) For the biography, see \(\text{KRI VI, 350.16}\) and E. Frood, Biographical Texts from Ramessid Egypt (Leiden, 2007), 215. The mention of an Upper Nubian Miw in this inscription is perplexing as Egyptian domination of Nubia was waning even by the reign of Ramesses III; see for instance L. Török, The Kingdom of Kush: Handbook of the Napatan-Meroitic Civilization (Leiden, 1998), 101-104; Zibelius-Chen, ‘Das nachkoloniale Nubien’, in Gundlach, Kropp & Leibundgut (ed.), Der Sudan in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, 203. This, and the fact that the rest of the text concerns Lower Nubia, leads one to Frood’s suggestion (253 n. 22) that this may be a Lower Nubian placename, even though the orthography \(\text{\textcurrency} \text{\textcurrency} \) is identical to other writings of Miw.


\(^{1739}\) Priese, Allorient Forschungen 1, 38; A. Spalinger, ‘Some Notes on the Libyans of the Old Kingdom and Later Historical Reflexes’, JSSEA 9 (1979), 144-45. For arguments against this interpretation see Darnell, GM 94, 17-19 and Cooper, JARCE 48, 7, 20.

\(^{1740}\) Due to the co-occurrence of Irem in documents which mention gold, Zibelius-Chen prefers locating Irem in the Atbai; see Zibelius-Chen, ‘Die Kubanstele Ramses’ II. und die nubischen Goldregionen’, in C. Berger et al. (eds), Hommages à Jean Leclant, II, 414-415.

\(^{1741}\) \(\text{KRI I, 103.10-15}\).
the Korosko road leading south from Lower Nubia to Abu Hamed. Irem could very well have been located in the Atbai, but just as easily placed, following O’Connor, in Butana or Shendi reach.

II. IX \textit{Wnšk} and \textit{Ḥw\textsuperscript{c}.t-ṛḥ}

These placenames are found only in a single text that is generally dated to the reign of Amenhotep III, a stele known as ‘the Bubastite fragment’. The text was purported by Faulkner to relate to a Punt expedition, while Topozada preferred to locate the episode in the Upper Nile near Atbara and Khartoum. The fragmentary nature of the text makes it difficult to reconstruct the expedition, but it is certain that a maritime voyage of some nature is described, and that some actions took place against \textit{NHs.y} people around a well (\textit{ḥmn.t}) and a ridge (\textit{ḥs.t}) in a region called \textit{Ḥḥsḥ.t-imn.t}. It is important to note that the placename \textit{Ḥw\textsuperscript{c}.t-ḥr} also occurs in the Topographical Lists, as does \textit{Ḥḥsḥ.t}, which led Faulkner to locate them near Punt. But the writing of the placename \textit{Ḥḥsḥ.t} is just regular \textit{ḥḥs.t} ‘hill-country’ (not \textit{Ḥḥsḥ.t}) with a postpositional phonetic complement, and thus \textit{ḥḥs.t-imn.t} would logically be a western region towards Libya. Indeed, \textit{Ḥw\textsuperscript{c}.t} is not in the Puntite section of the Thutmosis List, but rather in the final section, which, based on other placenames, could even be Libyan (\textit{Tḥn.w}). In a small list from Ramesses III’s Libyan wars at Medinet Habu, though, \textit{Pwnt} occurs alongside \textit{Ḥw\textsuperscript{c}.t}. It is difficult to know whether this indicates that \textit{Ḥw\textsuperscript{c}.t} is in Libya or Punt.

\begin{footnotes}
1742 These possibilities are outlined in O’Connor, \textit{JEA} 73, 112, with the exception of the Korosko road.
1746 It was read ‘Khaskhet’ in \textit{GDG} 4, 156; Schiaparelli, \textit{La Geografia dell’Africa orientale}, 257; Breasted, \textit{ARE} II, § 849.
1747 In Faulkner, ‘A possible royal visit to Punt’, in \textit{Studi in memoria di Ippolito Rosellini nel primo centario della morte}, 88 it is remarked that \textit{ḥḥs.t-imn.t} could indicate the west coast of the Red Sea, from the perspective of a sailor who was going south towards Punt. This rather ignores the Egypto-centric manner in which cardinals were configured. A navigator by this logic could easily call Sinai \textit{ḥḥs.t-ṛs.yṛ} if he were in Canaan, or label Lebanon \textit{ḥḥs.t-imn.t} if he were in Kadesh, but such logic is only rarely encountered. For a rare situation where cardinals were used relative to the campaign, see for example, the biography of Amenemheb and the ridge ‘on the west of Aleppo’ (\textit{ḥḥs.t-imn.t ḫṛp}): \textit{Urk. IV}, 891.3.
1748 \textit{Urk. IV}, 800, no. 88. See also Säve-Söderbergh, \textit{Ägypten und Nubien}, 161-162.
\end{footnotes}
While it requires further research, it is plausible then that the Bubastite fragment records a campaign to the ‘west’ (*imn.t*) in the Marmarica and Gebel Akhdar,\(^{1750}\) thus putting *Hwšt* on the Mediterranean littoral of Libya. Morris also makes a pragmatic objection to a Puntite expedition in the Bubastis text, as it is unlikely a king would have ventured months away from Egypt on a dangerous Red Sea maritime voyage.\(^{1751}\) Topozada’s speculation that *Hwšt-Hr* is further south than the Fifth Cataract falters on a complete lack of any evidence of campaigning this far south.\(^{1752}\) Against the Libyan hypothesis is the lack of any texts that speak of Nehesy in western contexts. The name *Wnšk* has no Egyptian explanation and thus is from an African language.\(^{1753}\)

### II. X Other Shasu placenames in Edom

While the *Tš-Šš.s.w* toponyms of *šTr* [66] and *Yhwšt* [53] have been treated in full, as they convey likely Edomite localities near the Gulf of Aqaba, Shasu names like *Rbn*, *Smt*, *Pyspys*, and *Wrbr* (all found in the Topographical Lists at Soleb and Amara) could also possibly be located in and around the Gulf of Aqaba and Edom.\(^{1754}\) However, they may well be located further north in the Wadi Arabah, Transjordan, or Palestine, there being no supporting locational evidence.

---

\(^{1750}\) Bardinet, *Relations économiques et pressions militaires en Méditerranée orientale et en Libye au temps des pharaons*, 36, 98, 132 has collected a number of references to the procurement of hardwoods and oils from *Thn.w* or *ḫš.t-imn.t*, identifying these places with the Gebel Akhdar (classical Cyrenica). See also the comments in P. Kuhlmann, ‘The realm of “two deserts”: Siwah Oasis between east and west’, in F. Förster & H. Riemer (eds), *Desert Road Archaeology* (Köln, 2013), 149.


\(^{1753}\) Purely as a preliminary observation on *Wnšk*, one might note that *Wa-n* is a common introductory prefix in Berber (Tuareg) toponyms ‘that of’, while *ašek* or *išk* can refer to ‘tree’ or ‘peak’ see M. Aghali-Zakara, ‘Anthroponymes et Toponymes Touaregs’, *Littérature orale arabo-berbere* 27 (1999), 216, 229.

\(^{1754}\) For these lists, see Edel, *Biblische Notizen* 11, 63-79. Lipinski, *On the Skirts of Canaan*, 362 compared *Rbn* to the tribe of Reuben. Given the transhumant nature of Israelite tribes it is not particularly of assistance in localising the placename.
8.1 Mapping the Desert and the Sea: Problems of historical geography

Knowledge of named places is highly localized, no single individual knowing more than a fraction of the named places in the lexicon of the geographically extended language group.\(^{1755}\)

This toponymic survey has made every attempt to document all placenames in Egypt’s eastern peripheries in the Eastern Desert, Sinai and Red Sea. The textual record is an imperfect representation of the total toponymic repertoire. If we take the toponymy of the Wadi Hammamat or Sinai mineral zones as examples of how complex local desert toponymies could be, then it is clear that numerous placenames are missing from this corpus. Particularly troubling is the apparent lack of any toponym for the northern parts of the Eastern Desert around Gebel el-Urf and Wadi Dara, or the lack of any name for the region east of Edfu, Kom Ombo, and Aswan beyond Dhâlī [50]. Generally speaking, the toponymic record becomes more incomplete the greater the distance from Egypt. Thus, there are no certain names for the Arabian coast or large swathes of the Eastern Desert and Atbai like Wadi Gemal or the Halaib Triangle.

Studies have attempted to predict the density of placenames in regional areas with some success, positing a direct relationship between population density of a region, subsistence patterns, and toponymic density.\(^{1756}\) Taking Hobb’s figure of one person every 90 km\(^2\) for the northern part of the Eastern Desert (Ma’aza territory), one can make a rough estimate of the population in areas reliant on pastoral nomadic subsistence.\(^{1757}\) In addition to missing Egyptian names, there must have been a great many foreign names for desert places and regions which never entered Egyptian texts. Another method to predict toponymic density might be use regions for which there is good local toponymic data, such as the Wadi Hammamat, although with this case, there is an appreciably high density of names due to the fact that the Wadi Hammamat was a goldmine, a stone quarry, and a thoroughfare, and as such was a somewhat exceptional region. A better measure for the potential number of placenames might be the number of goldmines (Fig. 5) and goldmines (Fig. 6) in the desert. If, like the Sinai or Wadi Hammamat, each of these mines had a


\(^{1756}\) Hunn’s study found that population density and toponymic density are roughly proportional, so a wide-ranging nomadic group will have a similar number of toponyms spread over a wide-area as an urban population in a small area.

\(^{1757}\) Hobbs, Bedouin Life in the Egyptian Wilderness, 2. There is very little historical data from which to estimate the population of the Eastern Desert. Merymose’s campaign to Ibhat [12.6] in the Wadi Allaqi area captured 1,052 people. On this data alone one might come to a rather high figure for the Eastern Desert as a whole (perhaps >5,000-10,000).
specific placename, there would be at least more than one hundred ‘unrecorded’ Egyptian mine-

A short rejoinder to this problem may be that, without the assistance of foreign intermediaries, Egyptians may not have known the names for many desert localities. In many Eastern Desert rock inscriptions, wells or mountains are not named, but demonstratively qualified as ‘this well’ (ḥmn.t tn) or ‘this mountain’ (dw pn). Furthermore, repetitive features in the desert may have had no specific name, as in the Turin Map, where several locations are labelled generically as ‘mountains of gold’ [T4, T5, T12, T16]. It is to be expected in a vast desert region that such ad hoc labelling may have been the norm.

Egyptian language toponyms in foreign areas are almost always related to spectacular features or resources, as with the ‘Myrrh Terraces’ [85]. Local features that held no economic interest would have been largely unknown to Egyptians, but presumably known to indigenous inhabitants. Similarly, the names of individual wadis, the most ubiquitous feature of this region, are largely unknown except where they contain mineral wealth (R3-hnw [26] or R3-šš. wt [59]). The well-sites of Idštḥ [14] and Ištḥb [10] in the Henu biography illustrate one of the few cases where local non-Egyptian placenames with no geological importance are enumerated in non-Toponomastic texts. Presumably, these placenames were communicated by local informants or intermediaries (smntyw, ifš.w) on this expedition. Thus, foreign regions were usually referred to obliquely using broad choronyms, unless specific expeditions allowed for more finite knowledge. There is no name for any of the numerous gold mines in the Eastern Desert, except for Dw-Gbtw [35A], which stands in contrast to the Sinai where the names of turquoise mines were inscribed as part of local expedition reports and biographical texts. This must be attributable to social patterns of exploitation. The presence of Egyptians at Serabit is well documented, but mining in some Eastern Desert sites was probably short term, and in the Atbā you may have been a negotiated process between Egyptians and foreigners. There is that common principle in ancient toponymy that names were only noted due to their relative importance to the textual purpose. In this areal study, placenames are almost entirely related to their being the destination of expeditions (mšʾ) or more rarely topos in literary and hymnic literature. Thus, one might conclude that unless a placename is either the location of resources, or less likely, en-route to such a location, it was unlikely to be recorded at all (even if known in spoken language), except in the Toponomastica.

1758 See for instance Rothe, Miller & Rapp, Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt, 312, 352, 368.
1759 The stele of Sa-Hathor even suggests that local Nubians were forced to wash gold, see n. 1015.
8.1.1 The Eastern Desert and Atbai

Almost all the Egyptian names in the Eastern Desert correspond to regional names, mines, quarries, or in a few cases, wells [12A, 27, 37, 38] and small seasonal settlements involved in trade or mining [18, 35B, 40]. While the Turin Map is an important source for the topography of the Wadi Hammamat, it produces relatively little in the way of new placename data, but rather uses generic terms to label key sites in the region. Some placenames in the Hammamat region, Tdiht [14], Tihb [10], and perhaps ///kh [T15], are unique in that they indicate a foreign non-Egyptian occupation of the desert as far north as Coptos. This is generally further north than scholarly estimates of the supposed Medjay homeland in the Eastern Desert of Nubia. These names designate expanses of desert where wells were located, and as such, may not have had as much locational significance to the Egyptians compared to local populations, thereby explaining the preservation of local names (autonyms). Strangely, there are very few texts that indicate foreign occupation of the Wadi Hammamat. The Middle Kingdom inscription Hammamat no. 191 mentions a local well that is hidden (sšt) from the Tw.tyw-nomads, which must be the Egyptian term for the autochthonous inhabitants of the wadi. Thus far, no local material culture has been encountered in the Wadi Hammamat area that would point to a non-Egyptian population.

In the Eastern Desert of Nubia, the Atbai, there is plentiful evidence of foreign occupation. Correspondingly, all placenames in this region are in foreign languages. Mdɔ [24], Ikyt [13], 3wš [9], Wbšt-spt [17], and Tbh [12] referred to regions around Wadi Allaqi east of the Second and Third Cataracts. The names recorded under Mdɔ in the Topographical Lists [114-119] may also refer to unknown occupation sites in this region. Further north in the Eastern Desert, in the region adjoining the Gulf of Suez, few placenames are recorded with certainty [16, 19, 31, 42, 44]. Almost all of these are found in the early Middle Kingdom stele of Khety, and in most cases their precise location is uncertain.

8.1.2 The South Sinai and Gulf of Aqaba

In the Sinai, most toponyms can be placed in the mineral regions of Wadi Maghara and Serabit el-Khadem, except Thwiw [51], which may be further southeast near Saint Catherines Monastery. From an early date, the Egyptians established hegemony of the South Sinai, surely for the purposes of mineral exploitation. As such most placenames in this area are a reflection of this economic activity. There are some more proverbial placenames such as the mine names [56, 67] and ‘The-flower-land’ [60], a more or less ‘photographic’ reaction by Egyptians to the physical geography of Sinai. While the historical geography of the region is difficult to reconstruct, the further Sinai, towards Edom, is dominated by Semitic placenames [51, 52, 54, 66, 69].

\[^{1760}\text{Couyet & Montet, Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouadi Hammâmât, 97-98.}\]
Egyptian archaeological presence beyond the South Sinai is only prevalent at Timna, it should be no surprise that the majority of the placenames in this region are foreign. Many of these names have good cognates in biblical traditions and some are connected with the theophany of Yahweh and the Exodus tradition (Tab. 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hieroglyphic Placename</th>
<th>Biblical Hebrew Cognate</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*nht [69]</td>
<td>יֵין קָנָה har Sinay</td>
<td>Mount Sinai (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tl-šš.w-Yhwš [53]</td>
<td>יֵין קָנָה har Yahweh (?)</td>
<td>The-Shasu-Land of Yahweh – Mount Yahweh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dw-n(y)-Sr [66]</td>
<td>יֵין קָנָה har Se'ir</td>
<td>Mountain of Seir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hrb [63]</td>
<td>יֵין קָנָה Horeb</td>
<td>Horeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pš-Dw-n(y)-Hlr [71]</td>
<td>יֵין קָנָה har ha 'Elohim</td>
<td>Mountain of El</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Idm [52]</td>
<td>יֵין קָנָה 'Edom</td>
<td>Edom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dw-n(y)-Hmrk (?) [72]</td>
<td>יֵין קָנָה har ha 'Amaleki (?)</td>
<td>Mountain of the Amalekites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*šk [54]</td>
<td>יֵין קָנָה 'Atak</td>
<td>'Atak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Biblical toponyms and their Egyptian counterparts in this corpus.

Individually, each of these placenames does not say much about the relationship between Egypt and Semites in the region, but together they point to a shared contact between Shasu and Egyptians in the Sinai and Edom. The date of this repertoire of Semitic toponymy, mostly Ramesside (except *nht), corresponds to Muchiki’s estimated date for the arrival of Egyptian loanwords in Biblical Hebrew.\(^{1761}\) The fact that the generic elements in two of these placenames were translated, Egyptian *dw* from Semitic *hr* ‘mountain’, points to an intimacy with foreign placenames that is generally uncommon in the corpus. These toponyms arrived in Egyptian records as loanwords from local Semitic speakers, and at no point did Egyptians develop their own territorial lexicon for the further Sinai and Edom. Furthermore, the fact that three of these placenames occur in symbolic contexts, a fictional tale \(^{71}\) and a magical letter \(^{63, 72}\), points already to some cultic importance associated with these places, a tradition that would be later echoed by biblical literature.

Given the proximity of the Sinai and Edom to Egypt, the presence of Canaanites in Egypt, and Egyptians in Timna, it is perhaps not surprising that many of the placenames connected with the Exodus tradition are found in Egyptian texts. The earliest phases of the Hathor temple are datable to Seti I,\(^{1762}\) but some scholars have suggested that Egyptian interest at the site might date as early as Amenhotep III.\(^{1763}\) Earlier, non-circumstantial evidence for Egyptian activity in the Wadi Arabah or Transjordan is wanting.\(^{1764}\) Importantly, the presence of these placenames in Egyptian documents confirms the antiquity of the biblical toponymy of the broader Edomite region, and

---

\(^{1761}\) Muchiki, *Egyptian Proper Names and Loanwords in North-West Semitic*, 324-325.

\(^{1762}\) See Higginbotham, *Egyptianization and Elite Emulation in Ramesside Palestine*, 119.


\(^{1764}\) For example, Redford states ‘The Eastern Sinai, the Jordan Valley and Transjordan seem not be within Egyptian’s sphere of activity’, see Redford, *JARCE* 23, 143.
their early connection with the cults of Yahweh and perhaps 'El. The placenames do not specifically communicate the pre-eminence of Yahweh in Canaanite religion, but it is tantalisingly possible that $P\text{-}Dw-n(y)-Il$ as a mining site refers to a mountain-cult connected with a copper mine in Sinai or Edom. In some respects, the placenames give credence to the orthodoxy of the Midianite-Kenite hypothesis that the Yahwistic cult and/or his theophany, in at least one tradition, was connected with the southern centres in the Sinai, Edom, and Midian. Whether this is due to Yahweh’s theophany (following Shupak), or a local cult and/or origin of these deities, is outside the confines of this work. It may be worth simply emphasising that, while 'El is known from a variety of onomastic contexts in Egyptian documents relating to Syria-Palestine, Yahweh is only encountered in one toponym that is almost certainly in the Sinai-Edom region, and more debatably a personal name.

8.1.3 The further Red Sea and the Southern Atbai

Our comprehension of the historical geography in this region is poor. There are a number of placenames that with some confidence can be placed in coastal Sudan and Eritrea: $Bi\beta\text{-}Pwnt$, $Pwnt$, $Wmt$, and $Wkm.t$ [80, 81, 82, 84]. The Isles-of-the-Wentiu [81A] might represent an island group near Tokar or the Dahlak group and ‘mw [78] designated the gold-bearing region east of the Fifth Cataract and Abu Hamed. Precisely locating the corresponding names for these regions in the Topographical Lists [86-113] is for the moment impossible. If the list represents a series of itineraries, then the Puntite and Wetenet names may represent stopping points and settlements along the African coast on a maritime voyage to Punt. The Medja placenames [114-119] may represent places approached on gold-mining expeditions in the Wadi Allaqi region, or sites along the Korosko Road, but these ideas must remain hypotheses.

The question of contacts with Arabia has not been solved, and there is little toponymic data that is conclusive in this respect. In North Arabia, $Sr$ [66] might have designated the region of Edom, but no toponyms can be confidently ascribed to regions of the Hejaz or Midian. It is hypothesised here that the gold-bearing region of $hw$ [75] may designate the Hejazi and Midianite coast, but the data is inconclusive. The ethneme $Gntw$ may refer to the coastal inhabitants of the Tihama, but could just as easily be a group in Africa. Punt may designate the southern Tihama in addition to the African coast, but this argument is based only on a handful of Arabian sherds at Mersa Gawasis. That these ‘two-Punt’s’ could be explained by the dual placenames $Pwnt/Bi\beta\text{-}Pwnt$ or

1765 For the synthesis of Yahweh and El, see M. Smith, *The Early History of God* (New York, 1990), 8-9, 22 who opines that 'El and Yahweh converged at some point in the Period of Judges c. 1100 BCE.
1767 There is also another debatable instance of Yahweh in a personal name $Yw$ from the New Kingdom, see n. 989. For 'El in Egyptian documents (chiefly onomastica), see Hoch, *Semitic Words*, 27-28.
Egyptian terminology for oceans, and the Red Sea, was as a rule not specific. Generic terms denoting large bodies of water, \textit{w3d-wr}, \textit{nnw}, and Semitic \textit{ym} could be freely used for the Red Sea, the Mediterranean and even mythical oceans. Only on two occasions is specific terminology used of the Red Sea, neither of which predate the New Kingdom: \textit{W3d-wr-3ib.ty} ‘Eastern Sea’ \cite{79} and \textit{P3-ym-\textsuperscript{53}-n(\textsuperscript{\textit{y}})-mw-kd} ‘The great sea of water which goes around’ \cite{77}. A text from Sinai, no. 215, mentions crossing the \textit{nnw}-sea in order to reach Sinai, meaning the Gulf of Suez, but this can hardly be a specific name given the meaning of \textit{nnw} as ‘primeval waters’. The term \textit{w3d-wr} in several texts can be identified with the Red Sea,\textsuperscript{1768} as can the later synonym \textit{p3 ym}.\textsuperscript{1769} Later traditions have other specific names for the Red Sea. Coptic lexicographers derived the term \textit{ϫοϩάρι} from a Demotic phrase \textit{P3-ym-n(\textsuperscript{\textit{y}})-h3ry} ‘the Sea of Storm(s)’.\textsuperscript{1770} In the story of Setne, the Cycle of Inaros, and the ‘Sesostris story’, the Red Sea was also labelled in a relative sense as the \textit{P3-ym-n(\textsuperscript{\textit{y}})-Kht} ‘the Sea of Coptos’.\textsuperscript{1771} In this data set, however, only \textit{W3d-wr-3ib.ty} and \textit{P3-ym-\textsuperscript{53}-n(\textsuperscript{\textit{y}})-mw-kd} specifically refer to the Red Sea. Even though both these terms date roughly to the same period, it may be presumed that \textit{W3d-wr-3ib.ty} was the earlier name for the Red Sea, given that the funerary corpus of the Book of the Day probably predates the New Kingdom, and the presence of the Semitic loan \textit{ym} is only attested from the Eighteenth Dynasty.

### 8.2 Hierarchies and Allonyms

As many of the names in this thesis refer to large areas, there is a particular overlap in the referent geography of many placenames. Such groupings are called ‘allonyms’, places for which there is more than one name. For instance, the region of Wadi Allaqi could be labelled \textit{MdB} \cite{24}, \textit{Ibh3\textsuperscript{t}} \cite{12}, and then \textit{Ikyt} \cite{13} in the New Kingdom. The region east of Coptos could be called \textit{His.t-}

\textsuperscript{1768} Egyptians at Mersa Gawasis called the Red Sea \textit{W3d-wr}, see E. Mahfouz ‘Osiris de Ouadj-Our: une novelle attestation provenant du ouadi Gaouasis au bord de la mer Rouge’, \textit{BSFE} 180 (2011), 10. In Sinai no. 211 \textit{w3d-wr} is used to refer to the Gulf of Suez, see \textit{Urk.} IV, 1893. 8.

\textsuperscript{1769} For \textit{p3-ym} as the Red Sea, see the Turin Geological Papyri \cite{T1}. For another Red Sea context see the letter of Ramessesnakht, Helck, \textit{JARCE} 6, 148, line 47.

\textsuperscript{1770} Westendorf, \textit{Koptisches Handwörterbuch}, 49. For debate on this issue, see R. Towers, ‘The Red Sea’ \textit{JNES} 18 (1959), 152, K. Ryholt, \textit{The Petese Stories II} (Copenhagen, 2005), 34.

\textsuperscript{1771} Erichsen, \textit{Demotische Glossar}, 578. For the documents, see S. Pasquali ‘Le Πιμμειῶμις de Coptos et «la route de la mer (Rouge)>>’, \textit{BIFAO} 109 (2009), 390.
The Sinai confusingly could be called Bi.t.w [55] and Ht.yw-Mfk3.t [64].

Spatially subordinate to these choronyms were the respective local placenames, toponyms, oronyms, oikonyms, and so forth. Many of these differentiations come from semantic domains, so that they emphasise different aspects of the topography and were probably employed by different social groups. In the Wadi Hammamat region, for example, there are names referring to wells (H3b.t-Mrl.y-Rcw), quarries (Dw-bhn), gold-mines (T3-wH.yt-b3k-nbw), forts (P3-htm /// /// /// c.w.s), foreign-placenames (Ihtb), supra-regional terms (H3s.t-Gbtw), and the wadi itself (R3-hnw). Each of these names occurs in documents in different periods, and thus it is likely that each name was used by distinct social groups, some remaining in use, others becoming moribund (Tab. 9). In the Wadi Hammamat, this neatly explains why many of the earlier placenames of the wadi area are not known on the Turin Map, as these placenames may have been unknown to the Ramesside Theban authors of the map, whose main purpose was the quarrying stone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placename</th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>MK</th>
<th>NK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[11] T3h.t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[27] H3b.t-Mrl.y-Rcw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26] R3-hnw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[47] Dw-n(y)-bhn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14] T3ht/Ihtb</td>
<td>&gt; Tyhtb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18] T3-wH.yt-b3k-nbw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[36] P3-htm /// /// /// c.w.s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[46] Dw-w3b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35] Dw/H3s.t-Gbtw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Placenames in the environs of Wadi Hammamat.

Placenames in the Sinai region (Tab. 10) show a similar instability. There are very few names that survive in texts from the Old Kingdom until the New Kingdom. Most names hail from Middle Kingdom records, particularly the biography of Khety. Again, the toponyms generally refer to different constituent features in the region, such as topographical features (Did3, Dw-n(y)-hz tyw), individual mines (Mn-k3w, Ht.t-n.t-Pr-sm3.w, Sw4d.t-msr-rrdi.t-n.tt-im-r3), mining regions (R3-33t.wt, Hrr.wt(y)t), and larger supra-regional entities (Ht.yw-Mfk3.t, Bi.t.w). The only stable term seems to be Mfk3.t, which may have been synonymous with Bi.t.w in the Middle Kingdom. Some of these chronological gaps in the toponymic data are probably due to the frequency of mining expeditions in a given period, but it is also likely that names simply changed with differing epochs of expeditionary activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OK</th>
<th>MK</th>
<th>NK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[64]</td>
<td>Ḥt₂yw-Mfk₁.t</td>
<td>&gt; Mfk₃.t</td>
<td>&gt; Ḥis₂t-mfk₃.t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[55]</td>
<td>Bi₁.w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[59]</td>
<td>R₂⁻ṣṣ₁.w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[73]</td>
<td>Dw⁻ⁿ(ṣ)y⁻ḥz.tyw</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Ḥz.tyw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[70]</td>
<td>Dḥd₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[60]</td>
<td>Ḥrr⁻wt(y)t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[58]</td>
<td>R₁⁻ḥtw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[61]</td>
<td>Ḥṭ₂⁻n⁻t⁻Pr⁻ṣmt₁.w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[57]</td>
<td>Mnkte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[67]</td>
<td>Sw⁻³d⁻t⁻ms⁻ʳ⁻rdl⁻t⁻n⁻t⁻im⁻ṣائل</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Placenames in the South Sinai mineral zone.

### 8.3 Routes in the desert and the Sea: Using placenames to reconstruct ancient routes

Using toponyms as recorders of geographic coordinates, it is possible to reconstruct routes that the Egyptians used in the desert and the Red Sea (Fig. 41, below). In actuality, these regions were probably crisscrossed with a complex maze of roads and pathways, but archaeological indicators of route features are inherently poor. Our awareness of precise routes is confined to paths marked with inscriptions. Other ‘implicit’ routes may pragmatically be reconstructed from a combination of archaeological remains, textual narratives, and known water sources along navigable wadis.\(^{1772}\)

Very few routes in the Eastern Desert are marked by pottery dumps, cairns (alam), or any other structures.\(^{1773}\) An exception is the route leading along the north side of Wadi Arabah to the Old Kingdom copper mines at Wadi Abu el-Maysa, where a series of Old Kingdom alam have been found.\(^{1774}\) Remains of paths are also visible on the route from the Nile to the Hatnub quarries.\(^{1775}\)

But, most of the routes are known only through rock inscriptions or their known end-points. Routes may be presumed for every goldmine and quarrying site, but it is difficult to know how

\(^{1772}\) The nature of such archaeological material is specifically treated in H. Riemer & F. Förster, ‘Ancient desert roads: towards establishing a new field of archaeological research’, in Förster & Riemer (eds), Desert Road Archaeology, 19-58.

\(^{1773}\) At least compared to the archaeological material of the Abu Ballas trail in the Libyan Desert, a road which is marked with pottery dumps and cairns, for which see chiefly Förster, BMSAES 7, 1-36 and S. Hendrickx, F. Förster & M. Eyckerman, ‘Pharaonic pottery of the Abu Ballas Trail: ‘Filling stations’ along a desert highway’, in Förster & Riemer (eds), Desert Road Archaeology, 339-379.


\(^{1775}\) On these short routes, see now I. Shaw, ‘“We went forth to the desert land…” : Retracing the routes between the Nile Valley and the Hatnub travertine quarries’, in Förster & Riemer (eds), Desert Road Archaeology, 521-532.
often these were trodden, or whether they were used by local indigenes rather than Egyptians. A case in point is the mines at Umm Balad and el-Urf, where there is no local archaeological material or inscriptions that would point to a precise route used to access these mines. From the mere presence of the mines, one might pragmatically assume a ‘path of least resistance’, here a route running east roughly from Middle Egypt, or a route heading north from Coptos via Wadi Qena. It would seem likely that such a route probably extended to the galena mines at Gebel Zeit, although this site was probably also accessible by sea. As maritime routes leave no trace, except where harbour sites have been discovered, it is impossible to infer their existence unless explicitly mentioned in texts. It is possible, for instance, that a variation of the maritime route to Timna (see B1 below) may also have led to the Arabian coast, or that another alternative route left Mersa Gawasis striking due east towards the Hejaz. From textual data, a land route to Punt must also be reconstructed,¹⁷⁷⁶ but as there is no data on its relative location and it must remain a desideratum of future research.

**A1 (NK):** A route leading from the Eastern Delta to the Sinai mines [⁵⁵, ⁶⁴], with another path bifurcating towards Timna [⁵⁴], and perhaps even to oases in Saudi Arabia. The route to the Sinai mineral zone is alluded to by the presence of officials from the North Sinai sites of ṫkw and ṭbr.w at Serabit el-Khadem.¹⁷⁷⁷ The route towards Timna is marked by cartouches of Ramesses III, and is also mentioned in the ṭk-expedition [⁵⁴] of pHarris I.¹⁷⁷⁸ Due to the presence of a similar cartouche in Tayma Oasis, Tallet and Somaglino posited an extension of this route towards this oasis.¹⁷⁷⁹

**A2 (OK-NK):** A path leading to Ayn Soukhna [¹⁶, ²¹], although there is no current data where it left the Nile, although the Memphite region seems likely.¹⁷⁸⁰

¹⁷⁷⁶  For this route, see toponym [⁸⁴].
¹⁷⁷⁷  For a troop commander of ṫkw, see R. Giveon, ‘A Long lost inscription of Thutmose IV’, Tel Aviv 5 (1978), 170-174. For a mayor of ṭbr.w at Serabit (Sinai no. 81), see Gardiner, Peet & Černý, *The Inscriptions of the Sinai*, II, 81.
¹⁷⁷⁸  This route seems roughly equivalent to the Darb el-Hagg, for which see Hoffmeier, *Ancient Israel in Sinai*, 131, 137-138.
¹⁷⁸⁰  For ancient remains in this area, see n. 1162.
Figure 41: Routes in the Eastern Desert, Sinai, and Red Sea as reconstructed from the toponyms
A3 (OK-MK): A path leading to the copper mines on the north side of Wadi Arabah. Sections of the route are marked with cairns (alam).\textsuperscript{1781} Another route, on the south side of the wadi, led to the Fourth Dynasty harbour at Wadi el-Jarf.\textsuperscript{1782} The western part of this route was used in the New Kingdom to access the calcite quarry at Wadi Sannur [49].

A4 (OK-MK): The terminus of this route is the copper/gold mines at Wadi Dara and Gebel el-Urf, perhaps to be equated with the choronym Şem.t [42], with a possible extension to the galena mines at Gebel el-Zeit [44]. It is not known whether Wadi Qena, or a route leading east from the area of Minya (or both) were used to access these sites.\textsuperscript{1783}

A5 (OK-MK): A route that tended northeast from Coptos [35] towards Gidami, then east towards the Middle Kingdom water-station at Wadi Gasus, and finally the harbor at Mersa Gawasis [40].\textsuperscript{1784} It is marked by inscriptions at Gidami.\textsuperscript{1785} This seems to have been the outbound route taken by Henu to reach the Red Sea, through Id₂ḥt [14] and Ỉḥḥt [10]. This route could have also been used to access sources of copper (Wadi Semna), gold, and galena (Umm Huweitat) en-route to Mersa Gawasis.

A6 (OK-NK): This route left Coptos for the Bekhen Quarries at Wadi Hammamat [26, 47] and is marked by inscriptions on the stretch of road between Qasr el-Banat and Wadi Hammamat.\textsuperscript{1786} A continuation of this route left the Wadi Hammamat northwards towards Mersa Gawasis [40], as is explicitly mentioned in Henu’s biography. Local inscriptions indicate many branches of this route, accessing various wadis and gold mines north and south of Wadi Hammamat. A parallel route probably led along Wadi Qash, where there is an inscription of Narmer and other pharaonic graffiti.\textsuperscript{1787}

\textsuperscript{1781} Tristant, \textit{BSFE} 182 (2012), 41-45.

\textsuperscript{1782} Dr Yann Tristant (Personal Communication).

\textsuperscript{1783} Aufrère notes the complex maze of routes leading east of the Oryx Nome, none of which have yet yielded pharaonic material; see ‘The deserts and the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Upper Egyptian nomes during the Middle Kingdom’, in Friedmann (ed.), \textit{Egypt and Nubia: Gifts of the Desert}, 210-211. The mention of Gbtw ‘Coptos’ at Gebel Zeit suggests a route leading north through Wadi Qena, as suggested by Mathieu, \textit{BIFAO} 98, 241.

\textsuperscript{1784} For the Middle Kingdom well-station at Wadi Gasus, see A. Manzo, ‘Mersa/Wadi Gawasis in its Regional Setting’, \textit{Scienze dell’antichità} 17 (2011), 221. Details of the exact path and wadis used are modelled in Bard, Fattovich & Manzo, ‘The Ancient Harbour at Mersa/Wadi Gawasis and how to get there: New evidence of Pharaonic seafaring expeditions in the Red Sea’, in Förster & Riemer (eds), \textit{Desert Road Archaeology}, 550-553.

\textsuperscript{1785} Green, \textit{PSBA} 31, 319-23.

\textsuperscript{1786} Redford & Redford, \textit{JARCE} 26, 3-49; Couyat & Montet, \textit{Les inscriptiones hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouadi Hammâmât}, 115-117. For the inscriptions at el-Muwayh, see Bülow-Jacobsen et al., \textit{BIFAO} 98, 107-109.

\textsuperscript{1787} Rothe, Miller & Rapp, \textit{Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt}, 91-93.
A7 (OK-NK): A route leading east of El-Kab, probably accessing Bir Manih and nearby goldmines further east and south. It is plausible that a route also departed from the Thebes to this region.\textsuperscript{1789}

A8 (OK-NK): A route leading east of Edfu via Seti’s well-temple at Kanais [37], leading to the gold mines of Wadi Barramiya and other nearby goldfields [50]. The route is marked by rock inscriptions along its length.\textsuperscript{1790} Goldmines and inscriptions extend as far as the Red Sea shore along this route, so it is likely that Egyptians accessed the coast by travelling east of Edfu.\textsuperscript{1791}

A9 (OK-NK): A route tending northeast of Kom Ombo towards gold mines east of this region. The route is marked with plentiful rock inscriptions.\textsuperscript{1792} A New Kingdom Amazonite quarry at Gebel Mig’if may also have been accessible by this route.\textsuperscript{1793} Inscriptions along Wadi Bezah and Wadi Dunqash suggest that this route joined with A8.\textsuperscript{1794}

A10 (MK-NK): A short route leading south from Aswan towards the amethyst mines at Wadi el-Hudi [33]. It is unknown if a route extended east from here, but there are pharaonic inscriptions c. 200 km further east at Abrak, which might indicate paths continuing towards the Red Sea from the Aswan region.\textsuperscript{1795}

A11 (OK-NK): The route to Wadi Allaqi [12, 13] is marked by many inscriptions at Umm Ashira [38], and is mentioned explicitly in the Kuban Stele.\textsuperscript{1796} This route had many side branches, perhaps one leading southeast towards the goldfields of Onib and also due south to Bir Ungat, where there are Old and Middle Kingdom inscriptions.\textsuperscript{1797} Whether this track continued to the Red Sea coast must remain moot until fieldwork in the Halaib area is conducted.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{1788} For inscriptions in this area, see Rothe, Miller & Rapp, \textit{Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt}, 17-31, 44-90 and Colin, \textit{BIFAO} 98, 89-125.
\textsuperscript{1789} Theban locals appear in local inscriptions at Bir Manih; see Colin, \textit{BIFAO} 98, 103-104, 106. It would also be possible to access the calcite quarries at Dababiya through this route, for which see Hikade, \textit{Das Expeditionswesen im ägyptischen Neuen Reich}, 47, 215.
\textsuperscript{1791} The easternmost Pharaonic inscriptions along this route is only 16 km from the shore, see Rothe, et al., \textit{Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt}, 391-395. Note also a representation of a New Kingdom boat along this path, see G. Fuchs, ‘Rock engravings in the Wadi el-Barramiya, Eastern Desert of Egypt’, \textit{African Archaeological Review} 7 (1989), 127-153.
\textsuperscript{1792} Rothe, Miller & Rapp, \textit{Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt}, 246-370.
\textsuperscript{1794} A Kom Ombo official Mfy is found in Wadi Shalul, Wadi Shait and Wadi Alam at the end of the Edfu route on the Red Sea; see Rothe, Miller & Rapp, \textit{Pharaonic Inscriptions from the Southeastern Desert of Egypt}, 228, 377, 381, 392, 394.
\textsuperscript{1795} de Bruyn, \textit{JEA} 44, 97-98.
\textsuperscript{1796} For the inscriptions see Piotrovsky, ВАДИ АЛЯАКИ, passim; Černý, \textit{JEA} 33, 52-57. The Kuban stele specifically mentions a ‘difficult road’ (\textit{w1.wt ksm.wt}) to the goldmines; \textit{KRI} II, 355.9.
\textsuperscript{1797} For the inscriptions at Bir Ungat, see Roccati, \textit{BSFE} 169-170, 51-58 and Damiano-Appia, ‘Inscriptions along the Tracks from Kubban, Buhen and Kumma to “Berenice Panchrysos” and to the South’, in
A12 (MK-NK): The so-called ‘Korosko Road’ is a somewhat hypothetical Middle and New Kingdom route leaving the Nile from the Korosko area south for Khashm el-Bab, Bir Murra, and Nabari and thence the Nile at Abu Hamed. A certain New Kingdom scribe Nebnetjeru is recorded in Wadi Allaqi, Khashm el-Bab, and Umm Nabari, suggesting that he at least trekked a good portion of this road. While there are inscriptions marking this route as far south as Bir Murra, there is some debate as to whether this route could access the Nile, as no data for Egyptian presence south of Murra has been discovered. This route may have also given access to the gold mines at Abu Siha and Umm Fit Fit.

A13 (MK-NK): This is a route leaving the Second Cataract for Khashm el-Bab, where there are pharaonic inscriptions. According to the Castiglionis, the route linked up with Bir Ungat.

A14 (NK): This is a route, similar to A12, which departs the Second Cataract for the goldfields at Umm Nabari. Such a route certainly existed, as Herunefer, a Buhen noble, left three inscriptions along its course en-route to Bir Murra via the mines at Nabari (possibly [13, 17, 24]. Sites along the route are also marked by various Middle Nubian and Egyptian ceramics.

A15 (MK): Due to the discovery of a fort east of Kerma, it is likely that there was a desert route leading east of here. The exact destination of such a route remains unknown. It may have cut across the desert to Abu Hamed, avoiding the bend in the Nile, or could have aimed for goldmines at Abu Siha.

A16 (NK): There is no local evidence for this route, but its existence is assured due to the locations of goldmines at Gebel Nigeim, Aliakateb, and Ganaite [78]. The route might have led east from Kurgus, where rock inscriptions mark the extent of Egyptian control during the New

---


1798 Davies, Sudan & Nubia 18, 34, 36-37; Piotrovsky, ВАДИ АЛЛАКИ, 46, 67, no. 2 and 7.

1799 See Davies, Sudan & Nubia 18, 30-44.

1800 Klemm & Klemm, Gold and Goldmining in Ancient Egypt and Nubia, 544, 549.

1801 For the Khashm el-Bab, see Castiglioni & Castiglioni, BSFE 169-170, 27-29, 38 and Davies, Sudan & Nubia 18, 36-37.

1802 Castiglioni, Castiglione, Bonnet ‘Goldmines of the Kingdom of Kerma’, in Godlewski & Latjar (eds), Between the Cataracts, 269.

1803 Davies, Sudan & Nubia 18, 37-40.


1805 Bonnet & Reinold, Genève, nouvelle série 41, 31-32.

1806 For proposals of this route, see Castiglioni & Castiglioni, ‘À la recherche de la terre d’Amou’, in Anderson & Welsby (eds), The Fourth Cataract and Beyond: Proceedings of the 12th International Conference for Nubian Studies (2014), 524-530. In an earlier article they suggest the route leaving the Kerma classique fort ultimately led to Kurgus, avoiding Dongola reach; see Castiglioni, Castiglione & Bonnet ‘Goldmines of the Kingdom of Kerma’, in Godlewski & Latjar (eds), Between the Cataracts, 268.
Kingdom, but could plausibly have exited the Nile anywhere south of here. At Khor Ariab and Bir Ajam, remains of Middle Nubian cultures have been found. Given the proximity of the second millennium BCE remains at Erkowit, it is plausible that such a route continued eastwards towards the Red Sea.

**A17 (OK-NK):** This is a small road to Hatnub [28], leaving from the Amarna region. Portions of the road are still extant to the present day in the form of a small raised causeway and cairns.

**B1 (NK):** This is a maritime route, only known explicitly from pHarris I where ships sailed to ʿtk [54] ‘Timna’. The route must have rounded the Sinai Peninsula and landed in the region of Aqaba/Eilat.

**B2 (OK-NK):** This is a maritime route that led from Ayn Soukhna [21] towards El-Markha and the Sinai mineral zone [55, 64, 73]. The existence of this route is proven by inscriptions mentioning the same officials at Ayn Soukhna and in the Sinai mines.

**B3 (OK-NK):** This is a long maritime route that traced the littoral of the Red Sea. In the Old Kingdom, its existence is proven due to the presence of Puntite traffic at Ayn Soukhna [21]. Thus, there was a maritime route that followed the Red Sea coast, likely linking Ayn Soukhna, with Gebel Zeit (Khb.w) [44], Mersa Gawasis (Zw.w) [40] and, after sailing further south from here, Wtn.t [81] and Punt [82]. The exact coastal termini of this route are unknown, but would have been somewhere on the coast of eastern Sudan and Eritrea.

**B4 (OK):** Similar in function to B2, but departs from the Fourth Dynasty port at Wadi el-Jarf for the opposite shore at Tell Ras Budran and the copper and turquoise mines in the hinterland [55, 64, 73].

---


1810 The Pepinakht inscription illustrates the use of Ayn Soukhna as a harbour for Punt voyages, see section 4.2.3.

1811 The presence of Nile E ware from the Delta at Mersa Gawasis suggests that the maritime route between Ayn Soukhna and Mersa Gawasis was travelled during the Middle Kingdom; see Bard & Fattovich, *JAEL* 2, 10.

8.4 Toponymy and Archaeology: New sites in the desert
For many placenames, particularly choronyms, there is no assurance that there would be any extant archaeological remains associated with their location. However, there are a number of toponyms for which there is reason to suspect the existence of archaeological remains. In the case of the following placenames, no archaeological material has yet been ascribed to their location, and thus their discovery should be considered goals of archaeological surveys:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khkh [43]</td>
<td>A late Ramesside mining or smelting site on the Red Sea coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His.t-Gbtw [35]</td>
<td>In pHarris I, this is a Ramesside landing place on the Red Sea coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmpšw [45]</td>
<td>A region (?) of Middle Kingdom galena mines, probably located somewhere along the Red Sea coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idḥt and Tḥḥb [14, 10]</td>
<td>Artificial cisterns or wells in the region north of Wadi Hammamat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prḥt̄m /// /// /// ʷ.ḥ.s [36]</td>
<td>A Ramesside fort east of Coptos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Toponyms with undiscovered archaeological material.

8.5 Placenames as symbols
Some placenames in this corpus are not destinations in expedition texts, but rather occur in religious and fictional literature. The occurrence of toponyms in these texts may lead one to suggest that the places are not a ‘location’ per se, but rather geographic motifs or symbols, chosen because their inherent features were considered salient in Egyptian religion and imagination. Just as imn.t ‘the west’ is a well-known motif for the afterlife in Egyptian culture, so too could placenames in this corpus be symbolic and communicate different ideas. This subject of mythically charged space has been approached by Brunner and Klimkeit, who regard the placename in certain contexts as not realisable at one location, but rather anchored according to their mythic value. It is prudent here to separate those true Jenseitstopoi from places that could be both observed in ‘this world’ and the afterlife. But, the analogy that these places in certain texts, were not situated geographically, but mythologically, explains their value as symbols.

The most notable toponym that is used symbolically is Punt, which occurs in rhetorical texts, funerary texts, love-songs, hymns, and magical texts. Like Punt, Wetenet, and Medja also occur in such texts. The southeast was cosmically connected with sunrise and solar-birth, which gave southeasterly placenames an auspicious status in Egyptian religious texts. At least some of these associations might be subsumed under the myth of the ‘wandering-goddess’, where the

---

1813 The question of whether these remains are still extant today must remain moot. Fash floods or later re-use, especially in the case of mines, may have obliterated any pharaonic remains.


1815 For these associations see n. 748.
solar-eye leaves Egypt for the southeast. In other texts, these placenames function in the epithets of a number of gods who are typically associated with foreign lands and the southeast, such as like Mut, Khonsu, Min, and Hathor. Such associations occur with the following toponyms:

| Pwnt | Associated with Mut [84.7, 84.16, 84.90], Khonsu [84.9], Wereret [84.13A, 84.20], Amun-Re [84.30, 84.64, 84.74], Shezmet [84.77], Thoth [84.75], Min [84.82], Hathor [84.7, 84.16, 84.17, 84.33, 84.59], and solar-east [84.56, 84.63, 84.66, 84.85, 84.91] |
| Wtn.t | Min [81.2], Re [81.12], solar-east [81.2, 81.8, 81.13] |
| Mdī | Min and solar east [24.13], Amun-Re [24.15, 24.17] |
| Wd-wr-ỉš.ty | Solar-east [79.1] |
| ȝzm.t | Horus [42.3-9], Min [42.12], Sopdu [42.10] |

Some placenames in this corpus also appear in magical texts. It seems likely that their existence was precisely due to their mythological significance. This is related to the mechanics of magical texts, which usually evoked mythological allusions and deities in order to achieve the desired outcome of the magical ritual:

| Pwnt | [84.76], [84.77], [84.97] |
| Pi-dw-n(y)-Hmrk | [72.1] |
| Hrb | [63.1] |

A similar notion exists when foreign placenames occur in fictional literary narratives, but in this corpus only Punt [84.14], Bi3-n(y) ḫty [55.3], and lw pn n(y) k3 [76.1] occur in narrative fiction. As Enmarch emphasises concerning the Shipwrecked Sailor, the notion of long-distance voyages would have been a relatable experience to many Egyptians, especially the officials and members who took part in such large-scale expeditions. The same principal explains the inclusion of Punt in love songs. Its inclusion was reliant on the audience being familiar with its connotations, its great distance, and produce, but not necessarily its location. In such literature, Punt was a fertile garden of myrrh, its mention conveying connotations of distance, fertility, and divinity. As with placenames in religious and cosmographic texts, Egyptians must have ‘visited’ such places on expeditions before these places were elevated to the status of a literary or religious motif. Punt and Wetenet first appear in such texts in the early Middle Kingdom, well after the late

---

1816 Darnell, *The Enigmatic Netherworld Books of the Solar-Osirian Unity*, 417. This myth has its basis in observable astronomical phenomena, where the sun wanders along the horizon throughout the year. But, it has also been argued that the myth refers to the movement of Sirius rather than the sun, for which see J. Quack, *A Goddess rising 10,000 Cubits into the Air…or only one Cubit, one Finger*, in J. Steele & A. Imhausen (eds), *Under One Sky: Astronomy and Mathematics in the Ancient Near East* (Münster, 2002), 283-294.


1819 There is also an instance of Punt in a ‘teaching text’ [84.13], but the context is similar to that of rhetorical texts where Punt is a symbol for a distant land.
Old Kingdom voyages to these places. Thus, there was a latent period between the first expedition to distant places and their elevation as symbolic topoi.

8.6 The Expeditionary Context: The arrival of foreign names in texts

Many of the placenames in this thesis are found specifically in expedition texts and may have been born out of expeditionary activity. When Egyptians ventured into certain areas, they did not always label the location itself, but borrowed the local toponym (autonym). The presence of these foreign names implies some level of interaction, bilingualism, and negotiation between Egyptians and foreign groups. For instance, in Henu’s march from Coptos to the Red Sea, two foreign placenames are enumerated, \textit{Id\dot{d}ht} [14] and \textit{T\dot{h}tht} [10]. If these names were not part of a pre-existing stock of placenames known to Egyptians, it must be concluded that they were communicated to Henu by locals interacting with the Egyptian expedition. In other words, it is likely that many placenames arrived in the Egyptian geographic repertoire from expeditionary activity and local interactions with indigenous peoples. In the Egyptian administration, the trailblazers for expeditions were the \textit{smn.ty} and perhaps \textit{im.y-r\dot{a} iaA.w}.\footnote{Eichler, \textit{Untersuchungen zum Expeditionswesen des ägyptischen Alten Reiches}, 188-197. Individually, for \textit{smn.ty} see J. Yoyotte, ‘Les Sementiou et l’Exploitation des regions minières a l’Ancien Empire’, \textit{BSFE} 73 (1975), 44-54; Espinel, \textit{Etnicidad y territorio}, 64; H. Fischer, ‘More about the \textit{Smntjw}’, \textit{GM} 84 (1985), 25-32. In one case, a \textit{smnt} even dug a well in Wadi Mueilha, see Espinel, \textit{JEA} 91, 65 n. 49. The most comprehensive work on the \textit{F\dot{h}.w} is L. Bell, \textit{Interpreters and Egyptianized Nubians in Ancient Egyptian Foreign Policy: Aspects of the History of Egypt and Nubia} (University of Pennsylvania, unpublished Doctoral dissertation, 1976).}
The former discovered new geological deposits in the desert, while the latter were perhaps intermediaries between Egyptians and foreigners. The \textit{smnt.y} are known from Wadi Hammamat, Wadi Hammama, Ayn Soukhnna, and even as far away as Abrak, all regions known for geological wealth.\footnote{Urk. IV, 344.16: \textit{nn ph st wpw hr smn.tyw} ‘There are none who have reach it (the myrrh-terraces) except your sementiu’. These \textit{smn.ty} had visited Punt before the expedition proper, and thus may have been involved in piloting the expedition and, speculatively, even the introduction of the Puntite names in the Topographical Lists.} They are also mentioned in Hatshepsut’s Punt Expedition text as the only people who visited the myrrh terraces before Hatshepsut’s expedition.\footnote{De Bruyn, \textit{JEA} 44, 97-98.} While there is no direct evidence linking these offices to the introduction of toponyms, pragmatically these individuals would be the first to hear or see a new place and communicate it to Egyptians on the Nile.

Indigenous names could only arrive in Egyptian records through expeditions and/or translators. Such names seem to have only been sought in areas with little economic relevance, or regions far from the Egyptian homeland, perhaps where negotiation with foreigners was necessary to conduct
operations, like at Timna-ֶתk [54]. As a general rule, foreign names in Egyptian texts occur on the periphery of Egyptian interests. In the Eastern Desert, there are extremely few non-Egyptian placenames north of the Wadi Allaqi, but south of here there are only foreign names. So too in the Sinai, most Egyptian names are confined to the ‘mineral zone’ of Wadi Maghara and Serabit el-Khadem, but no Egyptian names are known for other areas of the South Sinai or Wadi Arabah.

Translators were probably of assistance in the process of communicating and encoding foreign placenames. The iꜣꜣ.w ‘interpreters’ are well attested in the Old Kingdom, while in later periods they are more elusive but still documented. 1823 There is a wide-range of material that points to some Egyptian scribes (s🇸) being trained or conversant in Semitic languages, 1824 but there is little data in this respect for African languages. Conversations between Medjay and Egyptians are recorded in the Semna Dispatches, with a quite similar exchange occurring in the Punt Expedition of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahri. 1825 A Ramesside hieratic papyrus in the Bankes collection may record a short magical text in an African language. 1826 A large number of African theonyms and phrases appear in the ‘supplementary’ editions of the Book of the Dead, which must demonstrate some bilingualism between speakers of African languages and Egyptians. 1827 But even here, this evidence pales in comparison to evidence of Semitic bilingualism present in both Egyptian documents and the Akkadian Amarna letters. This predisposition explains why some generic terms in New Kingdom Semitic names were translated into Egyptian (Dw-n(y)-Sꜣr [66], Pꜣ-Dw-n(y)-II [71]), where in African languages there are no equivalent multi-lingual placenames, except Hnm.t-Ibhyt [12A]. Presumably, local populations of Nubians and Puntites living in Egypt would have assisted in such bilingualism, 1828 and these populations may have been the conduit by which some names came into Egyptian vocabularies. Stockfisch has analysed the contact implied by foreign placenames in Egyptian, and emphasises the importance of ‘middle-men’ - ambassadors and messengers. 1829 The presence of foreign placenames, accordingly, does not

1823 See Bell, *Interpreters and Egyptianized Nubians in Ancient Egyptian Foreign Policy: Aspects of the History of Egypt and Nubia*, 86-87. There is also the well known depiction of interpreters in the tomb of Horemheb; see G. Martin, *The Memphite Tomb of Horemheb, Commander-in-Chief of Tutankhamun* (London, 1989), I, pl. 115.

1824 See, for example, Allon, *LingAeg* 18, 8.

1825 For interpretation of the dialogue in the Semna Dispatches, see Liszka, *A Study of the Medjay and Pangrave as an ethnic group and as Mercenaries*, 163 n. 718; 274-275.


1828 Nubians are well known archaeologically and textually in Egypt, for which see generally Meurer, *Nubier in Ägypten*, 83-115. There are some Puntites, even one ‘scribe of the necropolis’ (identifiable by the name Sꜣ(.t)-Pwnt) in the late Middle Kingdom; see Schneider, *Auszänder in Ägypten während des Mittleren Reiches und der Hyksoszeit*, II, 100-104.

imply recurrent contact or strong relationships, but sporadic or individual events such as expeditions, envoys, trade, and/or diplomacy. Thus, the presence of a single Egyptian expedition into a new region could stimulate new toponymic repertoires.
Chapter 9: Linguistic Analysis

9.1 Foreign Languages

From the toponymic evidence it is certain that Semitic languages were spoken in the Sinai and Edom. Semitic lexemes appear in several placenames such as *il* ‘god’, *s<r* ‘thicket’, and *hrb* ‘waste, desert’. The early date of the texts makes it dangerous to speculate as to its affiliation or relationship to specific Canaanite languages or even ancient North Arabian dialects. Morphologically, there is nothing particularly distinctive in these toponyms that could assist in identifying the precise language of each toponym, nor can we be sure as to whether these placenames originate from a homogenous linguistic zone. Some of these toponyms show affixes ‘- [51] or –t [69], but these do not readily differentiate Canaanite languages.

The African placenames represented in this thesis are comparatively difficult to connect to specific languages. Following the work of El-Sayed and Zibelius-Chen, several Beja etymologies have been suggested, but it is difficult to be confident about many of these etymologies as we are unaware of the spatial distribution of Beja, Agaw, and/or Nilo-Saharan Languages in the Atbai and Eastern Desert in this period. Therefore, it might be safer to identify some placenames as being more broadly ‘Cushitic’, rather than from a particular language. Some toponyms seem to be easily relatable to Beja or Cushitic geographic vocabulary. This includes names like *Iwši < Yuwaš* ‘dirty’ [119], *Idšht < Adarot* ‘Red-place’ [14], *K3šm < k’er* ‘river’ [108] and *lkyt < kuayti* ‘sift’ [13]. This topic requires further research, not only from the standpoint of Egyptian-African phonetic correspondences, but also the reconstruction of toponymic traditions in individual Cushitic languages, as well as the reconstruction of the Proto-Cushitic lexicon.

A rather surprising development in this survey is the ease with which Puntite placenames can be connected to Semitic lexical roots (Tab. 12). Some of these names also exhibit typical (Ethio)semitic morphological affixes like an *m*-prefix or the suffix –(t)m (mimation). Along with the etymology of the Puntite ruler, *Prhw*, this data may point to an Ethiosemitic or Semitic language in the region of Punt. Mimation is present in South Arabian languages, but is not a

---


1831 See section 4.2.4.
feature of Ethiosemitic, albeit we have no contemporary data to rule this out as a feature of the ancient Ethiosemitic spoken in the second millennium BCE.\(^{1832}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puntite Toponym</th>
<th>(Ethio)semitic cognate (Leslau, <em>Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez, #</em>)</th>
<th>Cushitic (Saho-Afar) cognate</th>
<th>Remaining Affixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥʾhw /ʕh(r)w/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>‘eela ‘well’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥmsw /r(msu:/</td>
<td>rms ‘to touch’ (471)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnsiw /nmsʔw/</td>
<td>nš ‘lift, raise’ (794)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>m- -w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥw /ʕhw/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>‘aruwa ‘house’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwʃhw /gwʃhw/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>gar’ō ‘ravine’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mhdʒm /mhdʒm/</td>
<td>m(w)hz ‘waterway’ &gt; whz ‘flow’ (611)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥwʊrw /ʕ(w)h(w)r(w)/</td>
<td>ESA ḥd ‘to know’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iʃwım /ʕ(w)dʒm/</td>
<td>ʃm/ ‘bone/strong’ (58)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mmtw /mmtw/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>m- (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbwťw /mb(w)cw/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wdrwtt /wdʒl(w)ct/</td>
<td>ESA wšl ‘to join’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-t (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şthbw /stḥbw/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şidtm /ʃ(iː)dʒtm/</td>
<td>šzy ‘detach’/ šṭṭ ‘split’ (538, 541)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-tm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nwhtm /nwhtm/</td>
<td>nwh/h ‘be long/far’ (409)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-tm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḡkwht /ʔkrwht/</td>
<td>ḡzl ‘field, plain’ (240)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-ht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Possible cognates for Puntite placenames [86-100].

\(^{1832}\) For mimation in Semitic toponymy, see Lipinski, *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar*, 228, and, more generally in noun formation, see Lipinski, *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook*, 344-345. Mimation is not extant in Ethiosemitic, but is found in South Arabian Languages. A. Al-Jallad, ‘Final Short Vowels in Ge’ez, Hebrew ʾattâ, and the Anceps Paradox’, *Journal of Semitic Studies* 59 (2014), 321 suggests mimation was lost in the ‘Proto-Ethiosemitic’ stage of the language. See also Harding, *Index of Pre-Islamic Proper Names*, passim for South Arabian names (his class D) with nunation (North Arabian) or mimation (Sabaic).
The caveat to this Ethiosemitic connection is that, while lexical roots in Proto-Semitic and Ethiosemitic have been reconstructed with some degree of success, and are therefore are relatively easy to compare etymologically to these placenames in Egyptian documents, the same cannot be said for Proto-Cushitic.\textsuperscript{1833} Indeed, in the Punt-list, there is a very plausible Lowland East Cushitic isogloss in $Gw\hat{h}w$ from the root $\star g\acute{s}$ ‘bury, cover’.\textsuperscript{1834}

Even then, this data supports the ongoing research of Breyer, who has connected some Puntite lexica with Ethiosemitic languages.\textsuperscript{1835} One might, thus, duly postulate an (Ethio)semitic stratum in the environs of Punt. This data would also be the earliest attestations of Ethiosemitic lexical material. It would be impossible to say if this ‘Puntite’ language was closer to Tigre, Tigrinya, Ge‘ez or even an ancient South Arabian language (ESA). The geographic spread of the Ethiosemitic languages in this period is wholly unknown, but Tigre as the coastal language would be the strongest candidate. The Tigre and Beni-Amer (a Beja-Tigre tribe) now extend as far north as Tokar, but in antiquity their first mention is in the fourth century CE text of Ezana as the ‘Khasa’ ($\chi\alpha\sigma\omicron\alpha$), who are vaguely situated as an enemy of the Nubian Noba.\textsuperscript{1836} Cumulatively, this data supports backdating the Ethiosemitic migration to Africa, well before the supposed ‘South Arabian’ migration of the first millennium BCE, perhaps meaning that the Ethiosemitic family has a much more ancient African history than is generally assumed.

\subsection*{9.2 Orthographic Remarks}
In principal, while most toponyms were written and copied in a similar fashion, in practice, most names experienced a degree of orthographic variance. The toponym Punt is illustrative of the great variation that is witnessed in the orthography and classifiers of a placename. These differing orthographies are a result of copying, active (re)interpretation, genre and different written mediums. The standard writing $\sqcup\sqsubset\hat{\ }\sqsubset$ was the norm in most documents. The special use of $\sqcup\sqsubset\hat{\ }\sqsubset$\textsuperscript{[84.16]} illustrates the shift of a toponym to an epithet or theonym with the addition of the [HATHOR] classifier. In personal names $Si$-Pwnt $\sqcup\sqsubset\hat{\ }\sqsubset\sqcup\sqsubset$\textsuperscript{[84.25]} or $\sqcup\sqsubset\sqcup\sqsubset\hat{\ }\sqsubset\sqcup\sqsubset\sqcup\sqsubset$ $Si$-t-Pwnt \textsuperscript{[84.24]}, the names are classified with zero, or mistakenly, $\hat{\ }$\textsuperscript{[84.26]}. A phonetically different reproduction $\sqcup\sqsubset\sqsubset\sqsubset$\textsuperscript{[84.85]} occurs in a Hymn to Amun-Re. In ‘enigmatic-script’, there is $\sqcup\sqsubset\hat{\ }\sqsubset\sqsubset\sqsubset$\textsuperscript{1837}.

\textsuperscript{1833} The major work for the Proto-Cushitic lexicon remains Ehret, \textit{SUGIA} 8, 7-180. Many of these reconstructions are speculative and should be treated with extreme caution.
\textsuperscript{1834} The root was successfully reconstructed in Orel & Stolbova, \textit{Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary}, 198, although the reflex of Egyptian $d.j$ should be discarded.
\textsuperscript{1836} \textit{RIE} 271.24. For a translation, see \textit{FHN} III, 1101-1102.
In hieratic documents, variants such as \( \text{x-x-x} \) [84.76] and \( \text{x-x-x} \) occur. Relevant here may be the concept of *Wortschreibung* where a placename was converted into like-sounding Egyptian words. Thus, \( P\text{-wnn.t} \) or \( P\text{n-wnn.t} > P(\text{r})(\text{r})\text{-n(y)-wn.n.t} \), two differing writings of Punt, may be reduced to Egyptian lexemes meaning ‘because’ or ‘the-one-who-exists’. While some of these writings produce different phonetic realizations, most may just be alternative writings that used the polyvalent graphemic system inherent in hieroglyphs.

Analysis of the nature of Egyptian ‘group-orthography’ is here confined to phenomena present in this toponymic corpus, and does not deal with the problem universally, as has been done by many authorities. The problem of \( \text{r} \) in foreign transcriptions has been dealt with, but the nature of two different systems for transcribing orthography in the Topographical Lists is a hitherto undiscovered and unresearched phenomenon. It appears that in the New Kingdom Topographical Lists there were 1) a set of names aligned with Kush that used \( \text{r} \) as a vowel; 2) another set in the Eastern Desert, Lower Nubia, and Punt which used \( \text{r} \) as a consonant; 3) a ‘new’ supplementary series of placenames that appeared after Thutmose III that used \( \text{r} \) as a vowel. The grapheme \( w \) appears too frequently in these lists to be consonantial in all cases. All African names entering the lexicon in the New Kingdom use C\( r \)-groups in this way, i.e. \( m(\text{r})w \) [78], \( Tk(\text{r})yt \) [13], with the former being confirmed by the writing without aleph for \( m \) [78.12].

The original transcription system for foreign words in the Old and Middle Kingdom placenames spelled foreign names with uniliterals and some biliterals, as in \( P\text{wnnt} \) [84], \( M\text{d}3 \) [24], and \( T\text{bibt} \) [12]. Later traditions, beginning with the Middle Kingdom Execration Texts, began to use complex digraphs, and selectively attempted to mark vowels through using \( \text{r} \), \( w \) or \( i \). As such, in most periods there are multiple scribal systems of transcribing foreign names, and the transcription system differed in distinct corpora, and was also somewhat sensitive to the target languages of the placenames. It is possible, therefore, to date the arrival of some placenames in the lexicon purely by orthographic standards. Occasionally, some toponyms seem to be converted

---


1838 I would like to thank Dr Francis Breyer for bringing the concept of *Wortschreibung* to my attention. For \( p\text{-wn} \) ‘because’ \( \text{x-x-x} \), see Lesko, *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*, I, 145.


into new orthographies from their older forms by the insertion of vocalic signs as in \( P\text{-}I\text{Abh}t < Ibht [12], Tyhtib < Ibht [12] \), or \( P\text{-}wnwt, P\text{-}wn.t < P\text{wn}\text{t} [84] \). As there is a lack of safe cognates for African toponyms, it is difficult to say anything definite about the vocalic system employed. The end result is a rather confusing set of coexistent writing systems.

### 9.2.1 Classifiers and Orthography

The use of classifiers is largely consistent with the schema outlined in Chapter 2. One orthographic detail this corpus reveals is that many writings employ the etymological non-toponymic classifier in addition to, or instead of, the regular toponymic classifiers \( \text{, } \), and \( \text{.} \) Zero classification is also quite common. As a rule, it occurs with toponyms which denote built structures, like temples, mines, and wells. That building names could become toponyms through a metonymic shift is clear, e.g. the name of the pyramid complex \( Mn-nfr(\text{-}Ppy) \), which later designated the whole town of Memphis (\( \text{, } \)), not just the pyramid complex. This shift is not exhibited in any of the placenames in this corpus, meaning that the classifiers \( \text{, } \), and \( \text{.} \) were reserved for use in true toponyms of some relative size. Thus, even though ‘microtoponyms’ and buildings were proper nouns, with some locational specificity, they were not treated as toponyms in Egyptian written culture. Zero classification is also common in many compound toponyms, particularly where the addition of \( \text{.} \) would be redundant. Where placenames used \( h\text{is}t \) or \( q\text{hw} \) as generic terms, it was not necessary to use a toponymic classifier, as the toponym’s generic term already indicates a space-category [HILL-COUNTRY] for the Egyptian reader, as in \( Dw-\text{bhn} \). In many cases, compound toponyms could retain their etymological classifiers of the respective words, as with \( \text{, } \) or \( \text{.} \) [26.4]. Essentially, these are cases of ‘lexeme classification’ versus ‘phrase classification’. That is, when \( \text{, } \) or \( \text{.} \) is placed at the end of a multi-lexeme toponym, the classifier qualifies the whole toponymic phrase as one semantic component. The choice of classifying a toponymic phrase with one toponymic classifier (\( \text{, } \) [64.2]) or individual etymological classifiers (\( \text{, } \) [64.5]) was largely influenced by the idiom of the scribe, but might in some instances demonstrate the lexicalisation of a noun phrase into a single toponymic lexeme. In the name \( Hrr.w(t)y \text{t} \), both the etymon [VEGETATION] and the toponymic classifier [HILL-COUNTRY] occur, as

---

1841 This might be considered evidence of dictation or phonetic transcriptions. Some didactic texts, like onomastica, may have been intended to familiarise scribes with these names, see AEO I, 2.
1842 Zibelius, Ägyptische Siedlungen nach Texten des Alten Reiches, 94-95; AEO II, 122.
1843 On this distinction, see Lincke, Die Prinzipien der Klassifizierung im Altägyptischen, 105-107, 117.
1844 For examples of this process, where composite generic names merge into one lexicalised toponymic item, see Kadmon, Toponymy: The Lore, Laws and Language of Geographical Names, 134-135. On the dropping of generic terms in toponyms see section 9.3.4.
also in names like $\mathcal{M}f\mathcal{k}A.t$ [64.12]. In contrast, foreign-language placenames usually take one of the standard toponymic classifiers, and there is no classifier with these toponyms that would manifest the etymon of the foreign name, with the possible exception of a god’s name in $P3$-dw-n(y)-Hmrk [72]. Classifiers in toponyms were thus sensitive to the reader and the textual context, thereby allowing the author of a text to give the greatest insight into the situation of a toponym without being unduly repetitive or tautological.

With respect to the toponymic classifiers, these seem to be used in a rather conservative manner. Punt, for instance, is never written with $\l$ and $l$, even in Ramesside hieratic texts.\footnote{The exception is the enigmatic-script text at Amara West, which has $\l$ $l$.} In fact, $l$ is written only on $Iww$, $Ik$, $R3$-\$3wt$, $H3$s.t-n.w(t)-Mb.y, $Wm.t$ (once), $Brhiw$, $IIn$, and $^m$\$w$, where it almost always occurs alongside $\l$.\footnote{See toponyms [75, 54, 59, 81, 83, 69, 78]. Both $Iww$ and $R3$-\$3wt$ only have these writings on the Speos Artemidos text.} Thus, $l$ only appears independently when the toponym derives from an ethnic term, and in all other cases the sign occurs as part of the visual crasis of $l$ and $\l$ in Ramesside orthography. As such, the throw-stick has no special meaning in placenames.

The sign $\l$ occurs in very few placenames. It is present on the unlocated toponyms $Sn$h, $B3$\$t$, and $Hz$t. It also occurs on names which have $wH.yt$ ‘settlement’ as a generic term [18], and relative toponyms ($H3$s.t-Gbtw [35] and $H3$s.t-\$3bt(y)t-\$3wn.w$ [31]).\footnote{See [39, 29, 22, 23, 31, 35, 50, 66].} Even in the late Ramesside Period, where O49 could be used with foreign toponyms,\footnote{Spalinger, JEA 94, 152, 163.} the only placename in this corpus exhibiting this classifier is $S^a$ $\l$ $\l$ $\l$ $\l$ $\l$ $\l$ $\l$ [66.5]. The reason for this absence is probably the complete lack of urban settlements in the Eastern Desert and Red Sea, and thus O49 in the Ramesside period still had some semantic value of [URBAN], even if it no longer solely designated Egyptian settlements. Di Biase-Dyson inferred this fact in a survey of placenames in the Ramesside vernacular of the Story of Wenamun, noting that the use of ‘city + foreign land’ might mean ‘foreign city’ rather than ‘Egyptian foreign city’.\footnote{Di Biase-Dyson, Foreigners and Egyptians in Late Egyptian Stories, 338 n. 338.} Thus, $S^a$, a region which apparently had settlements, was the exceptional case in this corpus with which all classifiers could be used. Elsewhere, it seems inappropriate to use O49, as no true urban settlements seem to have existed in these regions. This remains to be tested against other toponymic data (not to mention demographic realities) but neatly explains why desert placenames so seldom used this classifier.

The classifier N17/18 also occurs in a number of placenames, where it fulfils the same function
as \(\sim\).\(^{1850}\) In Old Kingdom placenames, like \(\text{Htyw-Mfk}\^3.t\) [64] and \(\text{Szmt}\) [42], it is common. In an enigmatic-script text from Aksha \(\sim\) is used for \(\text{Pwnt}\) [84.72].

The classifiers \(\sim\), \(\sim\), or \(\sim\) were reserved for true placenames of some subjective size, and excluded from microtoponyms and built structures. Their application was not the rule, especially in compound placenames which often bypassed this classificatory process. Whether placenames with these ‘toponymic’ classifiers constituted true ‘toponyms’ according to Egyptian culture is perhaps moot, as we have no such word or expression that would convey the specific meaning ‘toponym’ in Egyptian texts.

9.3 Morphology and Syntax

The morphology of Egyptian toponyms has not been specifically dealt with by linguists. As placenames are noun phrases, it is not surprising that the direct genitive is the most common grammatical feature. This is taken to mean that these toponyms, in contrast to those using the indirect-genitive, were well established placenames. According to Jansen-Winkeln, these genitival constructions were in free variation to some extent,\(^{1851}\) but the direct genitive may represent inalienable possession and thus more concrete proper nouns. Free variation in these genitival constructions is confirmed by some placenames, like \(\text{Ht}\^s.t-\text{Gb tw} / \text{Ht}\^s.t-n(t)\)-Gb tw [35], \(\text{Dw-}\text{blh}/\text{Dw-}\text{n(y)}\)-blh [47], and \(\text{Bi3-Pwnt} / \text{Bi3-n(y)}\)-Pwnt [82]. Indirect genitives are a standard feature in names like \(\text{Ht}\^s.t-n.t\)-hsmn [33]. Tripartite genitives (A + B + C) are encountered in both direct [8A-8B, 18, 56, 68] and indirect forms [61, 64C], but in most cases these are so-called ‘nested genitives’, comprised of an original direct genitive phrase with an attached generic term.\(^{1852}\)

Adjectives are not very common in the corpus and most commonly occur as cardinal references. Relative size might be alluded to in \(\text{Htf.t-}\text{wr.t-Hr.y-}\text{Ch3}\) ‘Great wastes of Khery-Aha’ [30] or \(\text{P3-ym-}\text{t-n(y)}\)-mw-\text{kd}\) ‘Great Sea of Inverted Water’ [77]; height is referred to in \(\text{R3-hnw-hr.y}\) ‘Upper Ra-Henu’ [26B], and \(\text{Dw-w'b}\) ‘Pure-Mountain’ [46] must be adjectival, as \(w'b\) is not marked with a nominal morpheme. Nisbe-adjectives are found in \(\text{R3-hnw-hr.y}\) [26B], \(\text{W3d-}\text{wr-}\text{lb.ty}\) [79], and in nominalised forms in \(\text{Tlb.t(y)t}\) [1] and \(\text{Hrr.wt(y)t}\) [60]. The relative lack of true adjectives is not surprising in Egyptian toponymy. So-called ‘secondary’ adjectives derived from verbal roots are

---

\(^{1850}\) Zibelius, \textit{AOVN}, 70. H. Fischer, ‘A Scribe of the Army in a Saqqara Mastaba of the Early Fifth Dynasty’, \textit{JNES} 18 (1959), 265 notes how it replaces \(N25\) in \(\text{Ht.yw-Mfk}\^3.t\). See also Kahl, \textit{Das System der ägyptischen Hieroglyphenschrift in der 0.-3. Dynastie}, 598-599. Gardiner, \textit{Egyptian Grammar}, 487 notes its use on \(\text{hlt}\) ‘horizon’, \(\text{Thn.w}\) ‘Libya(n)’ and \(\text{St.t}\) ‘Asia’.


\(^{1852}\) On tripartite genitives, see D. Werning, ‘Genitive possessive constructions in Égyptien de tradition: Compound construction vs. of-construction’, in E. Grossmann & S. Polis (eds), \textit{Possession in Ancient Egyptian} (in press).
the norm in Egyptian and this corpus of placenames. But the precise translation of these toponyms is dependent on whether one understands such participles to be nomen loci (see below) or abstract adjectival participles, and in many cases the orthography and context cannot distinguish between these meanings. Relative clauses are common in the labels of the Turin list, but no true toponym in the corpus contains a relative adjective except the adverbial toponym [67].

9.3.1 Deverbatives and Toponyms

A number of placenames in this study derive from verbal roots, which as a rule have deverbative or participial morphological suffixes. Some of these may be treated as nomen loci, that is place-nouns created from verbal roots through the affixation of a nominal suffix -w or -t. The existence of this morphological category, Osing’s Class A IV, has been questioned, but for our purposes, it suffices to say that toponyms often have a morphological ending which may be analysed as a nomen loci. The resultant words are not specifically ‘locative’ or ‘toponymic’, but are place-nouns, operating in the same way as agent-nouns as in the paradigmatic sdm ‘to hear’ > sdm.y ‘hearer’. The precise translation of deverbative placenames is difficult. They could very well be lexicalised place nouns, but it is also possible to translate them more abstractly as passive or active nouns, sdm(.yw/t) ‘the-heard-one’, which are then applied to topographical features. This facet of morphology requires further research, and cannot be treated comprehensively here. Such deverbative morphemes appear in the following placenames:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verb</th>
<th>noun</th>
<th>references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥsw ‘to break’</td>
<td>ḥsw.t/ḥsw.t ‘quarry’</td>
<td>[34, 41, 59]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wb ‘to open’</td>
<td>wb.t ‘opening’</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ỉḥ ‘to shine’</td>
<td>ỉḥ.t ‘horizon’ (lit. ‘shining-one’)</td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other examples are less certain. In the following list, the resultant noun is not registered in any lexicon, but the meaning and existence of the noun may be presumed on toponymic evidence and known verbal roots:

---

1853 Following the definition in Allen, Middle Egyptian, 61ff.
1854 For the nomen loci and deverbative morphology, see Osing, Nominalbildung, I, 258-267; W. Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der Deverbalen Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen (Wiesbaden, 1983), 72-73 and Gundacker, LingAeg 19, 47-49. C. Ehret, ‘Third Consonants in Ancient Egyptian’, in Takács (ed.), Egyptian and Semito-Hamitic (Afro-Asiatic) Studies in Memoriam W. Vycichl (Leiden, 2004), 34-35 also gives examples of these nominal prefixes in ‘place-nouns’ without using the term nomen loci. This is to be differentiated from the m-prefix which also achieves a similar semantic function and is often called a ‘nomen loci’ when used in place-nouns, see Osing, Nominalbildung, I, 321-323; Fecht, Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur, 180-181; Edel, Allägyptische Grammatik, 109-110.
1855 Schenkel, Zur Rekonstruktion der Deverbalen Nominalbildung des Ägyptischen, 72-73. See also Schenkel, LingAeg 13, 150-151.
1856 This research would require analysis of the vocalic environment of each example and the attestation of reflexes in Coptic dialects to ascertain whether the morph is truly a nomen loci or attributable to other classes in Osing’s and Schenkel’s typologies of noun formation. I must thank Dr Roman Gundacker for assistance with this issue.
In the following examples, the verbal stem is unattested in dictionaries, but such roots can be reconstructed on toponymic evidence and lexical cognates. These verbal roots probably became moribund in Old Egyptian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kḥb 'to scour'</td>
<td>&gt; kḥb.w ‘the-scoured-one’ [44]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wkm 'to supply (?)'</td>
<td>&gt; wkm.t ‘supplied-one’ [80]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḏl 'to sift'</td>
<td>&gt; ḏ.l ‘sifted-one’ [25]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zḥw 'to cut'</td>
<td>&gt; zḥw.w ‘cut-one’ [40]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only bare verb encountered is Khḥh [43], but it too must be some kind of deverbative, perhaps containing a missing nominal morph (-t/-w) not written in Ramesside hieratic orthography. A marked feature of this class of toponym is that it forms the majority of single-lexeme placenames (Wtn.t, Wkm.t, ṢṬ.y.t, Khb.w, Bīt.w). Therefore, one must conclude that the main way non-geographic lexemes were transformed into placenames in spoken Egyptian was either by the addition of a generic term and/or the application of a nominal suffix to a verbal root. In single-lexeme toponyms, these deverbatives might be treated as ‘dangling’ participles, where the zero-value antecedent is understood as the named place. The modern translation of such names provides some difficulties, as in many cases the sense of these deverbatives as abstract nouns or lexicalised nomina loci is uncertain.

### 9.3.2 Toponymic Clauses

While most toponyms in Egyptian (and indeed most languages) constitute noun phrases, a number of placenames in this study are periphrastic adverbial sentences containing participles and/or prepositions. A basic type is simply a noun phrase using a participle plus a noun complement, e.g. Ptr.t-nfr.w-Hw.t-hr.w ‘Which beholds the perfection of Hathor’ [56] or Ḥṣb.t-Mṛt.y-Rw ‘Which made Meryre Festive’ [27]. Longer names with prepositions, such as Swlq.t-mḥt-rqī.t-n.tt-im ‘Which prospered its expedition, which gave that which is in it’ [67], might seem strange as

---

1857 The toponym Zḥw.w could also be explained as a plural noun from zḥw ‘beam’, but here one would expect plural strokes rather than the quail-chick.
1858 The placename Ḥṛt.wl(t)t [60] also contains a nominal prefix -t, which might be analysed as being a collective suffix or as a nomen loci attached to a nominal root.
1859 The use of feminine participles swlq.t and ptr.t in [56] and [67] demonstrates that the participles antecedent was the placename itself.
1860 The precise English translation of participles in these toponyms is dependent on whether one takes the participle to be an agent-noun, place-noun or an abstract active or passive verb, e.g. Pṛt.t-nfr.w-Hw.t-Hr.w as ‘Beholder of the perfection of Hathor’ or ‘(One)-which saw the perfection of Hathor’. See also section 9.3.1.
the meaning of a toponym, but such phraseology is quite common in Egyptian royal names. These ‘toponymic clauses’ only occur in built structures, and are therefore examples of ‘coining’ in placenames. They are thus similar to Egyptian domain names, which are also a priori ‘coined’, and like them constitute a great variety of syntactic types, often employing adverbal sentences. Like royal names, toponymic clauses also seem to be an ideological statement relating to the efficacy and purpose of the named structure.

9.3.3 Compound Generic Placenames

Generic terms (henceforth ‘generic’) were widely used in Egyptian placenames, being extremely frequent in this corpus. It is not possible to always identify when these generics were part of a ‘canonical form’ of a toponym, or if such forms ever existed. Some placenames, for example the Bekhen Quarries (brn) [47], have two different generics (dw and h3.t) applied to the same specific term, brn, both toponyms referring to different groupings of mountainous terrain. One might then differentiate two types of generics on a pragmatic basis: 1) ad hoc ‘tautological generics’, which serve to semantically reinforce and describe the toponym in an inconsistent manner, but are not part of any canonical name, so for instance b3.t-Pwnt; 2) ‘feature generics’, which are regularly encountered as a part of the toponymic noun phrase, like Ht.yw-Mfk.t [64], or refer to a separate feature related to the toponym, Pr-Hr.w-h.t.yw-mfk.t ‘House of Hathor of the Terraces of Turquoise’ [64C]. Only ‘feature generics’ are analytically considered toponyms, as almost all toponyms could be bound with ‘tautological generics’.

9.3.4 Dropping Generic Terms in Placenames

A number of toponyms illustrate a phenomenon whereby the generic part of compound names, the nomen regens, was dropped, leaving behind only the specific element (nomen rectum). Such dropping was only common after regular use of the placename. Indeed, this may be present in a great number of placenames, but can only be proven where both forms are present, as in Ht.yw-Mfk.t > Mfk.t [64], Pr-y.m-f3-n(y)-mw-kd > Mw-kd [77], H3.t-Gbtw [EGYPTIAN-PLACE] > Gbtw [HILL-COUNTRY] [35], Dw-Db.t.w [EGYPTIAN-PLACE] > Db.t.w [HILL-COUNTRY] [50]. A notable phenomenon regarding the dropping of generic terms is the exchange of classifiers with the specific element (nomen rectum) in relative placenames, whereby the original classifier ⋄ was substituted for [HILL-COUNTRY], so that an individual toponymic lexeme could refer to the desert near a city, as in H3.t-Gbtw > ⋄ Dmi-n(y)-Gbtw [35B]. Even in the Ramesside mining list, where all toponyms have the generic dw, the toponym Dw-n(y)-Tp-

---

1861 For example the name of Amenemhat, Imn.w-m-h3.t, ‘Amun (is) in the front’; see J. Quack, ‘Amenemhet: Die Propagierung eines Gottes’, Sokar 17 (2008), 54-57.
1862 Jacquet-Gordon, Les noms des domaines funéraires sous l’Ancien Empire égyptien, 57-76.
presumes a previously unattested Hb=st-Tp-ih.w that would explain how this toponym was written with [HILL-COUNTRY], rather than the regular әйәва'[EGYPTIAN-PLACE]. Whether foreign placenames with generic elements like Dw-Sfr > Sfr constitute ‘generic dropping’ from a second language, here Semitic רַעִיר har Seʻir, seems possible, but cannot be proven. Cases of ‘generic dropping’ are common in many languages, although little research has been conducted as to the preconditions where this takes place.

9.4 Toponym Motivation

The Ancient Egyptian interest in desert sites related strictly to the materials to be procured there, and the name of the main commodity might be enough to locate the place in the context of the valley kingdom.

What motivated Egyptians to name a place? The semantics of toponymic lexemes may answer this question. Not only do the meanings of toponyms sometimes identify the generic feature of the place, and thus its referent geography, but they also communicate the kind of features and ideas that the Egyptians used to label their landscape. As it is not possible, for etymological reasons, to review the semantics of foreign toponyms these will not be dealt with here. The chosen typology presented here measures the different semantic fields employed in toponymic lexemes using toponyms [1-85] (Tab. 13, below).

While one has to be careful with quantitative data, in that the sample only represents a finite and arbitrary group of placenames preserved in texts, this corpus unequivocally shows that natural geography comprises the largest semantic field for toponyms (46% of lexemes). This is largely due to the descriptive ease with which these landscapes can be described using geomorphological markers. Geological vocabulary occurs quite frequently (10%), no doubt attributable to the mining activity taking place in the desert. This category should be seen as exceptional, given that other regions of Egypt are unlikely to exhibit such a high frequency of this semantic field. Hydrological, botanical, and faunal terms are surprisingly infrequent, given their importance to life in the desert. The Egyptians may not have considered these features as functional or salient for textual purposes, given their preoccupation with mining and resources.

For examples in Chinese toponymy, see E. Wilkinson, Chinese History: A manual (Harvard, 2000), 133.

Quirke, DE 21, 66.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Category</th>
<th>Areal Eastern Desert</th>
<th>South Sinai</th>
<th>Red Sea</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Total Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Geomorphology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Geomorphological Metaphor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Geological</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Hydrological</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Cosmic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Faunal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Botanical</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Geography</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Settlement Type</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Areal or Political Abstract Unit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Cardinal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Relative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Shift</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Feature shift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Commendatory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Condemnatory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Mythic or Cultic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity or verbal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Recurrent Activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Event</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eponymous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Personal Name</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Royal Name</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Theophoric Name</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Ethnic or Social Construct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indigenous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Indigenous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Calque</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Phono-Semantic Matching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 Unknown</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: The incidence of semantic fields in toponymic lexemes [1-85]. The data does not include hapax toponyms [86-133], which are all non-Egyptian and fall into category 7.1. It also excludes the Turin Map labels [T1-20] which are not true toponyms.
Terms from human geography comprise a small percentage of toponyms (9%). Their presence is also attributable to their use as generic terms in mining settlements and structures. Placenames that are labelled with a relative sense are similarly uncommon across the corpus (10%), but are ubiquitous in the Eastern Desert. A particularly productive category for Eastern Desert placenames is formed by so-called ‘feature-shifts’, where a region of the desert is labelled using a proximal settlement on the Nile, entailing special use of classifiers or the addition of a generic term like ḫw or ḫls.t. This category alone tends to confirm that, where possible, Egyptians coordinated the deserts relative to the Nile.\(^{1865}\) This was not possible in the distant Sinai and Atbai and as such this method of naming was never used in these regions. Names which entailed subjective descriptions, ‘evaluative’ placenames, are rarely encountered in this corpus, and suggestively were not part of the Egyptians’ usual toponymic rhetoric. In this corpus, certain generics were qualified with positive adjectives, like ḫḥ.t, wr.t, and wꜥḥ, which entailed statements relating to the efficacy, size, or purity of the named place. There are no instances of condemnatory lexemes or places which explicitly allude to mythological narratives.\(^{1866}\) So-called ‘activity’ toponyms are infrequent and difficult to analyse. These designate toponyms with a verbal origin, and the only attested examples refer to a recurrent activity at the toponym. Eponymous toponyms generally occur in artificial structures, and are thus examples of coining. Eponymous vocabulary is only inherently descriptive when used with social groups who inhabit the said place. Elsewhere eponymous toponyms named after a deity or king are employed in built structures \([27, 36, 37, 38, 56, 57, 65, 71]\) or, on one occasion, a mining region perhaps belonging to Amun’s temple institution \([8\text{A}]\).

The indigenous placenames are foreign names co-opted into Egyptian texts, and on some occasions are combined in genitival expressions with Egyptian generics \([12\text{A}, 24\text{A}, 71, 72]\). Outside toponomastica, foreign placenames are generally rare (13%), so there must have been a preference for using Egyptian placenames when possible. If one were to add names found in toponomastica \([86-133]\) (see Tab. 14 below), which are all indigenous, it perhaps gives a more realistic picture of the actual ratio of Egyptian to foreign placenames in the region, with almost a third of toponyms comprising foreign language placenames.

\(^{1865}\) This spatial conception is discussed in A. Espinel, ‘Edfu and the Eastern Desert: Zába’s Rock Inscriptions, No. A222 Reconsidered’, Archiv orientální 91 (2000), 586. Espinel, based on rock inscriptions in the desert that mention the Edfu-nome, suggests that Egyptian’s conception of space was ‘odological’, that is, configured on subjective ‘paths’ rather than absolute realisations of where a place was located.

\(^{1866}\) The subject of mythic or cultic toponyms is inherently subjective; this category could include mythologically named Nile cities such as Zw.t ‘Asuyt’, related to the word ‘watcher’, an epithet of Anubis. There is also ḫmn.w ‘Hermopolis’, from Egyptian ‘Eight’, referring to the Ogdoad. A god’s name would an ‘eponymous’ toponym.
In summary, Egyptians could use a variety of semantic ideas to label space. In practice, almost half of this vocabulary was based on features in the natural environment. It remains to be seen whether the semantics of the Nile Valley toponyms are similar to this corpus.

9.4.2 The Referent Features of Toponyms

Placenames refer to vastly different features. The majority of toponyms in this study are attributable to choronyms and mine-names ‘latomonyms’ (Fig. 42). Often the latter overlaps with onomonyms, names referring to elevation features. Given that mining was the major Egyptian activity in the desert, the propensity of mine-names is not unexpected. The necessity of wells in desert expeditions makes the relative lack of hydronyms surprising, but perhaps many of these were unnamed unless specifically constructed by Egyptians. Outside the Turin Map oyclonyms (route names) are infrequent. One might suppose that choronyms acted in a similar way to designate route features. Strictly defined toponyms, referring to tightly bound geographical units, are infrequent compared to choronyms and latomonyms. Oyclonyms, names of buildings were
infrequent too, and in all cases referred to the names of mining settlements or trade stations. The ubiquity of all these features is directly related to this expeditionary activity. The names of mountains or valleys which had no relation to mines are rarely noted.

![Referent Features](image)

Figure 42: Frequency of placename features, using [1-85]. Total number of referents is 95.

There were only two specific hydronyms for the waters of the Red Sea and there were no names designating a finite part of the sea. Egyptian language did have a complex technical vocabulary relating to aquatic features such as canals, runnels, eddies, creeks, pools, and floodplains, but there seems to be a fairly limited lexicon for specifically maritime features.\(^{1867}\) This may explain why there are so few terms found in Egyptian texts for seas or parts thereof. As a rule, generic terms for watery expanses, like \(\textit{wfd-wr, nnw}\), and later Semitic \(\textit{ym}\), were used generically to refer to the Red Sea and Mediterranean as well as the Fayum.

\(^{1867}\) Albeit, many hydrological terms have poor or non-existent definitions, see \textit{AEO} I, 6-10.
The most ubiquitous placenames in this study are choronyms followed by latonymns, oronyms and toponyms. Choronyms were no doubt used due to the large expanses of the desert encountered by Egyptians, and the ease by which areas could be broadly labelled via their constituent ethnic group or relation to the Nile Valley. Furthermore, their extensive usage might be attributable to the difficulty of labelling specific parts of the desert which were not regularly visited by Egyptians. Latonymns and oronyms are common categories in the Eastern Desert and Sinai (Fig. 43). Hydronymns are not as common as one would expect in desert toponymy given their life-giving nature. Almost half of these hydronymns are names for the Red Sea, the other four being wells in the desert. The names of various buildings and houses are common in the Eastern Desert. There is a debatable case of an odonym in W3g [15], but it does not seem that traffic routes were frequent in Egyptian toponymy, despite the presence of many routes (see section 8.3). Odonymns are noted on the Turin Map, but this document remains one of the only cases where individual wadi-routes are labelled. Pasquali has suggested that an estate name recorded in Greek as Πημεωμος might be the rendering of an earlier unattested Egyptian route name P15,wy-n(y)-ml.t-ym ‘The Domain of the route of the Sea’. If true, this would refer to a route from Coptos.

---

1868 Odonymns have not been discussed by lexicographers. Briefly one might note the well-known W3.t-Hr ‘the ways of Horus’, a term applied to the North Sinai littoral route. A similar W3.t-Hr also occurs in Lower Nubia, for which see Zaba, The Rock Inscriptions of Lower Nubia, 189. In the Biography of Harkhuf, there is the W3.t-bw ‘Elephantine Road’ and the W3.t-wh3.t ‘Oasis Road’ (Urk. 1, 125.1, 14), although these are never mentioned again in Egyptian documents.
to the Red Sea.\textsuperscript{1869} Nesonyms (island-names) are known in two instances, one of which is probably fictive \textsuperscript{[76]}, while the other refers to some inhabited island-group in the southern Red Sea, \textit{Tw.w-Wm.tyw} \textsuperscript{[81A]}.

\subsection*{9.4.3 Generics and Geomorphology}

While one would expect a rather unique geographic lexicon for arid regions, Egyptians seem to have had a fairly limited vocabulary for such features beyond terms such as \textit{hšš.t} ‘hill-country’, \textit{dw} ‘mountain’, \textit{rē} ‘outlet’, and \textit{in.t} ‘valley’. The choronym \textit{hšš.t} denoted a larger section of undulating terrain and \textit{dw} referred to an individual mountain or range within a region (see Fig. 45). The use of the generic \textit{rē} ‘mouth’ seems to be especially orientated to the nature of desert wadis and their openings (confluence), and by association could refer to the wadi itself. The name for a longitudinal wadi was \textit{in.t} \textsuperscript{[12, 16]}, but this is only encountered twice in the corpus. A particular class of generics comprises those that figuratively refer to the landscape, i.e. geomorphological metaphors. The most dominant category are bodypart metaphors, which in this dataset includes \textit{rē} ‘mouth’ \textsuperscript{[25, 26, 58, 59]}, \textit{tp} ‘head’ \textsuperscript{[68]}, \textit{šr.t} ‘nose’ \textsuperscript{[68]}, \textit{šdšl} ‘scalp, crown’ \textsuperscript{[70]}, and \textit{dhn.t} ‘forehead’ \textsuperscript{[T13-T14]}.\textsuperscript{1870} It has been argued that the animal in \textit{Šr.t-tp-wnš.w} \textsuperscript{[68]} is a metaphor for a goat-shaped mountain,\textsuperscript{1871} but, apart from this debatable instance, no other overtly metaphorical language seems to have been used. The words \textit{rē} and \textit{dhn.t} occur so frequently in the Egyptian geographic lexicon that these original metaphors probably became technical geographic terms quite early in Egyptian.\textsuperscript{1872} The word \textit{ht.w} ‘terraces’ \textsuperscript{[64, 85]}, the plural of \textit{ḥt} ‘stair’, represents an interesting geomorphological idea. Based on the context of other placenames that have this generic term (\textit{Ht.yw-šnt.yw, Ht.yw-šs, Ht.yw-Mfkšt}), a translation of ‘range’ or ‘slopes’ in geographic contexts is appropriate, the regular translation of ‘stairs, terraces’ being somewhat unsuitable and forced for these names (see Fig. 44).

\textsuperscript{1869} Pasquali, \textit{BIFAO} 109, 385-395. Pasquali also proposes \textit{pḥ n(y) mi.t-stym} ‘That of the road of the Sea’.

\textsuperscript{1870} Some of these generic elements are described in Gundacker, ‘The Significance of Foreign Toponyms and Ethnonyms in Old Kingdom Text Sources’, in \textit{The Early/Middle Bronze Age Transition in the Ancient Near East: Chronology, C14, and Climate Change} (in press).

\textsuperscript{1871} Gundacker, ‘The Significance of Foreign Toponyms and Ethnonyms in Old Kingdom Text Sources’, in \textit{The Early/Middle Bronze Age Transition in the Ancient Near East: Chronology, C14, and Climate Change} (in press) and also Mumford & Parcak, \textit{JEA} 89, 98 n. 98. As a point of comparison it has been suggested that the name for Abydos, \textit{šbdw}, \textit{šb} ‘elephant’ + \textit{dw} ‘mountain’ was inspired by the shape of the escarpment above this site; see J. Wegner, ‘From Elephant-Mountain to Anubis-Mountain? A Theory on the Origins of the Name Abdju’, in Z. Hawass & J. Richards (eds) \textit{The Archaeology and Art of Ancient Egypt: Essays in Honor of David B. O’Connor}, II, 460, 464-465. However, Takács has provided a completely foreign etymology for the site, see G. Takács, ‘On the possibly Afrasian etymology of Osiris’, \textit{Archiv orientální} 66 (1998), 251-252.

\textsuperscript{1872} As the word \textit{rē} can mean ‘mouth’ or ‘opening’ (\textit{Wb.} 2, 389, 390), one cannot be sure in which sense it is used figuratively.
Built constructions were also fairly common in the desert, and these were noted in toponymy as sites associated with mining expeditions. Quarries or mines could be termed $s\bar{h}l.(w)t$ [34, 41, 49, T20], $ht$ [61, 62], and $bi3$ [55, 55A]. From the contexts in which they are applied, $s\bar{h}l.(w)t$ referred to open-cut quarries, with $ht$ and $bi3$ for galleries and shafts cut into bedrock. The term $hn\text{.}t$ [37, 38, 65] ambiguously designated a well or cistern, while $w\bar{d}-wr$ [79] and $ym$ [77] were technical terms for any large body of water.
9.5 Lexical Opacity and Toponymic Transparency

It is difficult to establish when many placenames arrived in the lexicon, and it is likely that they were exchanged in oral communication well before their first appearance in texts. Nevertheless, it is possible to estimate the degree to which names could be understood by their community. The linguist Edward Sapir, in his seminal article ‘Language and Environment’, attempted to make predictions of the time-period a group has spent in the same environment based on the lexical form of a placename.1873

The case is even clearer when we turn to a consideration of place-names. Only the student of language history is able to analyze such names as Essex, Norfolk, and Sutton into their component elements as East Saxon, North Folk, and South Town, while to the lay consciousness these names are etymological units as purely as are “butter” and “cheese”. The contrast between a country inhabited by an historically homogeneous group for a long time, full of etymologically obscure place-names, and a newly settled country with its Newtows, Wildwoods, and Mill Creeks, is apparent.

Is it possible to assess the semantic intelligibility of placenames for contemporary Egyptians by comparing names with productive elements in the general lexicon? Linguists use the term ‘opacity’ - the ‘failure to analyze a form according to its historical, morphosemantic composition’.1874 Generally, the longer a placename survives amongst a given community, the more ‘opaque’ it will become as the spoken language changes while the ‘conservative’ placename is fossilised in its original form.

Ignoring foreign placenames which are always predisposed to opacity, there are few examples of Egyptian names becoming opaque within this period. But, if the survey was chronologically extended to the Graeco-Roman and Coptic periods, this would increase exponentially. In the longue durée, one can cite numerous examples of Old Egyptian names becoming opaque, some of which are in use to the present day, such as Aswan (Swnt), Atfih (Tp-ihw), and Tell Basta (Pr-Bst.t). 1875 The problem with assessing transparency and opacity in ancient languages is ascertaining whether a linguistic community knows a word without recourse to interviews.1876 But,

---

1875 See Peust, Die Toponyme vorarabischen Ursprungs im modernen Ägypten, 14-15, 24.
1876 A study of opacity in Australian Aboriginal placenames reported widely divergent rates of toponymic intelligibility in different languages, which vary according to chronology, language change and migration; see M. Walsh, ‘Transparency versus Opacity in Aboriginal Placenames’, in L. Hercus, F. Hodges & J. Simpson, The Land is a Map (Canberra, 2002), 43-48.
non-standard orthographies or usage of classifiers may be used to identify opacity/transparency as a product of scribal unfamiliarity with the lexical form.

In cases where the etymological classifier of a placename is preserved, as with some writings of $R3-hnw$ [26] or $Mfk3.t$ [64B], it demonstrates that the placename’s meaning was known at least by some scribes. The semantic transparency of these names, was after all, desirable in an expeditionary context. The placename $R3-3w.t$ [59] is a good example of opacity within this period, where the writings seem to indicate an increasing distance from the original form of $\text{ess} \text{wt}$, after which one finds $\text{e}l \text{t} \text{wt}$, $\text{e}l \text{h} \text{wt}$, $\text{e}l \text{h} \text{w} \text{t}$, and $\text{e}l \text{h} \text{w} \text{t}$. This orthographic divergence may be attributed to the toponym being written in the unrecognizable form of $\text{ess} \text{wt}$, not the regular lexical form of $h3.wt$ ‘quarry’, and thus scribes had difficulty in recognizing the meaning of the name. In one instance, it was modified to $R1-3s.w$, due no doubt to the greater familiarity with the ethneme ‘Shasu’ rather than this obscure placename. Kadmon calls transparent placenames ‘descriptive’, in that they have an intelligible meaning for the people that use the toponym.1877 The general transparency of names in this corpus suggests Egyptians valued the functionality of a placename, and ‘opaque’ names, if they existed at all, were not often favoured or recorded due to their lack of intelligibility.1878 In this study, the functionality and utility of such ‘descriptive’ names was thus the reason for their continued existence.

The loss or replacement of a toponym may be attributed to opacity. The lack of modern reflexes of most placenames in this corpus is ascribable to the general abandonment of mining operations at marginal sites. Toponymic survival requires some sort of steady occupation or visitation for the name to survive in the longue durée. Successive migrations and language changes also contributed to the demise of these toponyms. Even when the Persians renewed quarrying Bekhenstone in the Hammamat, they knew the quarry as $Prs$ (later Πέρσου) not as $Dw-bhn$.1879

1878 To my knowledge, there are very few pre-Egyptian placename in the Nile Valley that would indicate pre-Egyptian inhabitants. The best candidates are the Semitic names in the Delta, for which see Redford, ‘Some observations on the Northern and Northeastern Delta in the Late Predynastic Period’, in Bryan & Lorton (eds), *Essays in Egyptology in honor of Hans Goedicke*, 201-210; Morenz, *Bild-Buchstaben und symbolische Zeichen*, 47-49. But it is hardly likely that Semitic speakers occupied the entire Egyptian Nile Valley. On the writing board from mastaba G2000 at Giza, a number of Nile placenames with no discernible Egyptian meanings are listed. The reading of a number of these toponyms is in doubt, but some appear distinctly non-Egyptian like $R3-hw\dd$ or $Hswt$; see Brovarski, *ASAE* 70, pl. 2.
1879 The meaning of this term is unknown. It has been related to ‘Persia’, see Bülow-Jacobsen, ‘Toponyms and Proskynemata’, in Cuvigny (ed.), *La Route de Myos Hormos*, 55. Thissen, *Enchoria* 9, 86-88 relates $pr$s to a mineralogical term. The best candidate seems a connection to Coptic $\text{φρς}$, $\text{ναρς}$ which Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*, 152 derived from earlier Egyptian $pzn$, but it has a good cognate in North West Semitic $prś$ ‘to scatter’ (see Černý, *Coptic Etymological Dictionary*, 225).
Arabisation of Egypt, as well as the arrival of the Khushman and Maʿaza Bedouin in relatively modern periods probably accelerated the extinction of any surviving pre-Coptic Egyptian placenames in the desert. Indeed, only a small number of placenames in this corpus still exist in contemporary toponymy and they are all non-Egyptian: Naqib el-Hawa for Ḥwīw [51], Bir Amawa for ṣmw [78], and Nahal ʿEteq for ṣlk [54]. Some relative placenames born out of Nile cities like ṫp-ḥw, Dḥw, and Gḥtw survive in modern Atfih, Edfu, and Qift.

9.6 Making Placenames

There are a number of placenames in this study for which it is possible to identify how the name was created. This is particularly apparent in the names of physical constructions like wells, mines and forts, which often bear the name of the king and/or a deity. Linguistically, these ‘coined’ names belong to van Langendonck’s active naming-process, being named at a finite point in time with a pre-existing proprial lemma (the King’s name) coupled with a generic term. In one case [37], this process is even described by an associated dedicatory text. At the temple of Kanais, the text states the local well was founded in ‘the great name of Menmaatre’, presumably bestowed on behalf of the king by Egyptian officials in charge of the construction of the well. The fact that these ‘coined’ names are applied to constructions rather than settlements or areal expanses suggests that there was a deliberate process to identify these sites as benefactions of the King and/or gods. Their location outside Egypt may suggest a deliberate attempt to mark foreign space as territorially Egyptian. This fact is revealed, more clearly, in the names of Seti’s forts in the North Sinai, but also by names in this study such as ‘The Well of Seti-Merenptah’ or ‘the Well of Ramesses, brave in life’ or ‘The fort of /// l.p.h’ [36-38]. Such a ritual coining event was likely replicated for these ‘coined’ placenames:

---

1880 This etymology makes good sense given Aramaic administration of Egypt in the Persian period and the use of the quarry by Aramaic speakers.

1881 Some placenames associated with monastic communities still survive to the present day. Bir Bikheit in the Wadi Arabah has a purported Coptic etymology from Coptic ⲟⲥⲓⲣⲟⲥ ‘The Northern-one’, see Y. Tristant & V. Ghica, ‘Biʾr Biḥit: Preliminary Report on the 2012 Field Season’, BACE 23 (2012), 16. The name Wadi Ḥaraʾon, where there are ancient goldworkings, might presumably be connected to the memory of Egyptian occupation.

KRI 1, 66.11-12.
Van Langendonck’s two part naming-process, however, cannot handle such names as often there is no pre-existing ‘proprial-lemma’.\textsuperscript{1882} For instance, there is no proper noun within the name $Swd\dot{3}t\msf{m}$ $\equiv rd.t\text{ n.t.t im}$ ‘That which prospered its expedition, which gave that which is in it’, but it would be absurd to think that this name was not somehow ‘coined’ at a moment in time when the mine was established. ‘Coined’ names in Egyptian, then, are characterised by their application to artificial structures and their often syntactically complex forms. That these long names occur in frontier regions is also indicative of an attempt to mark it as politically Egyptian. Not incidentally, this process tallies well with other toponymic studies which found a link between renaming and proximity to the ‘political power’.\textsuperscript{1883} This model can explain why politically important sites like forts, mines, and wells could have ‘coined’ names, but marginal sites were left in their conservative or indigenous forms, exhibiting no toponymic change over several thousand years, as with $Pwnt$ or $Tbht$.

The overwhelming majority of placenames in this study belong to van Langendonck’s so-called ‘gradual appellative’ type. These names usually have a more descriptive quality, bear no mark of being coined at any particular point, and result from the ‘semantic bleaching’ of a general descriptor into a proper noun toponym. As this process would only be clearly marked in speech, it is difficult to identify exactly when and how this occurred with most placenames. Almost all compound generic names belong to this category, being descriptors of topographical or geological features. These names are the products of long-term social processes. Take, for instance, relatively simple names like $Dw-n(y)-bl\text{yn}$ ‘Mountain of Bekhen-stone’. This name is a description of a mountain noted for its distinctive stone. It would be unreasonable to see in such a name a deliberate and active attempt at naming, rather, it is a passive process whereby placenames came

\textsuperscript{1882} See Chapter 1.1.
into being through descriptions of their features. Such names might have begun their existence as descriptors created by the explorations of the smn.ty or iꜣꜣꜣꜣw. The smn.ty in particular may have been responsible for the naming and description of many mining sites. For instance, upon discovering amethyst at Wadi el-Hudi, they may have termed it ‘the hill-country-of-Amethyst’ Ḥis.t-n.t-ḥsmn. Only after extended use within a community did such appellations crystallise into placenames in the strict sense. Egyptian toponyms then could broadly be categorised into two types according to their creation: 1) gradual-appellative toponyms that tended to be descriptive and 2) non-organic ‘coined’ placenames that tended to use eponymous and evaluative language.

In this corpus, there is no evidence of ad hoc naming without semantic reference to the named placed, nor the comparatively common practice in other cultures of using pre-existent placenames to name new locations. The meaning of all placenames thus had some inherent connection with their referent landscape, even if the names were not photographically descriptive.
Chapter 10: Conclusion

10.1 Egyptians and their Placenames

The creation of placenames in this region was a recursive process. A placename, in attempting to uniquely describe or name a feature in the landscape, entails a cognitive reaction to the landscape and its features. But, the purpose of the individual in the landscape affects this description. A place is only named because it was visited by the observer, and it is identified and named precisely because it serves some practical purpose worthy of communication to other members of the same community. This explains the propensity of mine names in this corpus, as most names were born out of the experience of an expeditionary apparatus that was interested in geological exploitation. These names are either the location of a resource, or describe the landscape near the resource. Other names, such as the sites of harbours and areal terms, similarly served practical purposes in identifying trade-ports or dividing the desert into broad regions. What should be stressed here is that the social element is important in the creation of the name itself. It is not just the landscape that deterministically affects the creation of the name, but also the people in the landscape. The very existence of a toponym is related to the purpose of the namer(s) in the landscape, and this purpose also affects the semantics of the name itself (Fig. 46). Thus, one toponymist has said of toponyms that they ‘are created by, belong to, and define both persons and place’. According to, toponyms are a historical artefact of both landscape and people. Only after this social process of observation and description was complete could the name circulate amongst the community and be recorded in texts. Non-Egyptian placenames (autonyms) were also created by the same process, although the communication requires another step of inter-cultural contact before it arrives to the ears of Egyptians. These toponyms indicate places where the Egyptians had no first-hand or intimate experience, but relied on foreign informants.

The meaning of Egyptian placenames directly relates to the needs of expeditions in noting mines, wells, harbours and the broad regions where they were located. All Egyptian toponyms are indeed ‘predicates’, in that they say something about the toponym, ‘the subject’. Generally, simple lexical forms predominate in this corpus, which is no doubt attributable to their formation by a descriptive ‘gradual method’, as well as the practical ease by which generic noun phrases can identify generic features within the desert landscape. Generic elements in toponyms served not only to identify the landscape, but also to determine the relative expanse of the referred toponym.

10.2 Territoriality – Placenames and Sovereignty

One of the few ways in which human territoriality differs from that of other animals is that we can extend our claims by naming our environment, which is easier than having to urinate on it every morning.1885

---

Labelling a unit of space with a name in one’s own language is in essence asserting a tacit territorial ownership. But, do the toponyms in this region purport any claims of territorial ownership by Egyptians? The answer is not simple, as principles of territoriality in Egyptian are not monolithic. On the one hand, there are the overtly ideological tropes present in religious and royal spheres which purport a universal ownership of all of creation, corresponding to Loprieno’s *topos*. Concurrently, there is a very real administrative reality (*mimesis*), which was at least tacitly aware that the Egyptian state had limits and boundaries.

Most names in this corpus are not explicit attempts to territorialize foreign topography. Deliberately coined names usually refer to structures and their efficacy, rather than political statements of ownership. The well-names at Wadi Hammamat (‘Festive-Maker-of-Meryre’), Kanais (‘The Well of Seti-Merenptah’), and Wadi Allaqi (‘The well of Ramesses-Meryamun, brave in life’) refer to the King’s benefaction in such constructions, not territory. In eponymously naming these places after the king, the Egyptians integrated these foreign-landscapes into their world system and marked them as their own. Eponymous names are indeed hallmarks of colonial toponymy, with most modern colonial enterprises being marked by the names of their royal or private benefactors. Some other names in this corpus might be administrative in function. The placename *Wtr.t-in.t* ‘District of the Valley’ certainly purports to some kind of administrative district near the Gulf of Suez. In this region there is no data which would point to Egyptians *deliberately* renaming foreign places in attempts to assert sovereignty.

But, the mere presence of Egyptian names speaks of the co-opting of what is essentially foreign territory into the Egyptian territorial sphere. This process is not deliberate or explicit, but is a byproduct of a gradual process of asserting Egyptian hegemony through successive expeditions. So even when indigenous populations had their own names for localities, Egyptians only used these names when they were exceptionally distant from the Egypt or when they were reliant on local populations for resource exploitation. Thus, there was a preference for using Egyptian names in the Eastern Desert and South Sinai, where Egyptian expeditions were a regular occurrence. In essence, as Crocombe’s remarks on ‘human territoriality’ suggest, this is akin to

---

1886 A. Loprieno, *Topos und Mimesis: Ausländer in der ägyptischen Literatur* (Wiesbaden, 1988), 10, 18-34. For an extension of these ideas to explicitly territorial concepts, see Espinel, *Etnicidad y territorio*, 13, 154.


1888 This is perhaps analogous to the Oases (Dakhla, Kharga), where there is very poor data for an Old Kingdom indigenous toponymy in the area (after which it disappears); for the only non-Egyptian names see L. Pantalacci, ‘Broadening Horizons: Distant places and travels in Dakhla and the Western Desert at the end of the 3rd Millennium’, in F. Förste & H. Riemer (eds), *Desert Road Archaeology*, 288-289, 292.
implicitly marking the space as territorially Egyptian. This might be considered an almost passive imperialist enterprise, with each Egyptian name referring to a tacit ownership of the land as Egyptian, even when it was not permanently settled. However, such a toponymic vocabulary had its limits. Egyptians were not prepared to extend this territoriality to Edom or the further Red Sea (Fig. 47), where they could make no pretenses to de facto sovereignty. Thus the boundaries of Egypt’s influence could be marked by toponyms.

![Number of placenames in the Southern Atbai and Red Sea in Egyptian texts and toponomastica](image)

**Figure 47:** Placenames and their affiliation in the Southern Atbai and Red Sea [75-85], including toponomastica [86-133]. There are 64 toponyms in total.

### 10.3 The Peripheral Toponymy of Egypt: patterns in marginal landscapes and language contact

Egyptians in the Eastern Desert, Red Sea and South Sinai were foreigners. The difficulties of desert travel and the purpose of the expeditions that took them there affected their naming practices. Most extant toponyms in this corpus were both a descriptor of the resource and the goal of expeditions. The ‘Myrrh-terraces’, the ‘Mountain of Bekhen’, or ‘The foreign-land of Amethyst’ assert this resource driven vocabulary. Another layer of toponymy existed which was not resource driven, but more descriptive and navigational. These placenames are dominated by markers of geomorphology and local features. Such names could designate a hill, vegetation, or the waters of a wadi, and reveal some intimate knowledge of the local environment. Larger areal placenames (choronyms) were born not so much out of acquaintance with the landscape, as of rather broad ideas as to its relative position or composition.
Figure 48: A model of placenames on the periphery, applied to names in the Sinai (left), Eastern Desert (Middle), and Punt (Right).

This model not only explains the proclivity and raison d’être of toponyms in texts, but also the semantic features of various toponyms. ‘Destination toponyms’ are often named after a resource and ‘local toponyms’ en-route or near to a destination may describe specific landscape features (Fig. 48). In conducting such expeditions in foreign landscapes, the Egyptians also came into contact with foreigners and introduced some of their names into the toponymic lexicon.

A number of pertinent historical observations come from this data which have significant impact on historical geography. From the toponymic record, it seems likely that the Eastern Desert was peopled by foreigners at least as far north as Wadi Hammamat, perhaps by Pre-Beja speakers, while a separate Asiatic group may have sporadically inhabited the region west of the Gulf of Suez. It seems likely that Egyptians in the Sinai occasionally roamed into its hinterland beyond the coastal mineral zone, to travel either to Timna or exploit local copper sources in the region around Saint Catherine’s Monastery. Within the New Kingdom, a new repertoire of Edomite
names arrived in Egyptian vocabulary, revealing a new found awareness of this region. In comparison, most regions of the Eastern Desert seem to have been explored already in the Old Kingdom. Judging from the texts, the Wadi Allaqi region was already explored in the Old Kingdom, with direct geological exploitation occurring in the New Kingdom. Gold mines in the Eastern Desert as far south as the Fifth Cataract ( ámb₁₉) were opened by Egyptians or local Nubian partners. Egyptians sailed on the Red Sea in all historical periods, perhaps as far south as the Eritrean coast, and as far north as the Gulf of Aqaba. Hypothetical extensions of such voyages may also have plied the Arabian coast, but, thus far, there is no firm evidence for this. It is likely that Egyptians met an early (Ethio)semitic and Cushitic population on such Puntite voyages.

This study has demonstrated that toponymy has the ability not only to comment on historical geography and the culture of naming, but can address many questions relating to history, linguistics, and archaeology. Toponyms in this thesis have been able to prove language contact between Egyptians, East Africans, and Asiatics, and can also situate archaeological remains in their proper context, even confirming the presence of pastoral cultures in regions unknown to archaeology. It is hoped that future area studies in toponymy will continue such research. A particularly rewarding avenue for future research would be to apply a semantic typology, akin to the one employed here, to Egyptian names on the Nile Valley, and develop a quantitative sense of how common certain semantic and morpho-syntactic features are in Egyptian toponyms. Such a study could more concretely address questions of morphology in Egyptian toponyms. This could also address the complicated issue of deverbative morphology in placenames. It is hoped that renewed research in African language contact with Egypt will be able to shed more light on African placenames in this thesis, and perhaps develop a systematic apparatus for phonetic correspondences throughout several historical periods. Indeed, it seems likely that with future research in Cushitic and Nilo-Saharan lexicons and onomastics, it may be possible to identify many African placenames in Egyptian documents. This could also be stimulated by further archaeological surveys and epigraphic discoveries, and this work has attempted to define some areas of promising potential in this respect.
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Volume II: Appendix of Texts

This appendix of texts is to be read with the body text of the thesis. Bold numbers in square brackets correspond to a numbered toponym, with decimals referring to individual texts of that toponym in a chronological order. Areal placenames [1-9] are not treated in the appendix. For full references see bibliography. Placenames appear in the established order of Egyptian uniliterals, except in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 where they are ordered by their progression in respective onomastica.
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## Zone 1: Eastern Desert [9-50]

### 3wšk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Number and Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text Type</th>
<th>Date (Dynasty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[9.1] Mirgissa Execration Texts</td>
<td>Koenig, <em>RdÊ</em> 41, 119</td>
<td>(6)...hk3 n(y) 3wšk skr.w nb.w n.ty hn=</td>
<td>(6)...The ruler of Aushek and all the captives are who with him.</td>
<td>Execration Text</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9.3] Theban Execution Texts</td>
<td>Sethe, <em>altägyptischen Tongefässcherben des Mittleren Reiches</em>, 37, pl. 11</td>
<td>hk3 n(y) 3wšk skr.yw nb.w n.t(y)w hn=</td>
<td>The ruler of Aushek, and all the captives who are with him.</td>
<td>Execration Text</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9.4] Theban Execution Texts</td>
<td>Sethe, <em>Die altägyptischen Tongefässcherben des Mittleren Reiches</em>, 39, pl. 11-13</td>
<td>Nhs.y nb.w n.w K3s n.w Mwgr n.w S3t n.w Irs// n.w N' s [n.w R] id3 n.w Irswh t n.w Im 3'n s n.w B3 [n.w] /// m3mw n.w Twks3 n.w B3 h's s n.w M3[k]ij n.w Tbsy n.w G3[r's] n.w 3wšk n.w Wb3 t-s(pt?) n.w T3t n.w B3t n.w Tksls n.w</td>
<td>All the Nehesy of Kush, of Muger, of Shaat, of Ires/// of Nas [of R]ida of Iresukhet, of Imanas, of Ia[a of] ///mamu of Tukes, of Bahasis, of Ma[k]ia, of Ibis, of Ga[r's?] of Aushek, of Webat-s(epet) of Iaaf, of Iaat, of Tjeksis of Megesruia.</td>
<td>Execration Text</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Posener</td>
<td><em>Prince et pays</em>, 52</td>
<td>(9) <em>hk3 3wšk Tghdw skr.yw nb.w n.tyw hn</em>r* =f</td>
<td>The ruler of <em>Aushek</em>, Tjeghedju and all the captives who with him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Posener</td>
<td><em>Prince et pays</em>, 61</td>
<td>(10) <em>Nhš.y nb.w n.w K3š n.w Mwgr</em> (11) n.w <em>Ššt n.w Gwsš n.w Gwbši n.w Gwbi n.w ///kn/// n.w <em>Mw</em>yw</em> (12) n.w *Bš n.w Ḥbšbyt n.w Rwmgt n.w Irsyk n.w Nššmḥ n.w <em>Tri</em>b n.w (13) <em>Irsšwšt n.w Imin</em>s n.w Iš/// n.w Kššy n.w Twššy n.w (14) *Bššfšis n.w Mššš n.w Iššš n.w Grš n.w 3wšk n.w <em>Wbšt-sp.t</em> (15) n.w *Išš št n.w Tšššš n.w Mwgršš n.w Rwš Iwn.tyw Stšy</td>
<td>(10)…All the Nehesy of Kush, of Muger (11) of Shaat, of Gwasai, of Gwabti, of Gwabi, of ///ken///, of Muayu (12) of Iaa, of Khabyt, of Rumegeten, of Iršik, of Nasmakh, of Teria, of (13) Irsukht, of Imanas, of Ima///, of Rakay, of Tuksay, of (14) Bahazis, of Makia, of Ibbes, of Gweru, of <em>Aushek</em>, of Webat-sepet, (15) of Iaat, of Tetjeksis, of Mugesria, of Rush, and the Iuntiu of Sety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Scharff</td>
<td><em>ZÄS</em> 57, pl. 21</td>
<td>(69, 2) <em>spr r niw.t rs.y m hrw pn</em> (69,3) wr n(y) <em>Mdš.yw 3wšk Kwi</em></td>
<td>(69, 2) The arrival to the southern city on this day: (69,3) the ruler of the Medjay of <em>Aushek</em>, Kewi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The table shows a translation of ancient Egyptian inscriptions and their translation into English, with references to scholarly works. The text contains specific names and titles, which are translated into modern English. The table also indicates the page numbers from various sources, such as *Prince et pays* and *ZÄS*.
### **Bhtb**

#### [10.1]

**Wadi Hammamat no. 114**

Couyat & Montet, *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât*, 82-83, pl. 31

- **Expedition Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment H)</th>
<th>&quot;Psnk Tyhtb&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H) Paseneq, Iyheteb</td>
<td>Topographical List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expedition Text 4:** Djedefre

#### [10.2]

**Soleb**

*LD*, III, 88h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment H)</th>
<th>&quot;Psnk Tyhtb&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H) Paseneq, Iyheteb</td>
<td>Topographical List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expedition Text 11:** Montuhotep III

### **Bht**

#### [11.1]

**Wadi Hammamat Goyon no. 23**

Goyon, *Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi* (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;sb3k Bht hr nb = (2) im.y-r3 mS cnyh&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Expedition Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4: Djedefre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hammamat, 57, pl. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[11.2]</strong> Karnak Topographical List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[11.2]</strong> Topographical List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[12]</strong> ḫḥt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[12.1]</strong> Biography of Weni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[12.2]</strong> Semna Dispatch No. 4 (= pBM 10752 recto)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hammamat, 57, pl. 9**

**Urk. IV, 802.**

155. ḫḥt

155. ḫḥt

Topographical List

18: Thutmose III

| **[12]** ḫḥt | | | | | |
| **[12.1]** Biography of Weni | Urk. I, 106.14-107.10 | | | | |
| **[12.2]** Semna Dispatch No. 4 (= pBM 10752 recto) | Smither, JEA 31, pl. 3, 3a | | | | |

**Hammamat, 57, pl. 9**

**Urk. IV, 802.**

155. ḫḥt

155. ḫḥt

Topographical List

18: Thutmose III

| **[12]** ḫḥt | | | | | |
| **[12.1]** Biography of Weni | Urk. I, 106.14-107.10 | | | | |
| **[12.2]** Semna Dispatch No. 4 (= pBM 10752 recto) | Smither, JEA 31, pl. 3, 3a | | | | |

**Hammamat, 57, pl. 9**

**Urk. IV, 802.**

155. ḫḥt

155. ḫḥt

Topographical List

18: Thutmose III

| **[12]** ḫḥt | | | | | |
| **[12.1]** Biography of Weni | Urk. I, 106.14-107.10 | | | | |
| **[12.2]** Semna Dispatch No. 4 (= pBM 10752 recto) | Smither, JEA 31, pl. 3, 3a | | | | |

**Hammamat, 57, pl. 9**

**Urk. IV, 802.**

155. ḫḥt

155. ḫḥt

Topographical List

18: Thutmose III

| **[12]** ḫḥt | | | | | |
| **[12.1]** Biography of Weni | Urk. I, 106.14-107.10 | | | | |
| **[12.2]** Semna Dispatch No. 4 (= pBM 10752 recto) | Smither, JEA 31, pl. 3, 3a | | | | |

**Hammamat, 57, pl. 9**

**Urk. IV, 802.**

155. ḫḥt

155. ḫḥt

Topographical List

18: Thutmose III

| **[12]** ḫḥt | | | | | |
| **[12.1]** Biography of Weni | Urk. I, 106.14-107.10 | | | | |
| **[12.2]** Semna Dispatch No. 4 (= pBM 10752 recto) | Smither, JEA 31, pl. 3, 3a | | | | |

**Hammamat, 57, pl. 9**

**Urk. IV, 802.**

155. ḫḥt

155. ḫḥt

Topographical List

18: Thutmose III

| **[12]** ḫḥt | | | | | |
| **[12.1]** Biography of Weni | Urk. I, 106.14-107.10 | | | | |
| **[12.2]** Semna Dispatch No. 4 (= pBM 10752 recto) | Smither, JEA 31, pl. 3, 3a | | | | |
[12.3] Soleb, Topographical List
Giorgini et al., *Soleb V*, pl. 239

Topographical List 18: Amenhotep III

[12.4] Sesebi, Topographical List
Lepsius, *LD III*, 1411. Photograph courtesy by Dr Kate Spence and Dr Pamela Rose

Topographical List 18: Akhenaton

[12.5] Kom el-Hettan Relief Fragment (Louvre C 18)
Varille, *BIFAO* 35, 164, pl. 3; *Urk. IV*, 1742.15-19

Topographical List 18: Amenhotep III

The hieroglyph for *ihb* appears as a Giraffe (E27), but technically giraffes are never seated in this fashion.

[12.6] Semna Inscription of Merymose
*Urk. IV*, 1659.10-1660.19

(2) /// /// *ḥp.r.n ṣwjyt ṣm.w n3 n(y) ḫrw.w n.w *Tbht*...

(2) /// /// the robbing occurred (?) of the harvest of the enemies of *Ibhet*....

(8)... *Ibht kši.t-ḥr.w ṣj.yw m ib.w=sn mši ḫs3 pš ḫk3 sm3=n=f st ḫr wd

(8)...loud-mouthed *Ibbet*, greatness was in their hearts. The fierce
Expedition Text 18: Amenhotep III
lion, the ruler, he who has killed them under the command of Amun, his noble father. It is he who led him in bravery and strength.

(10) List of the plunder which his majesty brought from the hill-country of Ibhet, the vile:
Living-Nehesy 150-heads
Archers, 110-heads
Nehesy-women, 250-heads

(11) Servants of the Nehesy-people, 55-heads
Their children, 175-heads
total living heads: 740
hands: 312
heads (12) united with the living: 1052
### 12.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zibelius, Afrikanische Orts- und Völkernamen, 197</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) Ṛnu.n n n.f n.(y) [rmחס]  
(2) p.f n.(y) Kš  
(3) Tp-חמי (?)  
(4) Miw  
(5) Triw  
(6) // iḏḥ  
(7) Irn  
(8) P3-Bḥḥ3  
(9) P3-mw-ḥ[ḥ] /// |
| Names for the people (2) of Kush  
3) Tep-heny (?)  
4) Miu  
5) Teriu  
6) /// adja  
7) Irem  
8) The Iabha  
9) The Mu-qed |
| Onomasticon | 19 |

### 13 Ikyt

#### 13.1 Luxor, statue base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>el-Razik, MDAIK 27, 222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topographical List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 13.2 Statue base (Louvre A18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varille, BIFAO 35, 164, pl. 3; Urk. IV 1742.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ti-Irt 2. Ikyt 3. Rbwł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ta-iret 2. Ikyet 3. Rebul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographical List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 13.3 Amada Stele (Cairo JdE 41806)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urk. IV, 1963.9-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (3)...ist ḫm-f /// /// /// /// /// /// hrw n.(w) ḫš.t Ikyt  
(3)...Now his majesty /// /// /// /// /// /// enemies of the hill-country of Ikyet |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expedition Text</th>
<th>18: Akhenaton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) <em>nsw bi.ty ˈnh m mỉt nb tḥ.wy Nfr-hpr.w--Rʾw sỉ Rʾ ˈnh m mỉt nb hỉ.i.w ḥỉ-n-im […]</em> (3) ḫʾi.w ḫr [s.i] it=ḥ pỉ ʿtn mỉ Rʾ m p.t tḥ rʾn b ʾst ḫm=ḥ [m ʾḥ.t=ṭn ʾw ṭd n ḫm=ḥ (4) nỉ n(y) ḫrw n(y) ḫš.t Iky(t) kšy.n= [sn ḫš t ḫm. t ḫši=ṣn r tḥ] (5) Ṣḥy ḫr Ṣḥm ʾḥt nb r=in /// /// (6) Ṣw. in ḫm=ḥ ḫr Ṣḥ. t Ṣm ḫn pỉ sỉ-nw [n(y) ḫš] /// /// (7) [ḥr.]w ḫn(y) ḫš.t Ikyt…</td>
<td>(2) The King of Upper and Lower Egypt who lives in truth, lord of the Two-Lands Neferkheperure /// /// (3) who has appeared upon the throne of his father, the Aton like Re in heaven and earth every day. Now his majesty was [in Akhetaten (when) one came to say to his majesty]: (4) the enemies of the hill-country of Ikyet [they] have planned [rebellion against Egypt, they descending to the land of (5) the Nehesy seizing everything which one lives (upon) for themselves /// /// (6) Then his majesty commissioned the King's son [of Kush and Overseer of southern foreign lands to gather an army to overthrow these] (7) enemies of the hill-country of Ikyet [men as well as Expedition Text 18: Akhenaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13.5]</td>
<td><strong>Sesebi, Topographical List</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>LD, III, 141m.</em> Confirmed by line drawing made available by Dr Kate Spence and Dr Pamela Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13.6]</td>
<td><strong>Karnak, Topographical List</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Müller, Egyptological Researches I, pl. 56</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographical List</td>
<td>18: Horemheb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[13.7]</strong> 10th Pylon Karnak, Statue base.</td>
<td>Legrain, <em>ASAE</em> 14, 30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[13.8]</strong> Wadi es-Sebua, stele of Setau (Cairo JdE 41395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helek, <em>SAK</em> 3, 90; <em>KRI</em> III, 93.9-11</td>
<td>(13)…*ḫšk pš hpš tnr n(y) Pr-⁴ pšy nb nfr pš tš n(y)Trm h[sy kšfḥ p]š] (14) wr n(y) <em>Ikyt</em> hn” hm.t=ḥrd.w=ḥ is.tw=ḥ nb hw(=i) m ṭš pd.t m ṣḥm [wš.t] ḫ hr ḫš†t mš†=ḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[13.9]</strong> Kuban Stele (parallel text also at Aksha)</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> II, 355.4-358.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9). iw wn nbw ṣš hr ḫš.t<em>Ikyet</em> hr wi.t ksn.ti hr mw r-ikr ir šm.t nhw.w m (10) nš† nr.w n(w) i* nbw r= gs ʂm ir.y nš† n.ty hr spr r= mwt.in=šn n itb.t hr wi.t</td>
<td>(9)…There is much gold upon the hill-country of <em>Ikyet</em>, but the road is difficult because of water; if a few (10) of the sievers and gold-washers went on it (the road), half of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expeditions Text</th>
<th>Ramesses II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>19: Ramesses II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them that reached it (Ikyet) then died because of thirst upon the road...

19)... As for the hill-country of Ikyet, this was said concerning it: The king’s-son of Kush said about it before his majesty: “It was a difficult situation because of the water since the time of the god. One dies on it because of thirst. Every king of the past desired to open a well upon it...

(26)// half of the road to Ikyet...

(28) Is there water on the road to the hill-country of Ikyet?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[13.13]</strong> Aniba, Tomb of Penniut</td>
<td><strong>KRI VI</strong>, 353.5</td>
<td>(8) May the ka of the Pharaoh l.p.h, your lord, praise you, the one who is confident of (9) that which you do in the hill-countries of the Nehesy to the hill-country of Ikyet, you bring the tribute as plunder before the Pharaoh</td>
<td><strong>Tomb Biography</strong> 20: Ramesses VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Letter 20: Ramesses IX


Helek, JARCE 6, 148

(38)...hm-ntr tp.y lmn.w-RC.w nsw ntr.w RC.w-msl-s(w)-nh.t (hr) dd n (39) Nhys.t III mh.yt 'ny-n3 Nhys (40) [II] mh.yt sis.nwt Nhys.t III mh.yt Tr(41)bdi Nhys.w III pd.wt n.(I) h3s.t Ik(42)dt...

(70) ml.t n.(I) t3 hy.w n.ty iw=s t n n3 Nhys.w t3 mh.yt Nhys.yw (71) n.(w) t3 Ik.t i:smi m pd.wt r n3 (72) hy.w n.(y) s3s w n.(y) Mw-kd r rdi.t st p3 hp$ t(n)r n.(y) pr-35 c.w.s n p3 (73) iwt

(38)...The first prophet of Amun-Re, king of the gods, Ramessesnakht said to (39) the Nubian who wore the feather Anytna, the Nubian (40) who wore the feather Sisenut, the Nubian who wore the feather Tere(41)bedi, and the Nubians who took the bows of the hill-country of Ik(42)yet..

(70) The copy of the provisions which were for the Nubians who wore feathers and the Nubians of the land of Ikyet who went forth as soldiers against the enemies of the Shasu of Mu-qed in that the strong arm of the Pharaoh l.p.h. throw them to the ground.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14.1</th>
<th>Idações</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Hammamat no. 114</td>
<td>Couyat &amp; Montet, <em>Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât</em>, 83, pl. 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) *hib.n* (10) [w(i) *nb(=)*  
*iñh(w) wñj(i, w)] *snb.w* r  
*sbl.t* *kbn.yt* r *Pwnt* r *ini.t* n  
*ñt.yw* wñj *m-ç.w* *hñjç.w*  
*hr.y-ib* dšr.t n *sndf h.t*  
*h3s.wt* *hÇ.n pri.kwi m*  
*Gbtw*…

(13)… *iw gr.t* *iri.n(=i)* *hnmt*  
12 m *bï.t* (14) *hnmt* 2 m  
*Idações* h.t *mh* 20 m *wç.t* *ht* *mh*  
30 m *k.t* *iri.n(=i)* *k.t* m *I3htb*  
*mh* 10 r 10 *hr*  *=* *nb* n *sm3*

(10) [(My) lord l. p.] h. sent me to  
conduct kebenet-  
ships to Punt in  
order to bring for  
him fresh myrrh  
from the rulers  
who are in the  
middle of the  
desert, because of  
his fear  
throughout the  
hill-countries.  
Then I went forth  
from Coptos…

(13)… Now I  
made 12 wells in  
the bush, (14) 2  
wells in *Idahet*,  
20 cubits on one  
(side), 30 cubits  
on the other), I  
made another in  
Iaheteb, 10 cubits  
by 10 cubits on  
each (side)
### [15] \( W^3g > Gw^3 \)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[15.1]</strong> Wadi Hammamat no. 114</td>
<td>Couyat &amp; Montet, <em>Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât</em>, 83, pl. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)...( i.n (=i) n = f , in.w , nb(.w) , gmi.(=i) , hr , idb.w , T^3-ntr , h^3i.(=i) , hr , W^3g , R^3-hnw )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)...I brought all produce for him which I found upon the shores of God's-Land, I descended upon Wag and Ra-Henu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11: Montuhotep III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [16] \( W^r.t-in.t \)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F+4) // /// ( wnh.t , kbn.t , igr , ts.t , im = sn ) (F+5) // /// // /// // /// // /// ( r , m , B^t , W^r.t-In.t ) (F+6) // /// ( k^3.t , tn , r , dr = \ldots )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F+4) ... clothing of the kebenet-ship, now the crew was in it (F+5) ... ... (?) from Bat, the <em>District of the-Valley</em> (F+6) ... this work to its limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5: Djedkare-Iseesi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [17] \( W^b^3.t-sp.t \)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[17.1]</strong> Helwan Execratin Text (No 63955)</td>
<td>Posener, <em>Cinq figurines d'Envoûtement</em>, 45, pl. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) ( Md^3.y , (2) , nb.w , n.w , W^b^3.t-sp.t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) All Medjay (2) of Webat-sepet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Execution Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (early)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17.2] Helwan Execratin Text (No 63956)</td>
<td>Posener, <em>Cinq figurines d'Envoûtement</em>, 45, pl. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17.3] Mirgissa Execration Text (COG 1)</td>
<td>Koenig, <em>RdÉ</em> 41, 118-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17.4] Mirgissa Execration Text (COG 2)</td>
<td>Koenig, <em>RdÉ</em> 41, 120-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Mirgissa Execution Text (BIC 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) $hk3 \ n(y) K(i)$ $\text{Tri}$ $hk3 \ n(y) \ Sz'$ $\text{B}3$ $hk3 \ n(y) \ W[b3]t-sp.t \ B'kwyt \ (2) \ dd(w)$ $n=f \ T'i \ hk3 \ n(y) \ 3wšk$ $Md3.y \ W3h-ib \ Nh$ $n.b.w \ n.w \ K38 \ n.w \ Sz'$ $n.w \ Wb3.t-sp.t \ Twnytw \ m \ Sfy$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) The ruler of Kush Teriahi, the ruler of Shaat Khasa, the ruler of Webat-sepet, Bakwayt (2) who is called Tjai, the ruler of Awshek, the Medjay, Wah-ib and all the Nehesy of Kush, of Shaat, of Webat-sepet and the Iuntiu of Sety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution Text</td>
<td>12 (early)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.6</th>
<th>Luxor Execution Text</th>
<th>Sethe, <em>Die altägyptischen Tongefässcherben des Mittleren Reiches</em>, 34, pl. 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A3) $hk3 \ n(y) \ Wb3.t-sp.t \ Twny$ $n.b.w \ n.w \ Hn'=f$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A3) The ruler of Webat-sepet Bakwayt, who is called Tjay, born of Ihaas, born of Wenkat and all the captives who are with him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution Text.</td>
<td>12 (early)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.7</th>
<th>Luxor Execution Text</th>
<th>Sethe, <em>Die altägyptischen Tongefässcherben des Mittleren Reiches</em>, 34, pl. 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A4) $hk3 \ n(y) \ Wb3t-sp.t \ Twny$ $m.\ Gmhwy \ msi.y \ n(y) \ Ti///$ $skr.w \ nb.w \ Hn'=f$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A4) The ruler of Webat-sepet Iaweny born of Gemhu, borne of Ti/// and all the captives who are with him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution Text</td>
<td>12 (early)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.8</th>
<th>Bruxelles Execution Text A.3 (E7440)</th>
<th>Posener, <em>Prince et pays</em>, 50, pl. 1, 37-38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(37) $hk3 \ Wb3.t-sp.t$ $Tt3w \ (38) \ skr.yw \ nb.w \ Hn'=f$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37) The ruler of Webat-sepet, Itjaw, and (38) all the captives who are with him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution Text</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17.9]</td>
<td>Bruxelles Execration Text A.4 (E7440)</td>
<td>Posener, <em>Prince et pays</em>, 52, pl. 1, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17.11]</td>
<td>Memphis, relief fragment of the Annals of Amenemhat II</td>
<td>Malek &amp; Quirke, <em>JEA</em> 78, 14-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[18.1]</th>
<th>T3-wh.yt-b3k-nbw/T3-wh.yt-p3-nbw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pAnastasi V1</td>
<td>Gardiner, LEM, 77.10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(w)p₃₆⁺w r-ššm dbn</th>
<th>1 ¾ (w)p₃₆⁺w dbn 120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zty ḫ₂₃ t</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š₂š h₂₃ t</td>
<td>2 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š₃b t ḫ₂₃ t</td>
<td>13/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wd₃(w)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p₃t</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š₃srw</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

electrum, 1 ¼ deben and remainder malachite, 120 deben zeti-ochre, 11 sacks Shaasekh-plant, 2 ¼ sacks Shabet-plant, 13/32 sacks and the remainder bows, 4 arrows, 20

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Large smooth Tjepet-ochre, 1
Shesat-incense, 280 sacks Christ’s thorn, 5 sacks Headrest, 7
Large Meshesh-wood, 15 bulls, 3
Gazelle, 14
Wigs, 164
Giraffe tail, 11
Ebony, 1

(68)…šdm= (68) p₃ h₂₃b
i:iri nbḥ [… m] (69) ḫ₂₃ t š₂š m P₃-h₃m
n(y) […] w.n ty ḫ₃₃ s₃-w₃-Gbtw (70) r T3-wh.yt-p3-nbw m₃w= ḫ₃₃ t (67)…I heard (68) the letter which my lord sent to me… (69) measuring as far as The-fortress-of- […] l.p.h. which is in The-hill-country-of-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Papyrus or Document</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
<th>Column(s)</th>
<th>Text (Translation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[18.2]</td>
<td>Goyon, <em>ASAE</em> 49, 360</td>
<td>pTurin 1879, 1899 and 1869</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Coptos (70) to <strong>The-Settlement-of-gold</strong>, and he measured as far as <strong>The-settlement-of-gold</strong> to The-Mountain of-Mentu (71). The letter [...] Amuneminet (72), I placed one of the Medjay with him, he measured together with these [...] nmi (?) m n3y=sn hnnm.wt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18.3]</td>
<td>Goyon, <em>ASAE</em> 49, 382</td>
<td>pTurin 1879, 1899 and 1869</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>The houses of <strong>The settlement of working gold</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18.4]</td>
<td>Helck, <em>JARCE</em> 6, 149</td>
<td>pCairo ESP, Document C-D</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 19.1 Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058)

- **Gardiner, JEA 4, pl. 9**

| B3w-dšr.t | (9)…ḥi.(=) n(=) m ḫtp r ẖḥ = ṭ ini.(=) n(=) ṭ p.w ḫš.wt m b3? m3 n(,y) B3t (10) b3 psd n(,y) Thwìw b3 rwd n(,y) Mnt-k³w m mft.t ḫrr.wt ḫšbd n(,y) Tfr.r.t (11) m s3hr.t tp.dw.w ht-²w³ m Dw-n(,y)-Hstyw r3-nṭt m B³w{k}-(12)dšr.t m mdw R³-S³wt msd(mt n.t Khbw |

- *(9)*…(I) returned in peace to his palace, and (I) brought for (him) the best of the hill-countries, as new-metal of Bat (10) shining metal of Ihuu, strong metal of Men-kau, as turquoise of Hererutet, lapis-lazuli of Teferret (11) as saheret of the summits-of-the-mountains, *ht²w³* from the mountain-of-Heztu, *r³-nṭt* from *B³wṭ-of-the-* (12) *dšr.t* as sticks from Ra-Shaaut eye-paint of Kehebu

### 20.1 Abusir, Funerary Temple of Sahure

- **Borchardt, Das Grabdenkmal Des Sahu-re, Band, II, Blatt I**

| B³k.t | Baket | Caption, Tribute scene | 5: Sahure |

- *(12)* *B³k.t*
| [20.2] | **Mersa Gawasis, Stele of Ankhow** | Sayed, *RdÉ* 29, 162 | (10) *in.w* [p]*u i̯b.n=sn r B3kt /// m /// /// | (10) this produce, they united at Baket /// /// | Expedition Biography | 12 |

**[21]**

who is directing /// [in] Bat///

[21.3] Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058)  
Gardiner, *JEA* 4, pl. 9

(9). .. *iyn(4) m htp r  sri s*w* m b'i? n(y) B Immutable (10) b'i psd n(y) Thu(w) b'i rwd n(y) Mn-kw m mfs.t Hrr.wt hsbd n(y) Tfr.r.t (11) m s3hr.t tp.t-dw.w ht-swi m Dw-n(y)-Hstwy r3-ntt m B3w[k]-H (12)dšr.t m mdw R3-S3w mšdm.t n.t Khbw  
9) ...(I) returned in peace to his palace, and (I) brought for (him) the best of the hill-countries, as new-metal of Bat (10) shining metal of Ihuiu, strong metal of Men-kau, as turquoise of Hereret, lapis-lazuli of Teferet (11) as saheret of the summits-of-the-mountains, *ht-swi* from the mountain-of-Heztu, r3-ntt from B3wt-of-the-(12)desert, as sticks from Ra-Shaaut eye-paint of Kehebu.

Expedition Text

11-12

[22] B3 Immutable

[22.1] Funerary Temple of Djedkare Relief block  
Grimm, *SAK* 12, pl. 1

Caption in a dedication scene (?).  
5: Djedkare Isesi

The-Land-of-Gold-and-Electrum: Batj, Seneh, Hezetj
<p>| [23] Bi3.t-T3b.t(y)T-3bw | <strong>Urk. IV</strong> 825.10-826.8 | (1) [rj.t htp.w-ntr wšh.n nsw-bi.ty Mnh-pr-Rc.w] (2) /// /// [r ˌriː.t hši.yt.n tt=f] (3) Imn.w n mw.t=f Sti.t ˈnk.t m ḭr.t n.t Imn.w (4) n.t(y)t hr Bi3.t-T3b.t(y)T-3bw | 1) [List of the god's offerings which the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Menkheperre laid down:] (2) /// /// [in order to perform that which his father] (3), Amun praises, for his mother Satet and Anukis in the shrine of Amun (4), who are upon (the)- Eastern-mining-country-of-Elephantine. | Dedication Text | 18: Thutmose III |
| [24.1] | <strong>Urk. I</strong>, 209.15-16 | (2)...im.y-rǐ pr ḥr.y-wdb Mrt šd ḫ3 im.y-rǐ n.w MdB3 ḫm3 Irṭt | (2) Overseer of the house of reversions of offerings, Meri, the inspection of interpreters of Medja, Yam, and Irjet | Title | 6: Pepi I |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[24.2]</th>
<th><strong>Urk. I</strong> 100.14-109.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abydos,</strong> Biography of Weni</td>
<td>(14) $\text{iri.n } hm\text{=} M\text{^s}$ n(y) $\text{db3.w } 533.w$ m $\text{Sm}^\text{r} mi\text{-}kd\text{=} M\text{^n}t.y$ m $\text{3bw mh.t Mdny.t}$ m $\text{T3-mh.w}$ m $\text{m-gs.wy pr mi-kd=nn}$ (15) m $\text{Sdr}$ m $\text{Hn-sdr}$ m $\text{Trt.t}$ Nhs.y $\langle m\rangle$ $\text{MdB}$ Nhs.y $\langle m\rangle$ $\text{1m3}$ Nhs.y (16) m $\text{W3w3.t}$ Nhs.y m $\text{K3w}$ Nhs.y m $\text{13-tmhw}$ 14) His majesty made an army of many tens of thousands in the entirety of Upper Egypt, south from Elephantine, north (to) Medenyt, from Lower Egypt and the whole two sides of the house, (15) from Sedjer and Khensedjer, from Irtjet Nehesy, from Medja-Nehesy, from Yam Nehesy, (16) from Wawat Nehesy, from Kaawu Nehesy, and from the Land of the Tjemehu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24.3]</td>
<td><strong>Urk. I, 111.7-11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rock Inscription near Philae</strong></td>
<td>(45) ...$\text{h3b } \langle wi\rangle$ $\text{hm=fr}$ $\text{3d mr}$ 5 (46) $\text{Sm}^\text{r}$ $\text{iri.t}$ wš$h.wt$ 3 $\text{s3t.w}$ 4 $\text{m snq}$ n(y) $\text{W3w3.t st hkJ3.w}$ $\text{h3s.wt}$ n.w $\text{Trt.t}$ $\text{W3w3.t Trtt}$ $\text{MdB}$ (47) $\text{hr st3}$ h.t (i)r=$\text{s}$ (45) His majesty sent $\langle me\rangle$ to cut 5 canals (56) in Upper Egypt (and) to make 3 barges and 4 ships from acacia wood of Wawat; now the rulers of hill-countries of Irtjet Wawat, Yam, and Medja (47) dragged wood for it...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 6: Merenre | Expedition Biography | 6: Merenre | Expedition Text | 6: Merenre |
| [24.4] Rock Inscription near Philae | Urk. I, 110.12-16 | (3) ( mnp.t-sp 5 ) ibd 2 ( \text{šmw sw 24} ) (4) ( \text{iwi.t} ) ( nsw ) ds=( \text{ḥf} ) s3 jh3s.t ( (5) ) st jh3j.w n.w ( \text{Medja} ) ( \text{Irtjet W3w3.t htr sn t} ) ( \text{ḥl.t i3w3} ) j3 wr.t | (3) Year 5, second month of Shemu, day 24 (4), the arrival of the king himself, he standing behind (this) hill-country (5), now the rulers of Medja, Irtjet, and Wawat kissed the earth and gave very great praise. | Expedition Text | 6: Merenre |
| [24.5] Execution Texts, ‘Große Figur’ | Osing, MDAIK 32, 146 | Every Nehsey who will rebel in Irtjet, Wawat, Zatju, Yam, Kaa, lankh, Masit, Medja, and Metereti, who will rebel and who will act and plot and who will say any evil word. | Execution Texts | Dynasty 5 or 6 |
| [24.6] Elephantine papyri (pBerlin 8869: Letter concerning the crimes of Sabni) | Smither, JEA 28, 17 | (12) ( \text{hw gr m33.n smrw-wf ty im, y-r't} ) pr Htp nfr-n ४७ sn=k im n j3.t n.t ( \text{Medja} ) ( \text{W3w3.t} ) (13) n-mrw.t [nfr n] ( \text{iri.n sn=k msdd} ) [s3=k] | (12) Furthermore, the sole-friend and steward Hetep has seen (that) your brother (=I) did not wait for the troops of Medja and Irtjet, so that your brother (=I) did not do that which [your scribe] hates | Letter | Dynasty 6-Dynasty 8 |
| <strong>[24.7]</strong> | Qubbet el-Hawa, Tomb of Setka | <strong>Edel, Seyfried, Vieler, Die Felsgräberne kropole der Qubbet el Hawa bei Assuan. I, III, 1743–744, pl. 82</strong> | (2)...iw=i hnt[i?] r T3-sti 3bw gmi.n (i=) g(i.t) t iy.t m Tm hft (i)h.t nb.(t) iy.t(i) m MD8 (3) iw [ini?] n(=i) 7nt.yw m Kbn nbw hnti(?) m T3-ntr ini.(w) n(=i) sntr n(y) Bm hbn(y) m Wnt.t (4) m /// /// /// m /// Nb gif.w m S3tw. | 2)...[I] went southwards towards Ta-Sety and Elephantine and then (I) discovered the deliveries coming from Yam, while everything was coming from Medja. (3) (I) [brought] myrrh from Byblos, gold and copper from God’s-Land, incense of Yam, ebony from Wetjenet (4) /// /// /// /// from /// Nab(?), and monkeys from Satju were brought to me. | <strong>Expedition Text, Tomb Biography</strong> | Dynasty 9 |
| <strong>[24.8]</strong> | Denderah Chapel Rear Wall (Cairo JE 46068) | <strong>Habachi, MDAIK 19, 22</strong> | (1) '[m]'3 hAs.wt i3h.ty(w) t dU.w hrw-nm.t t zm.ywt btk Nhst.yw (2) /// [dr.ty (?) rs.y [mh.w] MD8.w W3w.t Tmn.w [phw.w] in Hr.w Ntr[-hd.t] nsw-bi.ty | (1)...Clubbing the eastern hill-countries, striking the mountains, being easy-of-gait in the deserts, enslaving the Nubians (2) /// [two hands?] Upper Egypt, [Lower Egypt], Medja, Wawat, and Tjemehu [the marshes] by the Horus Netjerhedjet, King of Upper and Lower Egypt | <strong>Rhetorical Text</strong> | 11: Mentuhotep II |
| (24.9) Qubbet el-Hawa, Tomb of Sarenput | Urk. VII, 2.1 | (5) ...smi [n]=f in.w Med3 m bkt.w hkt3.w [n.w?] h3s.wt | (5) ...one who reports the produce of the Medja to him as the taxes [of] the rulers of hill-countries. | Epithet of Official | 12: Senwosret I |
| Lahun Papyri, UC 32185 (UCL Papyri) | Griffith, Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob, pl. 20 | (61) h3s.jt n.t Med3.w | (61) Khesayt-oil of Medjay | Administrative Text | 12 |
| Papyrus Ebers, 19-34 | Ebers, Papyros Ebers: Das Hermetische Buch, pl. 33 | (21) h3s.jt n.t Med3.w | 21) Khesayt-oil of Medjay | Medical Text | 12 |
| Louvre C30/Cairo 20089: Hymn to Min | Sethe, Ägyptische Lesestücke, 65.16-20 | dw3=Mn.w sk3i=i Hr.w f³t ³.w i-nd- hr=k Mn.w m pri.t=f k3i šw.ty s³ Wsir msi.n ³.x.t nṯr(y)t wr m sn.wt ³3 m lpw Gbtyw Hr.w tm³ ³.w nb ṣfš.ti sgr ṣbw.w iti.y nṯr.w nb.w wr bd.t h3i=f Med3 ṣfš.t ty m T3-sty Wtn.ty i(x)w (?) h3 (?| I praise Min and I exalt Horus, the one who raises the arm. Hail to Min in his procession, high of the two plumes, son of Osiris, whom Isis the goddess bore, great in the Senut, great in Ipu and Coptos, Horus, strong of arm, lord of awe, who silences threats, sovereign of all gods, great of scent as he descends from Medja, respected one of Ta-Sety, | Hymn to Min | Middle Kingdom |
| [24.13] | Vernus, <em>RdE</em> 37, pl. 16 (p. 141-143) | (x+1) ... hpr.w hr-h3.t ...(x+2) 3w-ib=ʃ stn.n=f ʃnt rh.yt rs-tp wr.t tp ḫrp.yt=ʃ /// (x+3) im;i sw3h.n=f ḫb wr.t sǐ.t n nsw ḫr rs-tp=ʃ ḫbhb ḫ3w[t] (x+4) n.w(t) M[ʤә].ly r ġ(r) k3 n ntr=ʃ m g3(w).t n.t ngʒ | x+1) /// the ones who were before /// (x+2) He lengthened his heart, (and) he was distinguished in front of mankind, and was very watchful upon his administration /// (x+3) who was gracious. He extended great festivals. Whom the king recognised because of his vigilance, who traversed the <em>Hill-countr[i]es</em> (x+4) of the Me[dja]ly in order to seek cattle for his god, in taxes of long-horned-cattle | Biographical text | Late Middle Kingdom |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[24.14]</td>
<td>Hymn to Amun-Re (pBoulaq 17; pBM 9988; Stele Bankes 4)</td>
<td>Luiselli, <em>Der Amun-Re Hymnus des P. Boulaq 17</em>, 43, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A 1, 4) nb $\text{Md}3.w$ $h\kappa3$ Pwn... (A, 2.4-5) wr $\text{id}.t$ $h\kappa3=!$ $\text{Md}3.w$ $nfr-\text{hr}$ $iyi&lt;!$ $m&gt; T3-ntr$</td>
<td>(A, 1.4) Lord of Medjay, ruler of Punt... (A, 2.4-5) great of scent as he descends from Medjay, beautiful of face as he comes from God's-Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For parallel versions of the text see Luiselli, <em>Der Amun-Re Hymnus des P. Boulaq 17</em>, xxii.</td>
<td>Hymn; epithets of Amun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Early New Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X+3) $[M\text{d}3]$ $m-k\text{d}.t$ $n.t\text{t} m?...$</td>
<td>X+3) the entire [Me]dja, because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Stele (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24.16]</td>
<td>Deir el-Bahari, Temple of Hatshepsut, relief fragment.</td>
<td>Urk. IV 318, N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[I$r\text{n}.w-R\text{c}.w$ nb $M\text{d}3$ $h\kappa3$ Pwn[t] /// ///]</td>
<td>[Amun-Re, lord of Medjaï, ruler of Pun[t]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown; Epithet of Amun-Re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18: Hatshepsut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The text might be the same as [24.14], although this cannot be confirmed due its fragmentary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73. $T\text{tw}$ 74. $If\text{t}$ 75. $M\text{tw}$ 76. $Tn\text{t}$ 77. $Hb$ 78. $M\text{d}3$ 79. $B\text{ht}$ 80. $M\text{ntw}$</td>
<td>73. Iaw 74. Ifet 75. Matu, 76. Tjenet 77. Heb 78. Medja 79. Betjbetj 80. Mentu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topographical List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18: Thutmose III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>Temple of Kumma, Biographical Inscription of a Nubian Viceroy, Inebny or Amenemnehku</td>
<td>(4) <em>mh-lb nsw hr wp.t n.(t) t3 iwi n=ff g3.(w)t n.(t) MdB.w</em> (5) <em>nbw n.(y) h3s.t nb.t s3-nsw im.y-r3 h3s.wt rsy.t</em> /// ///</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>Tombos, Rock Inscription of Inebny/Amenemnehku</td>
<td>(x+6) [dd=ff ink b3k] 3h n.(y) nb=ff mh.(w) pr=ff m [nbw] hnm.t 3bw hbn.v ti-sps (x+7) [Inm? 3b]v hs.yt snr n.w MdB.w (x+8) [m?] sps.w Kš hš[.t] s'r.w r 'h n.(y) nb ñ.y wy 'k hši.w pri mr.w s3-nsw lmn[-mnhw]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the lacunae see the parallels for the list of goods in Davies, *BMSAES* 10, 43, n. k
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List fragment</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1340, K</td>
<td>K) 'tw 'Ifi M3tw 'Tm Hbw MD3 Trm K) Iau, Ifetj, Matu, Tjeten, Hebu, Medja, Irem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.21</td>
<td>Temple of Kumma, Inscription of Seni</td>
<td>Caminos, Semna-Kumma II, pl. 20-22; Urk. IV, 142.2-6</td>
<td>(1) di.w (=i) m hsi.t hr nsw r h3.ty-f n(y) niw.t rsy.t im.y-r3 šnw.t n[t Tmn.w] (2) s3-nsw im.y-r3 h3.s wt rsy.wt Sni sip.n=f MD3 (3) mi-kd=f n c3.t n( ) mnj=f hr ib n(y) nsw t3.wy c.w.s (1) I was appointed through the favour of (lit. by) the king as the mayor of the southern city (and) overseer of the two granaries [of Amun]. (2) The King's-son overseers of the southern hill-countries Seni, (after) he inspected Medja (3) in its entirety because of the greatness of his excellence upon the heart of the king of the two-lands l.p.h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical list of Seti I</td>
<td>KRI I, 29.6</td>
<td>64. K33im 65. /// 66. /// 67. /// 68. /// 69. MD3 70. Iwši 64. Kaaim 65. /// 66. /// 67. /// 68. /// 69. Medja 70. Iushi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24.24]</td>
<td>Černý, Le Temple d’Amada V, pl. 4-5; KRI IV, 33.5-34.2</td>
<td>(2) *Hrw-nbw nb snd t3 šy(t) nsw bty nb t3-wy wʃ Kdr B3-n-Rcw Mriry-lmn.w s3-Rcw nb h3.w hʃ Rbw ini-ph.w st Mriry-n-Pth ḫtp-ḥr-M3.t dl(w) (3) *nḥ ntr nfr mši r H3rw k3 nḥt r Kš r sm3 T3-Mdb.y</td>
<td>Eπθet in Military Expedition against Wawat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>*R3-Qd.yt</td>
<td>(2) Golden-Horus, lord of fear, great of respect, king of Upper and Lower Egypt, lord of the two lands, subduer of Gezer Baenra-Mery-Amun, son of Re, lord of appearances who plunders the Libu and kills them, Merenptah, Hetephermaat, given life (3) May the good god live! Lion against Khor, strong bull against Kush, so as to destroy the Land-of-the-Medjay</td>
<td>19: Merneptah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[25.1]</td>
<td>CT VI, 212</td>
<td>(212m) ini.w n=f nbw n(.y) h3s.wt (213a) *nt.yw n(.y) T3-ntr t3.t n.t h3w-nb.wt in Hrw-sms.w (b) thn.w n.t ḫnw (c) ḫsb n(.y) Tfrr.wr (d) shy.t n.t Hbs (e) mfk3.t Mfg.w [t3.t n.t *R3-Qd.yt (g) hrs.t n.t Šy.t]</td>
<td>Funerary Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(212m) Gold of the hill-country, (213a) myrrh of God’s-Land, and costly stones of the Aegean-Islanders were brought to him by Horus the elder (b) (also) faience of Libya (c) lapis lazuli of Tefreret (d), sehit-stone of Hebekes(e), turquoise of Mefgat, costly-stones of Ra-Adjit, (g) and carnelian of Shait.</td>
<td>Early Middle Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26]</td>
<td>R3-hnw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[26.1]</strong> Kom el-Momanien, Tomb of Shemai</td>
<td>Mostafa, <em>ASAE</em> 71, 184, pl. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) <em>pri.t</em> [r] <em>R3-hnw</em> <em>m-sp</em> 2 (3) <em>r iwi(t) inr ṣps [m]</em> ///</td>
<td>(2) Going out [to] <em>Ra-Henu</em> for the second occasion (3) in order to bring costly stone [from] ///</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[26.2]</strong> Hammamat no. 114</td>
<td>Couyat &amp; Montet, <em>Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât</em>, 83, pl. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)...<em>ini.n(ī)=i n=f in.w nb(w) gmi.n(ī)=i ḫr ḫdb.w Tī-ntr hīī.n(ī)=i ḫr Wtg</em> <em>R3-Hnw</em></td>
<td>(15)...I brought all produce for him which I found upon the shores of God's-Land, (then) I descended upon the Wag and the <em>Ra-Henu</em></td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[26.3]</strong> El-Tod, Annals of Senwosret</td>
<td>Barbotin &amp; Clère, <em>BIFAO</em> 91, pl. 25e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>//nw</td>
<td>[Ra-He]nu</td>
<td>Annals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammamat no.</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Book/Article</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expedition Text 12:**

Amenemhat I

Hammamat no. 199

He said; my lord, Horus, sent me to Ra-Henu in order to bring this great noble stone…

Senwosret III

Hammamat no. 47

...going forth to that mountain of Upper-Ra-Henu.

Senwosret III

Hammamat no. G75

Now his majesty commanded the sending (of an expedition) to Ra-Henu in order bring monuments…
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Hammamat no.</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Book/Source</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Expedition Text</th>
<th>Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[26.7]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Couyat &amp; Montet, 40, <em>Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât</em>, 40, pl. 5</td>
<td>(15) ( iwi.t = f r ; h'\dot{s}.t ; tn ; h r. t ) ( (?) ) (16) ( n.t ; R3-\text{hm}_3 ; Wp.t ; n b. t ; t' h ; r ; ini.t ; m n w ; n ; h m = f \ldots )</td>
<td>(15) His coming to this hill-country, the highland (16) of \textbf{Ra-Henu} (for) Wepet, mistress of the palace, in order to bring a monument for his majesty…</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>Middle Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26.8]</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Couyat &amp; Montet, <em>Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât</em>, 51, pl. 14</td>
<td>(3) ( zbi.t ; h m = f ; r ; ini.t ; n = f ; m n w.w ) (4) ( In.t-r3-hnw ; m ; inr ; nfr ; n.(y) ; bhn.w )</td>
<td>(3) His majesty sent forth (an expedition) in order to bring monuments from (4) the valley of \textbf{Ra-Henu} for him, namely good stone of bekhenu…</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>12: Amenemhat III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26.9]</td>
<td>G84</td>
<td>Goyon, <em>Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi Hammamat</em>, 99, pl. 28</td>
<td>(2) ( h m.w-nsw ; h r ; h'\dot{s}.t ; tn ; n.t ; R3-(3) hnw \ldots )</td>
<td>(2) …The servants of the king were upon this hill-country of ( \textbf{Ra-}(3) \textbf{Henu} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>Middle Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### [27]  *Hb.t-Mr.y-R*<sup>5</sup> *w*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hammamat no. G46</th>
<th></th>
<th>‘Which made Meryre Festive’</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goyon, <em>Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi Hammamat</em>, 72, pl. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>Pepi I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [28]  *Hw.t-nbw*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abydos, Biography of Wenit</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Urk</em>. I, 107.16-108.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hatnub no. 3, Inscription of Nemtiu</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthes, <em>Die Felsinschriften von Hatnub</em>, pl. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hatnub no. 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthes, <em>Die Felsinschriften von Hatnub</em>,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(42) *[His] majesty sent me* (43) to Hatnub, in order to bring a great offering slab of calcite of Hatnub. I brought down this offering-slab for him in 17 days, it being hewn in Hatnub...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>zi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>iw h3b.kw r ḫw.t-nbw in h3.[ty-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>I went forth to this Hatnub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>with a hundred men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[28.4]</td>
<td>Hatnub no. 6</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatnub no. 6</td>
<td>Anthes, Die Felsinschriften von Hatnub, pl. 11</td>
<td>6: Pepi II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>I was sent to Hatnub, by the May[or]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Hatnub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>2000 calcite stones, which were sculpted and placed in four (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>in accordance with (?) the decree in the residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>which were placed (?) in the barges which were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>among Hatnub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>in the residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>in this Hatnub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 11     | 28.5  | Expedition Text                                                                 |
| Hatnub no. 7 | Anthes, Die Felsinschriften von Hatnub, pl. 12 | 6: Pepi II                                                                 |
|        | (1)   | The ship-captain Ser, (he) said: (2) Now                                |
|        | (2)   | pri.n(=?)                                                              |
|        | (3)   | gr ḫw.t-nbw tn in r-s3 pri r Bhks                                      |
|        | (4)   | 1) The ship-captain Ser, (he) said: (2) Now                            |
|        | (5)   | I was sent from the residence in order to make (6) work in Hatnub      |
|        | (6)   | I hewed (7) 2000 calcite stones, which were sculpted and placed in four |
|        | (7)   | in accordance with (?) the decree in the residence                    |
|        | (8)   | which were placed (?) in the barges which were                        |
|        | (9)   | among Hatnub                                                            |
|        | (10)  | in the residence                                                       |
|        | (11)  | day (?)                                                                |
|        | (12)  | mouths                                                                  |

| 12     | 28.6  | Expedition Text                                                                 |
| Hatnub no. 8 | Anthes, Die Felsinschriften | 6: Pepi II                                                                 |
|        | (1)   | im.y-ir.ty Sr d̄d(=?)                                                      |
|        | (2)   | pri.n(=?)                                                              |
|        | (3)   | gr ḫw.t-nbw tn in r-s3 pri r Bhks                                      |
|        | (4)   | 1) The ship-captain Ser, (he) said: (2) Now                            |

---

Notes:
- *Hatnub* refers to a place in Egypt.
- Seankhy is named as the son of an administrator, overseer of the army.
- Expedition Text: Reference to an expedition under Pepi II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[28.7]</td>
<td>El-Bersha, Tomb of Ahanakht (No. 5)</td>
<td>(12)…ltw(.w) n=f3.t šps.t hr-tp ḫw.t-nbw</td>
<td>12)…To whom Costly stones have come from Hatnub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[28.8]</td>
<td>El-Bersha, Tomb of Djehutyhotep (No. 2)</td>
<td>(1) šms twt n(y) mh 13 m inr n(y) ḫw.t-nbw ist št3 wr.t w3.t lyl.tn=f hr= r ih.t nb(.t) ist št3 (2) hr ib n(y) rmt ith ḫt3 tyw ḫr= m=f inr-št3-n(y)-snt m inr n(y) rwd.t</td>
<td>1) Bringing a statue of 13 cubits in stone of Hatnub. Now the road upon which it came was very difficult – more than anything. The difficulty was in the minds of the people who towed greatly upon it (the road), because of the difficult stone of cutting in the hard stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[28.9]</td>
<td>Theban tomb of Ineni (TT81)</td>
<td>/// ḫw.t-nbw s=f ḫt3.w=f m bi3… /// Hatnub, its door-leaves were erected in copper…</td>
<td>Dedication Text 18: Thutmose III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[28.10]</strong></td>
<td>Speos Artemidos inscription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urk. IV, 388.9-10</strong></td>
<td>(27) <em>kdl nî hnw.t-nfr=f wr.t m inr hâd n(y) 3n sbî. w=s m śś n(y) Hw.t-nbw</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27) I built his great temple in white stone of An, its doors were of calcite of <em>Hاتnub</em>…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedication Text</strong></td>
<td>18: Hatshepsut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>[28.11]</strong></th>
<th>Northampton Stele of Djehuty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urk. IV, 423.16-424.2</strong></td>
<td>(8) <em>iwnn 3i m hÎny n(y) T3-sty rd.w hr=f k3i(w) 3wî(w) m śś w’b n(y) Hw.t-nbw</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8)…A great shrine in ebony of Ta-sety, the stairs under it being high and wide, in pure calcite of <em>Hاتnub</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedication Text</strong></td>
<td>18: Hatshepsut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>[28.12]</strong></th>
<th>Karnak, inscription on a calcite offering-slab.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urk. IV, 866.12-13</strong></td>
<td><em>iri. {t}n=f w’b.t m śś n(y) Hw.t-nbw</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making for him a pure-place in calcite of <em>Hاتnub</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dedication Text</strong></td>
<td>18: Thutmosis III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>[29]</strong></th>
<th>Hatshepsut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[29.1]</strong></td>
<td>Funerary Temple of Djedkare, relief block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimm, <em>SAK</em> 12, pl. 1</td>
<td><em>T3-nbw-d”m B’t Snh Hżt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caption in a dedication scene (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Djedkare Isesi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>[30]</strong></th>
<th>Hatshepsut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[30.1]</strong></td>
<td>Abydos, Stele of Taniy (CG 20564)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariette, <em>Catalogue Général des Monuments d’Abydos,</em></td>
<td><em>htp di nsw wsir Hnt.y-imn.twy 3bdw di Inpw hî.n ty sh-nfr im.y w.t nb tês dsr hî m t hî m hnk.t hî m kî 3pd hî m snîr pri hr Hîs tr t n.t</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An offering which the king gives (to) Osiris, Foremost of Westerners, and which Anubis gives, foremost of the divine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offering formula</strong></td>
<td>Dynasty 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>172.1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[31]</strong></td>
<td><em>Hš.s-t-ỉb.t(y)t-ỉwn.w</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[31.1]</strong> Tutankhamun’s tomb, fan inscription</td>
<td>The Griffith Institute, Howard Carter Archive, card no. 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[32]</strong></td>
<td><em>Hš.s.wt-nbw-ỉmn.w-ỉ3-sty</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[32.1]</strong> Sehel no. 390</td>
<td>KRI III, 116.5. Gasse &amp; Rondot, Les Inscriptions de Séhel, 238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dedication Text
- 18: Tutankhamun
- 19: Ramesses II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Wadi el-Hudi no. 21</th>
<th>Sadek, Wadi el-Hudi, II, pl. 21</th>
<th>(8) $pri, i=f, h\tilde{3}$ $H\tilde{3}s.t-n.t-Hsmn$ hft wd $hm=f, pri=f, h\tilde{3}s.t.n.t$ <a href="9">S3</a>w…</th>
<th>(8) His going out to survey the Hill-country-of-Amethyst according to the command of his majesty (while) he went out to the Hill-country-of-Sh(9)au…</th>
<th>Expedition Text</th>
<th>12: Amenemhat IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>Sadek, Wadi el-Hudi no. 23</td>
<td>Sadek, Wadi el-Hudi, II, pl. 10.</td>
<td>(3) $m\tilde{3}.n=\tilde{4}$ $[m\tilde{3}.r]$ $H\tilde{3}s.t-n.t-Hsmn$ r in.t $hsmn$ (4) $hmig.t, hm.wt(?), mn.w-km, mn.w-hd, nsm.t, c.t$ ///</td>
<td>(3) I led [an expedition to] the Hill-country-of-Amethyst, in order to bring amethyst (4) gamet, hemut, black-menu, white-menu, feldspar, and precious-stones….</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>12: Sobekhotep IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also the corrected transcription of Seyfried, *Beiträge zu den Expeditionen des Mittleren Reiches in die Ost-Wüste*, 67.
### [34] H₃s.t-n.t-₃w

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[34.1]</th>
<th>Sadek, Wadi el-Hudi II, pl. 10; Fakhry, The Inscriptions of the Amethyst Quarries at Wadi el-Hudi, 40-42.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8) pri.t=f r h₃ H₃s.t-n.t-hsnn hft wd hm = pri.t=f r h₃s.t n.t <a href="9">S3</a>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8) His going out to survey the Hill-country-of-Amethyst according to the command of his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>majesty (as) he went out to the Hill-country-of-Sh₉au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [35] H₃s.t-Gbtw (dw-Gbtw, Dmi-Gbtw)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[35.1]</th>
<th>Beni Hasan, Tomb of Amenemhat/Ameny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newberry, Beni Hasan I, pl. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)…⃣⁹n=⃣⁹hnti.kw r sbb t b₃.w r Dmi-n(y)-Gbtw h₃.r ir.y-p₃.t h₃.ty-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9) im.y-r₃ niw.t t₃.ty Sn-wsr.t t₃.w.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)…Then I went south south in order to bring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wonders at the Landing-place-of-Coptos, together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the hereditary-noble, mayor, overseer of the city, and vizier, Senwosret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.p.h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[35.2]</th>
<th>Urk. IV, 931.8-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caption for scene:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⃣sp nbw n(y) H₃s.t-Gbtw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m₃b nbw n(y) K₃₈ bs.y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m htr in.wt rnp.t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving the gold of Hill-country-of-Coptos along with the gold of the hill-country of vile Kush as a tax every year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[35.3]</th>
<th>Urk. IV, 1473.5-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) st₃ /// /// (2) /// /// (3) n h₃.s.t tn m₃b nbw n(y) H₃s.t[n(t)] Gbtw /// nbw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₃.wt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Dragging /// /// (2) /// /// (3) to this hill-country together with the gold of the Hill-country [of] Coptos /// numerous gold.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expedition Text</th>
<th>12: Senwosret I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribute scene</td>
<td>18: Thutmosis III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18: Thutmosis III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35.4]</td>
<td>KRI II, 619.7-8</td>
<td>no. 12) <em>dd-mdw in Dw-Gbtw n s3-Rc.w R3.w-msi-sw-Mri.y-lmn.w iyi.n(=i) ini.n(=i) n=k nbw 53.t</em> no. 13) Words spoken by the Mountain-of-Coptos to the Son-of-Re Ramesses-Meryamun, I have come having brought much gold to you. Dedication Text 19: Ramesses II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35.5]</td>
<td>KRI II, 619.9-10</td>
<td>no. 13) <em>dd-mdw in Dw-Gbtw n s3-Rc.w R3.w-msi-sw-Mri.y-lmn.w iyi.n(=i) ini.n(=i) n=k msdm.t</em> no. 13) Words spoken by the Mountain-of-Coptos to the Son-of-Re Meryamun, I have come having brought galena to you. Dedication Text 19: Ramesses II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35.6]</td>
<td>Grandet, <em>Papyrus Harris I</em>, pl. 12</td>
<td>(12a, 7) <em>nbw n(y) H3s.t Gbtw dbn 61 kd.t 3</em> (12a, 7) gold of the Hill-country-of-Coptos, 61 deben, 3 kite Dedication Text 20: Ramesses IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35.7]</td>
<td>Grandet, <em>Papyrus Harris I</em>, pl. 78</td>
<td>(77, 12)... <em>st (hr) spr iw=sn wd3.w r H3s.t-Gbtw st mni.w m htp hr ih.wt ini.n w s.t štp(w) m hr.ty hr (iy)3.wt hr rmt štp r &quot;Hc.w hr itr.w mr(yt Gbtw wd.yt m ḫdī n-hr=w spr m ḫb.w...</em> (77, 12)... They arrived, they being healthy at the Hill-country-of-Coptos, they having landed in peace, bearing the things which they brought, they being loaded for the land-journey on donkeys and upon people and (also) loaded on ships at the Nile (at) the harbour of Coptos (and) proceeded downstream in front of them, arriving in festivity... Expedition Text 20: Ramesses IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35.8]</td>
<td>Gardiner, <em>LEM</em>, 77.10-15</td>
<td>(67)... <em>sdm= (68) p3 h3b i:iri n=i p(y)=i nb [... m] (69) H3 ⸅ H3 ⸅ M3-ḥtm-n(y) [... c.w s n ty hr T3-...</em> (67)...I heard (68) the letter which my lord sent to me /// (69) measuring as far as The-fortress-of-[…] l.p.h. Letter 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which is in the **hill-country-of-Coptos** (70) to The-Settlement-of-gold, and he measured as far as The-settlement-of-gold to The-Mountain of-Mentu. The letter […]Amun]eminet, I placed one of the Medjay with him, he measured together with these […] in their wells.

I am Min, who stands upon the hill-countries, he who seizes every land (33) being endowed (?), who shoots (?) and strides, the youth of the **hill-country of Coptos**, it is the sacred-land of Geb

I heard (68) the letter which my lord sent to me… (69) measuring as far as The-fortress-of-[…] l.p.h. which is in The-Hill-country-of-Coptos (70) to The-Settlement-of-gold, and he measured as far as The-settlement-of-gold to
### 19: Seti I

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>T3-حنط.ستي-مري.ي-ن(.ي)-بث</td>
<td>(1) iri (i)n wāw</td>
<td>(1) Made by the sailor (2) of the ship's crew (3) [who was charged] to dig The-well-of-Seti-Merenptah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kanais, Rock-stele of Anena</td>
<td>KRI, I, 72.8-9</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>T3-حنط.رب-مسى-سوى-مري-يمن-ن(.ن)-بث</td>
<td>(37)… حنط.رب-مسى-سوى-مري-يمن-ن(.ن)-بث</td>
<td>(37) this well at The-well-of-Ramesses-Meryamun-brave-in-[life]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuban Stele, parallel version at Aksha</td>
<td>KRI, II 360.5-6</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>Kuban Stele, parallel version at Aksha</td>
<td>Piotrovsky, ВАДИ АЛЛАКИ, 66</td>
<td>X+4) m /// T3-حنط.رب-مسى-سوى-مري-يمن-ن(.ن)-بث</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umm Ashira, stele.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X+4) in /// The-well-of-Ramesses-Meryamun-brave-in-life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Snh


### ZSw.w

| 40.1 | Stele of Khentykhetwer Northumberland 1934 | Nibbi, *JEA* 62, pl. 9 | [Image] | (1) dw3 rdi.t i3w n Hr.w wr n Mn Gbtw (2) in i(r).y-p6(.t) hš(t,ty)-ṣ bi.t im.y-r3 rw.yt (3) Ḥnt.y-.h.t-wr m-ḥt iwi.t=f m (4) htp m Pwnt mšt=f (5) Ḥn=t=f wd₃(.w) snb(.w) Ḥw=f htp(.w) (6) n ZSw.w rnp.t 28 |

(1) Praising and giving praise to Haroeris (and) to Min of Coptos (2) by the hereditary noble, the mayor, the sealer of Lower-Egypt, overseer of the law court (3) Khentykhetwer, after his return in (4) peace from Punt, his army (5) together with him, being healthy and sound, his fleet resting (6) in Sawuw, year 28 | Expedition Text | 12: Amenemhat II |
### [41] Șy.t

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coffin Texts, CT VI, 213</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold of the hill-country, (213a) myrrh of God's-Land, and costly stones of the Aegean-Islanders were brought to him by Horus the elder (b) (also) faience of Libya (c) lapis lazuli of Tefreret (d) sehit-stone of Hebekes(e) turquoise of Mefgat (f), [costly-stones] of Ra-Adjit (g) and carnelian of Shait.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [42] Șzm.t

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pyramid Texts 450b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unas has come before you, Horus of Shat, Unas has come before you, Horus of Shezmet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pyramid Texts 456b-c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May you travel to your fields and go through the interior of your kesebet-wood, and may your nose smell the scent of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.3] Pyramid Texts 528a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.4] Pyramid Texts 983a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.5] Pyramid Texts 987b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.6] Pyramid Texts 1085c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.7] Pyramid Texts 1136a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42.12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksb.wt=k nbw.t(y)t mfk3.twt tfrr.wt sn=k id.wt Šzm.t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parts of the text are replicated in other versions of this hymn, see Feder in Arnst et al. (eds) Begegnungen – Antike Kulturen im Niltal: Festgabe für Erike Endesfelder, Karl-Heinz Priese, Walter Friedrich Reineke, Steffen Wenig von Schülern und Mitarbeiten, 111-122.

---

| 43 | Khkh |
| 43.1 | pCairo ESP, Document C-D |

| Helck, *JARCE* 6, 148 | (45) di p3 ḫps īnr n(y) pr-c3 pṣy nb n3 (46) ḫr.w Ššs.w n(y) Mw-kd n.ty ḫmsi m Khkh (47) sp.t p3 ym n lwtn r-dr īw m lmwn.w-(48)Rṛ.w nsw ntr.w p3 ntr-c3 nb n(y) t3 i:šm (49) īrm ṣn r di.t n=ṭn dr.t |

(45) The strong arm of the Pharaoh, the good lord, has cast to the ground the (46) enemies of the Shasu of Mu-qed who were sitting in Qehqeh, the shore (47) of the sea. Since it is Amun-(48) Ra, king of the gods, the great-god, lord of the earth who went (49) with you in order to give to you a hand. |

Letter 20: Ramesses IX
### Khb.w

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[44]</th>
<th><strong>Khb.w</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[44.1]</td>
<td>Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner, <em>JEA</em> 4, pl. 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[45]</td>
<td><strong>Tmp3w</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[45.1]</td>
<td>Memphis, relief fragment of the Annals of Amenemhat II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quirke &amp; Malek, <em>JEA</em> 78, pl. 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9)... *iyt.n(=I) m ḫtp r ḫr ét<ti>n.(=I) n(=f) tp.w ḫš.s. w(t m biš? mš n(y) B3t (10) b3 psd n(y) Thwǐw biš rwd n(y) Mm-kšw m mpkšt Hrr.wt ḫšbd n(y) Tjfr.t (11) m šhr.t tp.t-dw.w ḫr-św m Dw-n(y)-Hstyw rš-ntt m Bšw [k]<t> (12)dšr.t m mdw R3-Sšlw msdm.t n.t Khbw |

(9)...(I) returned in peace to his palace, and (I) brought for (him) the best of the hill-countries, as new-metal of Bat (10) shining metal of Ihuiu, strong metal of Men-kau, as turquoise of Hererutet, lapis-lazuli of Teferret (11) as saheret of the summits-of-the-mountains, ḫt-św from the mountain-of-Heztu, rš-ntt from Bš-wt-of-the-(12) desert, as sticks from Ra-Shaaut and eye-paint of *Khebu*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expedition Text</th>
<th>11-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(15)... *iw.t m wdb-tp ḫtp.yw n.w Tmp3w *in.n=sš n m-* ḫw=sš n ḫ.ty 238 ¼ |

(15) Coming with bowed heads, the pacified-ones of *Tjempau*, they brought in their hands lead, 238 ¼ deben.

| Annals | 12: Amenemhat II |
### [46] Dw-w’b

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[46.1]</strong></td>
<td><strong>KRI II, 619.3-4</strong></td>
<td><strong>fig. 10) dd-mdw in Dw-w’b</strong></td>
<td><strong>fig. 10) Words spoken by the Pure-mountain, son of Re (Ramesses-Meryamun), I have come having brought gold to you</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Luxor Temple, List of Mining Regions</strong></td>
<td><strong>s3-Rc.w Rc-msi = mr.y</strong></td>
<td><strong>Imn.w iyi.n(=) ini.n(=) n=k nbw</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dedication Text</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goyon, ASAE 49, 351</strong></td>
<td><strong>p3 hnw Imn.w p3 Dw-w’b</strong></td>
<td><strong>The shrine of Amun of the Pure-mountain.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Turin Map Label</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hammamat no. 247</strong></td>
<td><strong>Imn.w n(y) Dw-w’b</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amun of the Pure-Mountain.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expedition Text; epithet</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [47] Dw-Bhn

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[47.1]</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hammamat no. G61</strong></td>
<td><strong>(13) iri.n = wd.t inr-hd r-b. t=i n ini.tn = hr h3s.t n(t)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(13) I made the stele of white stone under his authority because of that which I brought from the Hill-country-of-Bekhenu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goyon, Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi Hammamat, 83, pl. 23</strong></td>
<td><strong>(14) bhn.w</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expedition Text</strong></td>
<td><strong>12: Senwosret I</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Notes
- *KRI II, 619.3-4* refers to the List of Mining Regions at Luxor Temple.
- *ASAE 49, 351* refers to Goyon's publication on mining regions.
- *Nouvelles inscriptions rupestres du Wadi Hammamat, 83, pl. 23* refers to Goyon's work on the inscriptions of Hammamat.
- *ASAE* stands for *Annales de l'Institut Égyptien*.
- *Turin Map Label* refers to the Turin Map's label on the shrine of Amun of the Pure-Mountain.
- *Expedition Text* and *Expedition Text; epithet* indicate the context in which the text appears in the expedition's records.
- *Senwosret I* refers to the king Senwosret I, who is associated with the stele found in Hammamat no. G61.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[47.2] Hammamat no. 240</th>
<th>Couyat &amp; Montet, <em>Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât</em>, 113; <em>KRI</em> VI, 11.3-5</th>
<th>(14) ...iri.t mn.w pn n s.t nhḥ m $Dw$ pn $bhn$[.t] (15) $m-h3$.w $T3$-nṭr</th>
<th>(14) Making this monument for the place of eternity in this <em>Mountain of Bekhenet</em> (15) in the environs of God's-Land</th>
<th>Expedition Text</th>
<th>20: Ramesses IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[47.3] Hammamat no. 232.9</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> VI, 11.9</td>
<td>$r; p; Dw; n(y); bhn.y$</td>
<td>As for <em>The-Mountain of Bekhen</em></td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>20: Ramesses IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[47.4] Hammamat no. 238</td>
<td>Goyon, <em>ASAE</em> 49, 382</td>
<td>$83^\circ; m; T3$-wh,yt-$b3k$-nbw $r kn; P3-; Dw; n(y); bhn.y$</td>
<td>The beginning from the village of working gold to the end, <em>The-mountain-of Bekhen</em></td>
<td>Turin Map Label. This text is repeated three times on the papyri</td>
<td>20: Ramesses IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[47.5] Hammamat no. 238</td>
<td>Goyon, <em>ASAE</em> 49, 341</td>
<td>$///; bhn.y; r; gm.yt; m; P3-; Dw; n(y)-bhn.y$</td>
<td>/// <em>Bekhen-stone</em> which is found in <em>The-Mountain-of Bekhen</em></td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>20: Ramesses IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[47.6] Hammamat no. 238</td>
<td>Couyat &amp; Montet, <em>Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât</em>, 111, pl. 45</td>
<td>(4) $wp$-ntw $Dw$-(5) $bhn; r; ini(t); mnw.w; n; hm=f; w.s$</td>
<td>(4) A royal-mission to <em>The-Mountain-(5)-of-Bekhen</em> in order to get monuments for his majesty l.p.h</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>19: Ramesses II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammamat no. 12</td>
<td>Couyat &amp; Montet, <em>Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât</em>, 38-39, pl. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) <code>ist rdi.n hm=f m hr n(y) sš pr-nḥ R²-msr-sw-š3-hb-sd sš Hr.y n(y) rš-pr.w hm-nṯ Wsr-M³.t-R².w-nḥ n(y) pr Mnw 3št m Gbtw r hḥy nš wp.w n(w) (12) st-mš³.t m pš Dw-n(y)-ḥšn…</code></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Now His majesty appointed the scribe of the house of life, Ramessesashahebsed, the scribe of the temples, Hory, the priest of the temple of Min and Isis in Coptos, Usermaatrenakhtu in order to seach for the openings (12) of the place of truth in the Mountain of Bekhen…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>20: Ramesses IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P3-dw-n(y)-Mntyw</th>
<th>Gardiner, <em>LEM</em>, 77. 10-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(67)…sdm=f (68) pš hšb ḫr i:iri n± pšy± nb […] m (69) ḫš³š³ m P3-htm-n(y) […]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67) I heard (68) the letter which my lord sent to me… (69) measuring as far as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Ramesside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Goyon, <em>ASAE</em> 49, 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>[48.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin1879, 1899 and 1869 (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[48.2] pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869 (17)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[49.1]</th>
<th>Luxor Temple, List of Mining Regions</th>
<th>Dedication Text; list of personified mines</th>
<th>Ramesses II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[49.1]</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> II, 620.1-2</td>
<td><em>[fig. 17]</em> Words spoken by the <em>Mountain-of-Tep-ihu</em> to the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Usermaatre-Setepenre: I have come having brought white-stones in heaps to you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | *Dw-n(y)-Tp-ihw* | *Dw n(y)-Tp-ihw* n nsw-bi.ty Wsr-M3˚.t-R˚.w-stp-n(y)-R˚.w iy.i.n(=i) ini.n(=i) n = k c˚.t h˚.t m c˚.w |                  |
|   |                  | *fig. 17)* Words spoken by the *Mountain-of-Tep-ihu* to the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Usermaatre-Setepenre: I have come having brought white-stones in heaps to you |                  |

|   | **w.s n.ty hr T3-hs.t-Ghw (70) r T3-whi.t-p3-nbw mtw= hr h.˚ t s[3˚ m T3-whi.t]-p3-nbw r P3-Dw-n(y)-Mntw t3 s.˚ t [... Imn.w]-m-in.t iw (72) dl=w˚ n(y) Md3.yw irm= iw= hi mtw t3(73)m n3 [...] nmi (?) m n˚y=sn lmm.wt | The-fortress-of-[*] l.p.h. which is in The-hill-country-of-Coptos (70) to The-Settlement-of-gold, and he measured as far as The-settlement-of-gold to The-Mountain-of-(71) Menatu. The letter [*...Amun]*eminet (72), I placed one of the Medjay with him, he measured together with these [*] (?) in their wells. | }

|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |
| [50.1] | Luxor Temple, List of Mining Regions | KRI II, 619.5-7 | fig. 11) *dd-mdw in Dw-n(y)-Db3* n nsw-bi.ty Wsr-m3.t-RC.w-stp-n(y)-RC.w iyi.n (=) ini n=k nbw m hfl hh | fig. 11) Words spoken by the Mountain-of-Edfu to the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Usermaatre-Setepenre, I have come having brought gold in hundreds-of-thousands and millions to you. | Dedication Text; list of personified mines | 19: Ramesses II |
| [50.2] | Medinet Habu, Treasury text | KRI V, 322.4 | *nbw n(y) Db3* | Gold of Edfu(-land) | Dedication text, Caption for a gold-bag | 20: Ramesses III |
Zone 2: Sinai and Edom [51-74]

[51] Ihwiw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[51.1] Ihwiw</th>
<th>Gardiner, JEA 4, pl. 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058)</td>
<td>(9)...iyi.n(=i) m htp r *h=f ini.n(=i) n(=i) tp.w ḫḥw.wt m biš? m3 n(y) B[i]t (10) biš psḏ n(y) Ihwiw biš rwd n(y) Mn-kɔw m mfk₃t Hrr.wt ḫḥbd n(y) Tjr.r.t (11) m s₃hr.t tp.- ḫw.w ḫt-ꜣw n yr Dw-n(y)- ḫstw r₃-nṯt m B₃w{k}&lt;t&gt;(12)dṣr.t m mdw R₃-S₃w n.t Khbw (9)...(I) returned in peace to his palace, and (I) brought for (him) the best of the hill-countries, as new-metal of Bat (10) shining metal of Ihuiu, strong metal of Men-kau, as turquoise of Hererutet, lapis-lazuli of Teferrēt (11) as saheret of the summits-of-the-mountains, ḫt-ꜣw from the mountain-of-Heztu, r₃-nṯt from B₃w{q}&lt;t&gt; of the-(12)desert, as sticks from Ra-Shaaut and eye-paint of Kehebu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[52] Idm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[52.1] Idm</th>
<th>Gardiner, LEM, 76.11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pAnastasi VI</td>
<td>(53)...ky swḥḏ-lb n (54) pẖy=ti [nb] r [n.ty tw=ḥty= n m d[i, t] zš nḥ mw.w t ḫĪw.n(y) T(55)dm pẖ ḫtm n Mḥ.t.y-n-Pḥḥ-Hr-mṣ.t c.w.s n.ty Tksw (56) r nḥ bɔr{k}&lt;b&gt;[t n(y) Pr-ltm n(y) [Mr]y-n-Pḥḥ-Hr-mṣ.t (57) n.ty Tksw r s₃nhw =w r s₃nhw n ḫwy= w ḫḥw.wt m pḥ kɔ ḫw n(y) Pr₃ t₃ c.w.s (53)...Another communication to my [lord], namely [that we] finished letting the families of the Shasu of E(55)dm pass the fortress of Merenptah-Hetephermaat l.p.h which is in Tjeku,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(56) to the pools of the Temple of Atum of Merenptah-Hetephermaat (57) which are in Tjeku in order to feed them and feed their herds, through the ka of the Pharaoh, l.p.h.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>53</th>
<th>Yhw₃ (T³-Ṣšs.w)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>Soleb Topographical List, fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giorgini et al., <em>Soleb V</em>, pl. 207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T³-Ṣšs.w-Yhw₃</td>
<td>Shasu-land-Yahwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographical List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 53.2 | Soleb Topographical List |
| Giorgini et. al, *Soleb V*, pl. 221 |
| 1. T³-Ṣšs.w-Wrbr |
| 2. T³-Ṣšs.w-Yhw₃ |
| 3. T³-Ṣšs.w-Smt |
| Topographical List |
| 18: Amenhotep III |

| 53.3 | Amara West Topographical List |
| KRI II, 217. |
| 90. Rph |
| 91. Swk |
| 92. T³-Ṣšs.w-Ṣrr |
| 93. T³-Ṣšs.w-Rbn |
| 94. T³-Ṣšs.w-Pyspys |
| 95. T³-Ṣšs.w-Smt |
| 96. T³-Ṣšs.w-Yhw₃ |
| 97. T³-Ṣšs.w-Wrbr |
| 98. Knitkmr |
| 90. Rapah |
| 91. Suk |
| 92. Shasu-land-Sarr |
| 93. Shasu-land-Reben |
| 94. Shasu-Land-Pyspys |
| 95. Shasu-|
| Topographical List |
| 19: Ramesses II |
| --- | --- | --- |

8. **Hrn**m  
9. **Rbt**  
10. **Hbr**  
11. **Tr**  
12. **Rh**b  
13. **Yh**3

8. Herenem  
9. Rebenetj  
10. Khebur  
11. Itjer  
12. Rehob  
13. **Yeha**

8. Herenem  
9. Rebenetj  
10. Khebur  
11. Itjer  
12. Rehob  
13. **Yeha**

| [53.5] | KRI IV, 96 | Topographical List

112. **Bwr**  
113. **Kmk**  
114. **Kbw**r  
115. **Yh**3  
116. **Twr**


79. Topographical List

| [54] | Topographical List

112. **Bwr**  
113. **Kmk**  
114. **Kbw**r  
115. **Yh**3  
116. **Twr**


(1)… w3l y4 n3y= wwp ty (2) r h{s}.t-*tk r n3 h3 w b3 y3 y n.ty m s.tn iw n3y=sn mns (hr) 3tp hr= w k.yt lty t m hr ty hr n3y= w (3) (b{t}) bw sdm= f ds, r dr nsw y ty gm y n3y= sn h3 w dtp,(w) hr b3 3tp,(w) mi d3 r n3y= sn mns (4) w3l m-hr= w r

(1)… I sent my ambassador (2) to the hill-country of **Atika**, to the great copper quarry which is in this place. Their galleys were carrying them, others were on a land journey upon their (3) donkeys. It had not been heard before, since kingship (began). Their mines were found loaded bearing.
| [55] Bīš.w |
|---|---|---|---|
| [55.1] Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058) | Gardiner, *JEA* 4, pl. 9 | (2) wn<.n(=) m Bīš.w (3) mš.t. n(=) sw dbn.n(=) hšs.wt Tnḥt | (2) .... When (I) was in Bīa (3) (1) inspected it, and (1) went round the hill-countries of Tjenhet… |
| [55.2] Ayn Soukhna no. 22 | Tallet, *Les Inscriptions d’Ayn Soukhna*, 55, 57 | (1) mšt ḫr.(y) Dd.w=ḥ(2) r BĪ B n nsw bi.ty ḫpr-kš-Rṣ.w ššm.(w) (3) rnp.t-sp 9 3bd 1 pr.t 3 | (1) the Chief, Deduef led the expedition (2) to Bīa for the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkare, the guider (?). (3) Year 9, 1st month of Peret, day 2 |

---

*Km.t spr(w) wḏḥ(w) fḥ(w) Ṣḥ(w) m sid ḫr pš sšd m ḫtn iw=w m Ṣḥw nbw n(y) sp 3*

copper, (it) being loaded like tens-of-thousands to their menesh-ships(4); proceeding forward to Egypt, arriving healthy, carrying what they made in heaps under the window (?) in numerous bricks of copper, like hundreds-of-thousands, they were the colour of gold of three-times
The hieratic is often difficult to follow. For notes on the readings consult Tallet, *Les Inscriptions d’Ayn Soukhna*, 57-58.

<p>| [55.3] | The Story of the Shipwrecked Sailor (pPetersburg 1115) | Blackman, <em>Middle Egyptian Stories</em>, 42, 44 | (23)...$\text{sm.kw r Bi}$(24)$-n(y)-\text{Tty h}$\text{5(25)i.kw r w3d-wr m dp.t (26) n.t m$h$ 120 m }3w=\text{s}$ | (23)...I went to Bia(24)-of-the sovereign and (25) I went down on the ocean in a boat (26) of 120 cubits in its length. | Literary Tale | 12 |
| [55.4] | Sinai no. 36 (Wadi Maghara) | Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 14 | (2)...$\text{I nx.w} \text{tp.w t3 iwi.t(y)=sn r Bi3.w pn}$ | (2)...[Oh living ones] who are on the earth, who will come to this Bia (5) Oh living ones who are on [the earth, who will come] to this (6) Bia (8) Oh living ones who are on the earth, who will come to [this] Bia | Expedition Text | Middle Kingdom |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(55.5)</td>
<td>Sinai no. 53 (Serabit el-Khadem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55.6)</td>
<td>Sinai no. 90 (Serabit el-Khadem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- *Ṯnḫ.w.tp.w t*: iwi.t(y) = 𝝁 r *Bīš.w pn* indicates a line from *The Inscriptions of the Sinai*.
- *Bīš* is a marker for a specific location or region.
- The translation includes elements of ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs and modern transliterations.
- The table format helps organize the textual content for easier reading and understanding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[55.7] Sinai no. 106 (Serabit el-Khadem)</th>
<th>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 35</th>
<th>North edge 1) ([rh.t]) (\text{ḏd}3.t) ḳy 1) [List] of the officials who came to this Bia...</th>
<th>Expedition Text</th>
<th>Amenemhat III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[55.8] Sinai no. 115</td>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 39</td>
<td>Western edge, 3) (\text{im.y} \text{rn=f}) (\text{ḏd}3.t) (4) (\text{wn m Bb}) (\text{pn}) 3) name-list of the officials (4) who were in this Bia.</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>Amenemhat III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I lead (the expedition) to this Bia, the might of the king was placed in my heart.

\[(13) \text{wn=f m3=f r Bb pn} \text{b3w nsw hr rd1.t m ib=f}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[55.9]</th>
<th>Sinai no. 117 (Serabit el-Khadem)</th>
<th>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 40</th>
<th>(9) ( r\text{h}.\text{t} , m\text{s}^* , iy\text{i} , r , B\text{B} ) (10) ( p\text{n} )</th>
<th>(9) List of the expeditionary-members who came to this (10) Bia.</th>
<th>Expedition Text</th>
<th>12: Amenemhat III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[55.10]</td>
<td>Sinai no. 141 (Serabit el-Khadem)</td>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 52</td>
<td>(4) ( b\text{t}m.\text{y}-n\text{r} , d\text{d}=f(5) ) iy\text{i}.\text{n}=i , r , B\text{B} , n , n\text{b}(6)=i )</td>
<td>(4) The god’s sealer, he says (5) I came to the Bia for my (6) lord</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>Middle Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[55.11]</td>
<td>Sinai no. 167 (Serabit el-Khadem)</td>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 54</td>
<td>(1) ([I] , n\text{h}.\text{w} , t\text{p}.\text{w} , t\text{i} , i\text{wi}.\text{t}(y)=s\text{n} , r(2) , B\text{B} , p\text{n} )</td>
<td>(1) Oh living ones who are on the earth, who will come to this Bia</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>Middle Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expedition Text 12: Amenemhat III

| Sinai no. 409 (Serabit el-Khadem) | Gardiner, Peet & Černý, The Inscriptions of the Sinai pl. 54 | (3)  \( T^{3}n_{h}.w \, tp.w \, B^{3}iwi.ty(4) \)  
\[ = sn \, r \, B^{3} \, pn \] | (3) Oh living ones who are on earth, who will come(4) to this Bia | Expedition Text 12: Amenemhat III |

### Expedition Text 11-12

| Sinai no. 56 (=Tallet, no. 154) | Gardiner, Peet & Černý, The Inscriptions of the Sinai pl. 18; Tallet, La zone minières pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï, I, doc. 154 | (4)  \( Ht.t \, Ptrt-nfr.w-Hw.t-Hr.w \, nhb.t.n \) (5)  \( htm.ty-ntr \, im.y-r^{3} \, ^{3}hwnw.ty \, im.y-r^{3} \, T^{3}-mh.w \, S^{3}-nfr.t \, m^{3}-hrw \)  
\( 6 \)  \( im.y-r^{3} \, m^{3} \, Twk \, m^{3}-hr \) | (4) The gallery ‘Beholding-the-perfection-of-Hathor’ which the (5) god’s-sealer, chamberlain, overseer of Lower Egypt, Sa-nefret, justified opened. (6) The overseer of the army Iuki, justified. | Biographical Inscription 12: Amenemhat III |

### Expedition Text 11-12

| Thebes, Stele of Khety | Gardiner, JEA 4, pl. 9 | (9)..  \( iy.i.n(=i) \, m \, htp \, r^{3}h=f \, ini.n(=i) \, n(=f) \, tp.w \, h^{3}s.wt \, m \, bi3? \, m^{3},(y) \, B^{3}t \) (10)  \( bi3 \, psd \) \( n,(y) \, Thwiy \, bi3 \, rwd \) \( n,(y) \, M^{n}- \) | (9)...(I) returned in peace to his palace, and (I) brought for (him) the best of the hill-countries, as | Expedition Text 11-12 |
### 58] *R3-htw*

| 58.1 | Sinai no. 90. | Gardiner, Peet & Čermý, *The Inscriptions of the Sinai* pl. 25a | (7) ḫd-t hotspot (8)s = m R3-
ht.(yw?) wn = wsdt = hm.wt
hr {s} (9) sb₃k.w n.ty m Bi₃PN | (7) I spent the morning in the **Outlet-of-the terraces**, and I asked the craftsmen concerning (9) the treasures which are in this mine. | Expedition Text | Early Middle Kingdom |

### 59] *R3-š3(j)w.t*

| 59.1 | Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058) | Gardiner, *JEA* 4, pl. 9 | (9). iyi.n (ṇ) m ḫtp r ḫh = f
in.n (ṇ) n (Ṣ) tp.w ḫs.wt m
bi₃? m ḫn (y) Bḥt (10) bi₃
psd n (y) ḫhwiw bi₃ rwd
n (y) Mn-k₃w m mfk₂.t
Hrr.wt ḫsbd n (y) Tfrr.t |

9)...(I) returned in peace to his palace, and (I) brought for (him) the best of the hill-countries, as new-metal of Bat (10) shining metal of Ihuiu, strong metal of Men-kau, as turquoise of Hererutet, lapis-lazuli of Tefertet (11) as saheret of the summits-of-the-mountains, ḫt-wḥ from the mountain-of-Hezatu, rṣ-nṯ ḫ from Bḥwt-of-the-
(12)desert, as sticks from Ra-Shaaut and eye-paint of Kehebu | Expedition Text | 11-12 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rhetorical Text 18: Hatshepsut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[59.2]</td>
<td>Speos Artemidos Inscription</td>
<td>Gardiner, JEA 32, pl. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[59.3]</td>
<td>Karnak, Hatshepsut Obelisk Base</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 373.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[59.4]</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Room 21</td>
<td>KRI V, 328.3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[59.5]</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Treasury</td>
<td>KRI V, 321.13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Hrr.wtt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner, JEA 4, pl. 9</td>
<td>60.1 Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)…iyi.n(=I) m ḫtp r ḫ=ini.n(=I) n(=f) tp.w ḫs.wt m bi?3 m3 n,(y) B3t (10) bi3 psd n,(y) Thwiw bi3 rsw n,(y) Mn-k3w m mfk3.t Hrr.wtt ḫsbd n,(y) Tfr.r.t (11) m šhr.t tp.t-dw.w ḫtšw3 m ḫw-n,(y)-Hstwy rš₃-nṭt m B₃w {k}&lt;T&gt;-(12)ḏš.r.t m mdw Rṣ-Š3wt msḏ.m.t n.t Kḥbw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 61 | $H_t\cdot t-n.t-Pr-$m$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>wn&lt;..n&gt;(4) m $B_{\text{i3.w}}$ (3) $m$.n(4) sw $d$b$n$.n(4) $h'3$s.wt $T_h$nht $w$n.n(4) m $p$r.w $n.w$ $m$h$.ty $h't$m.n(4) $p$r.w-$hd$= m (4) $d$w $p$f $n$(y) $p$r.w-n(y)-H$r.w-n(y)-$H_t.yw$-$Mfk$.t [rm$n$.n(4)] $mfk$.t $i$m $m Ht.t$- $n.t$-$pr$-(5) $sm$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>$H_t\cdot t-n.t$-///</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>[rm$n$.n(4)] $mfk$.t $i$m $m Ht.t$- $n.t$-$pr$-(5) $sm$3 $w$hm.n(4) $rnn$ m $k.t$ $ht.t$ $H_t.-n.t$-///</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>(4)...I carried turquoise there from the Gallery-of-the-house-of-the-(5)Foreigner, I repeated carrying from another another gallery, the Gallery-of///</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expedition Text 11-12
### [63] Hrb

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[63.1]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Massart, The Leiden Magical Papyrus I, 343 + 345, 15, 19</td>
<td>Recto VII, (6) *swr tw n3 n(y) h3s.wt p3 n.ty hrp i/// /// /// /// (7) ih.t *swr tw n3 n(y) h3s.wt iw = w (hr) dm // /// /// (8) t3 3h.t dm.t Hrb &lt;swr tw&gt; t3 3h.t ir.i.t tm s3.t/// ///</td>
<td>(6) The one of the hill-countries drinks you, the one who is submerged /// /// /// (7) thirsty. The one of the hill-countries drinks you, they are parched /// /// /// (8) the parched fields of Khoreb &lt;drink&gt;, the fields which are never satiated.</td>
<td>Magical Text</td>
<td>Ramesside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [64] Ht.yw-(M)fk3.t

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[64.1]</td>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Čermý Inscriptions of the Sinai, pl. 1</td>
<td>/// [Ht.yw]-fk3.t</td>
<td>/// [Terraces] of Turquoise</td>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td>3: Sanakht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lacunae is probably *Ht.yw* as there are no independent writings of *Mfk3.t* ‘Turquoise-Land’ until the Middle Kingdom.

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[64.2]</td>
<td><em>Urk. I, 246.3</em></td>
<td>x+7) /// /// ih.t nb.t (x+8) initi m Ht.yw-fk3.t /// 6000</td>
<td>x+7) Everything (x+8) which was brought from the Terraces-of-Turquoise /// 6000</td>
<td>Annals</td>
<td>5: Sahure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[64.3]</td>
<td>Ayn Soukhna no. 250 (Gallery G1)</td>
<td>Tallet, <em>BSFE</em> 177/178, 22; Tallet, <em>La zone minières pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï</em>, I, 227, II, 161</td>
<td>(1) ///-sp 7 3bd 4 šmw 4 wp.t iri.tn im,y-r; sr.w Sd-htp r Ḥt.yw-fḫ3.t (2) /// (3) /// (4) /// nsw-bi.ty Iss[i] m /// (5) im,yw-rḥ.(w) n.w mš♂ wn.w ḫrp s/// [m] Bt /// (1) /// the 7th count, fourth month of Shemu, day 4: the mission which the overseer of nobles, Sed-Hetep, made to the <strong>Terraces-of-Turquoise</strong> (2) /// (3) /// (4) /// the king of upper and lower Egypt, Isesi in /// (5) the overseer of the army, who is directing /// [in] Bat/// Expedition Text 5: Djedkare Isesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[64.5]</td>
<td>Giza, Tomb of Kaaper</td>
<td>Fischer, <em>JNES</em> 18, pl. 8; Barta, <em>Abusir V</em>, 174-175</td>
<td>(sš mš♂ nsw m) Ḥḥ.yw-fḥ3.t (Scribe of the army of the King) in the <strong>Terraces-of-Turquoise</strong> Title 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[64.6]</td>
<td>Sinai no. 13</td>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 7</td>
<td>Wp.t-nsw ḫḥ.b.t ḫm♂ im.y-r.ty ḫpr.w-wi3 ḫ(N.y)-nḥ-hnt.y-h.ty ḫ Ḥḥ.yw-fḥ3.t A royal mission which was sent with the Captain-of-the-ship's-crew Niankhkhentykhety to the <strong>Terraces-of-Turquoise</strong>. Expedition Text 5: Isesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Čermý</td>
<td>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</td>
<td>pl. 9</td>
<td>Wp.t-nsw h3b.t htn° htm.ty-ntr Hpy r Ht.yw-Mfk3.t</td>
<td>A royal mission which was sent with the god's-sealer Hepy to the Terraces-of-Turquoise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coffin Texts, VI</td>
<td>212-231</td>
<td>(212m) ini.w n=f nbw n(y) h3s.wt (213a) ṣnt.yw n(y) Ṭ3-nṯr ṣ.t n.t ḫw- nb.wt in ḫr.w-sm.s.w (b) ṣḥn.t n.t Thnw (c) ḫsbd n(y) Ṭfṛ.t (d) shy.t90 n.t ḥbks (e) mfk3.t Mfg.t (f) [rṣ.t] n.t Ṭ3-d.yt (g) ḥrs.t n.t ṣy.t</td>
<td>(212m) Gold of the hill-country, (213a) myrrh of God's-Land, and costly stones of the Aegean-Islanders were brought to him by Horus the elder (b) (also) faience of Libya (c) lapis lazuli of Tefreret (d) sehit-stone of Hebekes(e) turquoise of Mefgat (f) [costly-stones] of Ra-Adjit (g) and carnelian of Shait.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td>Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058)</td>
<td>JEA 4, pl. 9</td>
<td>... wn&lt;.n&gt;(=) m BI3.w (3) m3.n(=) sw dbn.n(=) h3s.wt Ṭnḥt wn.n(=) m pr.w n.w mh.ty ḫtm.n(=) pr.w-hd=f m (4) dw pf n(y) Pr.w-n(y)-Ṭḥr.w- n(y)-Ht.yw-Mfk3.t [ṛmn.n(=)] mfk3.t im m ḫt.t- n.t-pr-(5)šm</td>
<td>(2) .... When (I) was in Bia (3) (I) inspected it, and (I) went round the hill-countries of Tjenhet, when I was in the House of the Northerner, I sealed up his treasuries in (4) that mountain of the House-of-Horus-of-the Terraces-of-Turquoise, I carried turquoise there from the Gallery-of-the-house-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[64.10]</td>
<td>Malek &amp; Quirke, <em>JEA</em> 78, 15</td>
<td>( x+13 ) spr ( m^m_s^m ) (r)</td>
<td>x+13) The arrival of the expedition (to) the Terraces-of-Turquoise. They brought 14 13/32 heqat of Turquoise, and the remainder, beside khet-awa of 8700 deben, buried ore 5570 deben, wah-djat 6 heqat (x+14) /// /// /// 8 stars of the sea, 41 sacks of green-frit (?), 9 ¾ deben of silver, 10 cattle, 3 goats or ibex and 1 holy-cloth</td>
<td>Comment: The term bi(i)-kis is related to krs 'bury' (with the shift of (r &gt; i)), which is attested with the writing here as kis (\text{:\textcircled{c}}) (see Wb. 5, 64). The phrase is thus to be understood not as 'metal of Cusae' but simply rather 'buried ore'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>( \text{Ht.yw-fk}\text{k3.t} \text{ini.n}=sn ) ( \text{fk}\text{.t hh}\text{.t 14 13/32 wd.w gs htr-w3 dbn 8700 bi(i)-hks dbn 5570 wth-dh3.t hh}\text{.t 6 (x+14) /// /// /// sbi-s} ) ( 8 [\text{s}]s3.yt h3r 41 hd dbn 9 ¾ k3 10 ni3 ib 3 ngr.t l )</td>
<td>Annals 12: Amenemhat II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sinai no. 27</strong></td>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Čemý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em>, pl. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(r{(t.,i)\text{-}nsw m, \text{m}, n} {n}) mr.y(\neq n(y)) s.t-ib(\neq h) Ddw-Sbk-rn(\neq \text{snb} 2) mrr.w Pth rs.y inb(\neq Hw, t\cdot h\cdot r).w nb.t M(\text{fj}k, 3, t) (\text{dd.}, t(y))(\neq y)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>True royal acquaintance, beloved of his favourite, controller of the palace, Dedusobekreneseneb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>beloved of Ptah south of his wall, Hathor mistress of Mefkat, who will say....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expedition Text 12</strong></td>
<td>Amenemhat III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sinai no. 28</strong></td>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Čemý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(rnp, t, 42 , h, r, nsw-bi,, t.y, nb, t, \text{wy} , N(y)-M, \text{f}t, t-R, w, \text{snb} , d.t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(&lt;, mr.y&gt;) (Hw, t\cdot h\cdot r).w nb.t M(\text{fj}k, 3, t) im.y-(r, 3) hnw,ty wr {h(3, s, t)} (n(y)) pr-(hd) Tmn,, y (m, \text{f}t)-(hrw) (3) mr.y Hw.t-hr.w nb.t M(\text{fj}k, 3, t) (\text{hmt}, hr-c) (n(y)) im.y-(r, 3) htm.t Sn-wsr.t(4)-(snb, s) (H(w), y)-(sbk, hs.y, n(y)) (Hw, t\cdot h)-(r).w nb.t M(\text{fj}k, 3, t) (5) Spdw nb-(t, i, h, t),, tt Snfr.w (H, r).w nb h(3, s, t, w, ntr.w, ntr.t) (im.y(6)) (w, t, \text{pi}, di, n) (Hw, t\cdot h)-(r).w {h(w, t)} (&lt;, h, t, t&gt;) htp.w nb.t nfr.t mrr(=f) ph(7) m (htp, \text{dd.}, t(y), =f(y)) htp-di-nsw n (k, 3) (n(y))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Year 42 under the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, lord of the two-lands Nimaatre, given life (2) beloved of Hathor, mistress of Mefkat, the overseer of the great intendant of the treasury, Ameny, true of voice(2), beloved of Hathor, mistress of Mefkat, the assistant-treasurer of the overseer of the treasurer Senwosret(4)seneb son of Khuysobek, praised of Hathor, mistress of Mefkat (5) Sopdu, lord of the east, (of) Sneferu, (of) Horus, lord of the hill-countries, (and of) the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expedition Text 12</strong></td>
<td>Amenemhat III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 64.13 | Sinai no. 29 | htm ḫr-استقلال n(y) im.y-فيد htm. Sbk-htp nb-ذكية im."(w) (8) mr.yt ḫw.t-হর.w Mf3k3.t....
|       | Gardiner, Peet & Čemý, *The Inscriptions of the Sinai* pl. 10 | gods and goddesses who are in (6) this land, which gave to Hathor a gallery, and all good offerings; he who wishes to reach (home) (7) in safety (is) the one who will say "an offering which the king gives to the ka of the assistant-treasurer, the overseer of the treasury, Sobekhotep, lord of honour (8) beloved of Hathor of Mefakat....
| [64.14] | Sinai no. 30 | (2) mr.y ḫw.t-হর.w nb.t [Mf] (3) Mf3k3.t /// (2)…Beloved of Hathor, mistress of Mefakat…
|       | Gardiner, Peet & Čemý, *The Inscriptions of the Sinai* pl. 13 | Expedition Text 12: Amenemhat III
|       |       | (3) Beloved of Hathor, mistress of Mefakat, the careful treasurer (4) latu, lord of honour, who the mistress of the house, Py, bore, mistress of honour (5) who is beloved of Hathor, mistress of Mefakat. | Expedition Text 12: Amenemhat III
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[64.15]</th>
<th>Sinai no. 241</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)...Hw.t-hr.w nb.t Mfk3.t mr.y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)...Beloved of Hathor, mistress of Mefkat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[64.16]</th>
<th>pHarris I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandet, <em>Papyrus Harris I</em>, pl. 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(78, 6) wdp.w sr.w r H3s.t-mfk3 n mw.t Hw.t-hr.w hnw.t mfk3 ms n =(\hat{h}d) nbw s(sr.w-nsw) mk kn.w (7) m-b(\hat{h})=(s) mi.t(t) (\hat{s}) ini.w=(\hat{i}) bi(\dot{y})t n(t) mfk3 m(\hat{r})f (\hat{s}) ms m-b(\hat{h})=(i) bw ptr=(v) n (8) d(r) nsw.yt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(78, 6) I commanded butlers and officials to the Hill-country-of-turquoise for my mother, Hathor, mistress of Turquoise, (to) present to her silver, gold, royal-linen, mek-linen and numerous things (7) in her presence like the sand. Wonders of true turquoise in numerous bags were brought for me, and it was presented before me. They (the wonders) had not been seen again since (8) (the time) of kingship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Ramesses IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>$T\text{-}\text{hnm.t} \ R^c\text{-}\text{msi-sw-Mri.y-Imn.w}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>Sinai no. 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 65.2 | Sinai no. 262 | KRI II, 341.5; Gardiner, Peet & Černý, *The Inscriptions of the Sinai*, pl. 71 |
| | | (3) $hr.y-pd.t\text{Imn-m-il[p.t] n(y) } T\text{-}\text{hnm.t(4)-R^c.w-msi-sw-(Mri.y)-Imn.w dl-\text{xnh}}$ |
| | | (3) The troop commander Amenemope of The-Well(4)-of Ramesses-Meryamun, given life |
| | | Expedition Text; title |
| | | 19: Ramesses II |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>66</th>
<th>$S^r (T\text{-}\text{s}s.w)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>Gebel Shaluf Stele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 66.2
**Tanis Obelisk**

*KRI* II, 408.16-409.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East face:</th>
<th>Golden Horus: Ka-nakht-Userenput, King of Upper and Lower Egypt: Usermaatre-Setepenre, Son of Re: Ramesses-Meryamun, the fierce lion, the raging-one who destroys the land of the Shasu, who plundered the Mountain-of-Seir in his brave strength, lord of the two-lands [Usermaat]re-[Setepenre].</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 66.3
**Amara West Topographical List**

*KRI* II, 217.

| 90. Rph |
| 91. Swk |
| 92. T3-Sis.w-Styy | 90. Rapah |
| 93. T3-Sis.w-Rbn | 91. Suk |
| 94. T3-Sis.w Pyspys | 92. Shasu-land-Sarr |
| 95. T3-Sis.w Smt | 93. Shasu-land-Reben |
| 96. T3-Sis.w Yhwi | 94. Shasu-land-Pyspys |
| 97. T3-Sis.w-Wrbr | 95. Shasu-land-Semet |
| 98. Kntikmr | 96. Shasu-land-Yahwa |
| | 97. Shasu-land-Werber |
| | 98. Qentikmer |

Rhetorical Text 19: Ramesses II

Topographical List 19: Ramesses II
| [66.4] | Grandet, *Le Papyrus Harris I*, pl. 77 | (9) ... *ir*y = $sk$ $s^r$.w $m$ m$h.w.t$ (10) $s^t.s.w$ $fh$ = $n^3y$ = $m$ $h$r $m$ r$mt$ $h$t.$w$ $n^3y$ = $m$ i.$w$ m-$m.i.t(y)t$ $m$m $r^3$-c = $m$ $d$h(.w) ini.$w$ m $h^3$k m in.$w$ $K$m.$t$ (11) $d$i = $s$t $n$ $ps$,$d.t$ m $h$m.$w$ $r$-$pr.w$ | (9) I destroyed Seir(ites?) in the families (10) of Shasu. I destroyed their tents, their people and possessions, and their cattle likewise, without number, they being been fettered and brought as captives as tribute of Egypt. (11) I gave them to the ennead as servants of the temple. | Expedition Text | 20: Ramesses IV |
| [66.5] | Caminos, *A Tale of Woe*, pl. 11 | (5, 4) *bs$i$ $h^3$b $sw$ $r$ $Nhr$ $r$ ini T$m$rw$g$n$ $h^3$p $z^*$-s $r$ $n^3y$ $s^r$ $m$-$d$i $= f$s$,$f $n$ $= n$h$n$ $m^3$ $m$ $p$h $= f$r $n^3y$ $s$b.$t$y$w$ | (5, 4) Enter and send him to Naharin in order to bring the hidden Temrugen, with whom he travelled to Seir(ites) (?) (and said) “Turn around again!. Oh that he might attack the rebels.” | Narrative Text | 20-21. |

The sense of this passage is unclear. The phrase $n^3y$ $s^r$ might be an ethnic group rather than a place.
### [67] Sw3d.t mꜣšś rdi.t n.tt im=š

| [67.1] Sinai no. 53 (=Tallet, no. 161) | Tallet, *La zone minières pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï*, I, doc. 161 | (1) wn hₜ.r tp nfr Sw3d.t-mꜣšś-rdi.t-n.tt im=š m=š | 1) Opening the mine at the right-moment: ‘That-which prospered its expedition, which gave that which is in it’ (is) its name. | Biographical Inscription | 12: Amenemhat III |

### [68] Šr.t-Tp-ih.w/wnד.w (?)

| [68.1] Autobiography of Weni | Urk. I, 104.12-105.4 | (29) dd=_errno(w) wn.t btk n-hₜ.m ḥꜣs.twy pn m Šr.t-tp-ih.w (?) d3i.k(w) (30) m nmi.w ḫn ꜣ ḫw tp bn iri.n (=) wdt r b m ph.ww n(w) ḫw t (31) ḥr mh.t b b ḥr.yw-ꜣ st gs t(w)t n(t) mꜣšś pn m ḥr.t iyi.n (=) ngr n=šn ml-kd=šn sm=š (=W) btk bh im=šn | (29) It was said that there were rebels among these foreigners in Sheret-tep-ihu (?). I crossed (30) in barges with this army and I put to land in the rear of the ridge (31) to the north of the land of the sand-dwellers. While half of this army was on the road – I came and seized all of them and I killed every rebel amongst them. | Expedition Text | 6: Merenre |

### [69] Tnhₜ

| [69.1] Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058) | Gardiner, *JEA* 4, pl. 9 | (2)... wn<.n>(=) m Biž.w (3) m3.n (=) sw dbn.n (=) ḥꜣs.twy Tnhₜ | (2) …. When (I) was in Bia (3) (I) inspected it, and (I) went round the hill-countries of Tjenhet… | Expedition Text | 11-12 |
### [70] $\text{Djdj}$

| 70.1 | Tallet, *La zone minières pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï I*, doc. 194 |
| 70.2 | Gardiner, *Inscriptions of the Sinai*, pl. 42 |

#### 70.1
Serabit el-Khadem, Doc. 194

**Caption for Hathor:** $\text{Hw.t-hr.w nb.t} \text{Mfk3.t hr.y-ib.t}$

#### 70.2
Sinai no. 120 Serabit el-Khadem

**Caption for Hathor:** $\text{Hw.t-hr.w nb.t}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expeditions Text</th>
<th>Expedition Text; epithet of Hathor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [71] $\text{P3-dw-n(y)-II}$

| 71.1 | Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 35; Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, pl. 1, 4 |

#### 71.1
Blinding of Truth (pChester Beatty II = pBM 10682). Duplicate of the text in 1,8.

**Caption for Hathor:** $\text{Hw.t-hr.w nb.t}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expeditions Text</th>
<th>Literary Tale</th>
<th>Ramesside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10, 3</td>
<td>10, 3</td>
<td>10, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 71.1
Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 35; Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, pl. 1, 4

**Caption for Hathor:** $\text{Hw.t-hr.w nb.t}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expeditions Text</th>
<th>Literary Tale</th>
<th>Ramesside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10, 3</td>
<td>10, 3</td>
<td>10, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 71.1
Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 35; Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, pl. 1, 4

**Caption for Hathor:** $\text{Hw.t-hr.w nb.t}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expeditions Text</th>
<th>Literary Tale</th>
<th>Ramesside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10, 3</td>
<td>10, 3</td>
<td>10, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### [72] P3-dw-n(y)-Hmrk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[72.1]</th>
<th>Leiden Magical Papyrus (343 + 345) (recto III, verso VI)</th>
<th>Massart, <em>The Leiden Magical Papyrus I</em> 343 + 345, 15, 37</th>
<th>(6) di tw n-m (7) p3 ʔh w di tw n-m p3 smn iw=k n(y) n3 n(y) ʔ3.t šm(‼) (w) (8) n ty ʔhr h3s.t P3-Rc.w di ʔt=fr r3 h3s.t rmn=fr P3-(9)dwn(y)-Hmrk mh</th>
<th>(6) To whom will I give you, (7) Oh Akhu-illness, To whom shall I give you, Oh Semen-illness, you (belong) to the wild donkeys (or the donkey of the wanderers) (8) who are upon the hill-country. Pre, he placed his back to the hill-country, and his shoulder (or side) to <em>The-(-9)-mountain-of-Hmrk</em>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magical text</td>
<td>Ramesside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text follows recto version which is extant. The word *rmn* due to the classifier is ‘shoulder’, not the verb *rmni* ‘to support’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[72.2]</th>
<th>Leiden Magical Papyrus (343 + 345) (recto XXIII)</th>
<th>Massart, <em>The Leiden Magical Papyrus I</em> 343 + 345, 27</th>
<th>X+2) mi pri (X+3) [m ʕw] mn msi.n mn m-dd Hmrk[...]</th>
<th>X+2) Come! Go forth! (X+3) [from the limbs] of so and so whom so and so bore, said <em>Hmrk</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magical text</td>
<td>Ramesside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[73.1]</td>
<td>Thebes, Stele of Khety (JdE 45058)</td>
<td>Gardiner, <em>JEA</em> 4, pl. 9</td>
<td>(9)... iyin(=i) m ḫpt r šh-w šn.in(=i) n(=f) tp.w ḫš.n.wt m bi3? m n(y) Bt (10) bi3 psd n(y) Ṣlw bi3 rwd n(y) Ṣn-kw m Ṣft.t ḫrr.wt ḫšbd n(y) ḫrr.t (11) m šḥr.t tp.t-dhw ḫt-š wši m Dw-n(y)-Ḥšyw Ṣš-ni m Bšw{k}š (12) ḫšr.t m nšw Ṣš-wt mšm.t n.t Khbw</td>
<td>9)...(I) returned in peace to his palace, and (I) brought for (him) the best of the hill-countries, as new-metal of Bat (10) shining metal of Ihuiu, strong metal of Men-kau, as turquoise of Hereru, turquoise of the summits-of-the-mountains, Ṣš-wš from The-mountain-of-Heztu, Ṣš-ni from ḫšr.t of the-(12) desert, as sticks from Ra-Shaaut eye-paint of Kehebu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[73.2]</td>
<td>Sinai no. 211</td>
<td>Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> pl. 66; Helck, <em>MIO</em> 2, 192; <em>Urk.</em> IV, 1893</td>
<td>(22) ḫš[r.nš(w)] š-wd wr ḫw [nš.wš(w)] (23) m ḫš Šw ḫy št mšš wšn r ḫ.t šd(w) n nhw mh(w) r ḫr śf m Ṣpr śf r niw.t [ṛš.y] Ṣfr ḫtp</td>
<td>(22) [I] crossed the ocean and [I moored (23) in ḫš[t]u, while the army was under my authority, being safe and without loss, being full to its limit on its arrival to the [southern] city in peace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expedition Text | 11-12 | 18: Amenhotep III |
| 74 | // n rdi.t Mfk3.t n(.y) nsw-bi.ty Nb-w-k3.w-Rc.w |
| 74.1 | Sinai no. 48 (=Tallet, no. 148) | Tallet, La zone minières pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï, I, doc. 148 |
| 74.1 | | (2) The name of the gallery which the true confidant, his beloved, the god’s-sealer, the overseer of the fleet of Hathor (3) Montuhotep, lord of veneration, born of Sahathor, lord /// (4) opened /// (?) interior-which-gave-turquoise-to-the-king-of-Upper-and-Lower-Egypt, Nebkaure-may he live forever |
| | | Expedition Text |
| | | 12: Amenemhat II |
### Zone 3: Further Red Sea and Atbai [75-85]

**[75] Iww**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[75.1] Coffin Texts, IV 46</th>
<th>CT IV, 46-47</th>
<th>(46f) iw rdì (.w) n = i hpr. w n. w mn. t in nby. t nb. t-nb. wt (g) pri. t m nbi δr. (y) t znì. w p. t (b) iw t p = i sì = m ḥsbd (i) iw h. t = m ẓm (j) iw b'ñ. t = m nbìn n. (y) Iww (k) str. wt = cìg. wt = m ṭw-nwût = nb Ṣhìw (47a) iw wn &lt; m &gt; n = zǔ. t (b) iw mtr. n = n ḥn. w m ḥw. t-nwtr. w n. t Ḥw. t-hr. w (c) iw dbn. n = p. t ḥn cîw (d) tì pn ḥr = m ṭw-ty = i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[75.2] Speos Artemidos Inscription</td>
<td>Gardiner, JEA 32, pl. 6; Urk. IV, 385.13-17</td>
<td>(13) Rṣ-ṣm.w t Iww n sdq = sn r ḥm = i Pwnt [wbn]. t i n = ḥr ẓh. wt (14) nh. wt ḥr čnt-yw wṣd mtn. w wn.w śrì ḥr wī.ty (13) Ra-Shaut and Iuu, they were not hidden to my majesty, Punt has arisen for me upon the fields (14) of trees bearing fresh myrrh, the roads which were blocked upon both paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [76] | $Tw-pn-n(y)-k\bar{a}$ | \begin{align*}
113) m=k ntr rdi.n \equiv (114) \\
\epsilon nh=k ini \equiv tw r Tw-pn-n(y)-k\bar{a} \\
113) \text{Behold, the god, he has caused (114) that you may live and that he may bring you to This-Island-of-Ka}
\end{align*} |
| [76.1] | The Story of the Shipwrecked Sailor (pPetersburg 1115) | Blackman, Middle Egyptian Stories, 44 |
| [77] | $P3-y m-\epsilon z-n(y)-m w-kd$ | \begin{align*}
(1)\; rn.w \; n \; n3 \; n(y) \; [rmn] &\quad (2)\; p3 \; n(y) \; K\hat{s} \\
(3)\; Tp-hny \; (?) &\quad (4)\; Miw \\
(5)\; Trw &\quad (6)\; \bar{s}d3 \\
(7)\; Trm &\quad (8)\; P3-I3bh\hat{A} \\
(9)\; P3-mw-k[d] &\quad (10)\; P3-my-mw-\epsilon z-n(y)-(10)\; mw-kd \\
(9)\; \ldots \text{Laden with the things of Egypt without their number, they were as 10,000. Proceeding in The-great-sea-of-Mu-qed, they arrived to the hill-} &\quad (9)\; \ldots \\
\end{align*} |
<p>| [77.1] | Stockholm, oMedelshavsmuseet14020 | Zibelius, Afrikanisches Orts und Völkernamen, vii, 197 |
| [77.2] | pHarris I Punt Expedition | Grandet, Le Papyrus Harris I, pl. 78 |
| 88 | | |
| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative letter</th>
<th>Pwnt nn h[m.w st dw wd3 hr yr</th>
<th>countries of Punt, without evil approaching them (or) proceeding under terror.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[77.3] pCairo ESP, Document C-D.</td>
<td>(45) di p3 hpš tnr n(y) pr-c3 p3y nb n3 (46) hr.w n.w Šs.w n(y) <strong>Mw-kd</strong> n.ty hmsi m Khkh(47) sp3.t p3 ym n p3 iwn r-dr iw m Imn.w- (48) R.w nsw ntr.w p3 ntr-c3 nb n(y) tI nb Ism (49) irm=n n r di.t n=n dr.t</td>
<td>(45) The strong arm of the Pharaoh, the good lord, has cast to the ground the (46) enemies of the Shasu of <strong>Mu-qed</strong> who were sitting in Qehqeh, in the shore (47) of the sea. Since it is Amun-(48) Ra, king of the gods, the great-god, the lord of every land who went (49) with you in order to give to you a hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Ramesses IX</td>
<td>(70) m.i.t n(t) tI hr.wt n.ty iw=st n n3 Nhšy.w tI mh.yt Nhš.yw (71) n(w) tI Ikyet I:Išmi m pd.wt r n3 (72) hr.w n(y) Ššs.w n(y) <strong>Mw-kd</strong> r rdi.t st p3 hpš t(n)r n(y) pr-c3 c.w.s n p3 (73) iwn</td>
<td>(70) The copy of the provisions which were for the Nubians who wore feathers and the Nubians of the land of Ikyet who went forth as soldiers against the enemies of the Shasu of <strong>Mu-qed</strong> in that the strong arm of the Pharaoh l.p.h. throw them to the ground.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**[78] ^nw**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>[78.1]</strong></th>
<th>Deir el-Bahari, Middle Colonnade, Punt Expedition of Hatshepsut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urk. IV,</strong> 328.9-329.11; Naville, <em>Deir el Bahari III,</em> pl. 72</td>
<td>1) ^{[3lp]} T3-nfr ^{3h}.w m kmy.t (3) n.t ^{nt.yw} m nhw.t n.t ^{nt.yw} w{d} (4) m hbny hr 3bw w{b} m nbw w{d} (5) n(.y) ^{nw} m ti{-}fsp (6) hsy.t m ihm.t (7) sntr msdm.t (8) m ^{l'n}.w (9) gif.w (10) tsm[.w] (11) m inn(12).w (13) n.w 3by.w ^{sm}(.w) m mr.wt hn* ms.w =sn (1) Loading the ships with very great quantities with wonders of the (2) hill-country of Punt and all good plants of the God's-Land; heaps of resin (3) of myrrh from trees of fresh myrrh, (4) ebony, pure ivory, gold, malachite (5) of Amu, ti{-}shepes wood, (6) khesyt wood, ihemet resin, (7) incense, black eye paint, (8) baboons, (9) velvet monkeys, (10) hounds, skins of Upper Egyptian leopards, and labourers together with their children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>[78.2]</strong></th>
<th>Fragment from Deir el Bahari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urk. IV,</strong> 326.6; Naville, <em>Deir el Bahari III,</em> pl. 70</td>
<td>(x+1) nbw ^{nw} ^{nt.yw} /// (x+1) gold of Amu, myrrh ///</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>[78.3]</strong></th>
<th>Speos Artemidos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner, <em>JEA</em> 32, pl. 6; <em>Urk. IV,</em> 384.7</td>
<td>(6) ^{[ntr]} nb mst.w m d.t-f m d{f}n(.y) ^{m3nw} (6) Every god being fashioned in his form as electrum of Amu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78.4]</td>
<td>Karnak, votive offerings to Amun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78.5]</td>
<td>Annals of Thutmose III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78.6]</td>
<td>Theban Tomb of Puyemre (TT39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78.7]</td>
<td>Luxor Temple, Litany to Min-Amun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78.8]</td>
<td>Luxor Temple, List of Mining Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78.9]</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Room 20 and 21, Bandeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78.10]</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Treasury Room, South Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[78.11]</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Treasury Room, West Wall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhetorical Text 20: Ramesses III

92
### 78.12
Inscription of Userhat at Sabu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vercoultter, <em>Kush</em> 4, 70; Hintze &amp; Reineke, <em>Felsinschriften aus dem sudanesische n Nubien</em> 1, 184, II, 268</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the Ka of the draftsmen, Userhat of Am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 79
*W3d-wr-I3b.ty*

| Piankoff, *The tomb of Ramses VI*, 151-152. Lines unnumbered, begins 7
th line from left, top register, p. 151. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bentiu is their name, Punt is their city. They are in the land of the Kenemtiu-faced-monkeys; the hill-country, Wetjenet (is) its name, (in) the eastern ocean. Their land is the eastern horizon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funerary Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 80
*Wkm.t*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edel, <em>NAWG</em> 1/6, 178-179; Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em> 67; 89;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) in the palace, who travelled through the mountains of Punt in order to bring (2) which (?) he said, (I) cut [eb]ony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedition Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallet, <em>La zone minières pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï</em>, doc. 203.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[81]** *Wmt*  

**[81.1]** Qubbet el-Hawa, Tomb of Setka  

| Edel, Seyfried, Vieler, *Die Felsgräbern ekropole der Qubbet el Hawa bei Assuan*, I, III, pl. 85 | iw=i ht[i.][k?[i?] r T3-sti ːbw gmi.n=e) g(3)i.t iyi.t m T3m rft (i)ys.t nb(t) iyi.t(i) m M[t]β iw [ini?] m (=) =nt.yw m Kbn nbw hmti(?) m T3-ntr ini(w) n(=) sntr n(y) bm hbn(y) m Wmt m /// /// /// m /// /// N3h gif.w m S[t]w  

[I] went southwards towards Ta-Sety and Elephantine and then (I) discovered the deliveries coming from Yam, while everything was coming from Medja. (I) [brought] myrrh from Byblos, gold and copper from God’s-Land, incense of Yam, ebony from Wetenet, /// /// /// from /// Nab(?), and monkeys/meerkats from Satju were brought to me. | Expedition Text 9 |  |

**[81.2]** Hymn to Min  

| Sethe, *Ägyptische Lesestücke*, 65.16-20 | dw3==Mn.w sk=Hr.w fβ= w i-nd-hr= k Mn.w m pri.t=f kβi šw.ty s= Wsir msi.n is.t ntr(y)t wr m sn.wf 3 m lw Gbtyn Hr.w 3m β.w nb ʃʃf,š sgr  

I praise Min and I exalt Horus, the one who raises the arm. Hail to Min in his procession, high of the two plumes, son of Osiris, whom Isis the | Hymn | Middle Kingdom |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>fAw.w iti.y ntr.w nb.w wr Bd.t h3i = Mdl3 šsšty m Ti-sty Win.ty i3(w) (?) ḫs (?)</td>
<td>goddess, bore, great in the Senut, great in Ipu and Coptos, Horus, strong of arm, lord of awe, who silences threats, sovereign of all gods, great of scent as he descends from Medja, respected one of Ta-Sety, he-of-Wetenet, praise (?) and praise (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[81.3]</td>
<td>Barns, Five Ramesseum Papyri, pl. 11</td>
<td>(32) wrd.t m iri.t šm.t ink tp.w ḫs.wt m nn? /// /// š3w n=n d/// (33) m-gs i3b.ty n(y) Win.t c?=n n wrd=¼... (32) Being weary in making a journey. I am on top the hill-country in (?) /// /// valuable-things for them ? /// (33) in the eastern side of Wetenet. The Baboon, I am not weary (?)...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[81.4]</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 616.17-617.1</td>
<td>(19) iy.i=n ḫr=ti=ḫ Thnw Ttw.w-Ttn.tyw n sḥm b3w=k (19) I have come to let you trample the Tjehenu, The-islands-of-the-Wetjenet-people because of the power of your might.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[81.5]</strong></td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List</td>
<td><strong>Urk. IV, 799, 803</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[81.6]</strong></td>
<td>Luxor Topographical List</td>
<td><strong>Urk. IV, 1340.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[81.7]</strong></td>
<td>Sinai nos. 238 + 427</td>
<td>Edel, NAWG 1/6, 178-179; Gardiner, Peet &amp; Černý, The Inscriptions of the Sinai 67; 89; Tallet, La zone minières pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï, doc. 203.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[81.8]</td>
<td>Deir el-Bahari; Medinet Habu, Solar Theology Text (parallel versions)</td>
<td>Parallel texts: see Karkowski, <em>The Temple of Hatshepsut: The Solar Complex</em>, 218; Voß, <em>SAK</em>, 378-379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| 81.12 | Litany of Re | Hornung, *Das Buch der Anbetung des Re im Westen*, I, 78; Piankoff, *The Litany of Re*, 28, pl. 7 | \( hkn.w \ n=r \ k^r \ k^3l(w) \)  
\( shm \ i^n.\ w \ h\eta n(w) \)  
\( Wtn.ty \ dpr.y \ m^3c \)  
\( irw.w \ twt \ is \ [h]\tilde{\iota} \ i^n.\ dw^3.t \) | Praise to Re, who is high of sekhem-power, the rejoicing Baboon, he of *Wetnet*, Khepri, who makes forms anew, you are the [corpse] of the baboon of the Duat. | Hymn | 19 |
| 81.13 | The Book of the Day | Piankoff, *Tomb of Ramses VI*, 151-152. Lines unnumbered, begins 7th line from left, top register, p. 151. | \( Bnt.yw \ nr \{m\} = \text{sn} \)  
\( niw.t = \text{sn} \ pw \ Pwn.t \)  
\( iw(=w) \ m^3 \ kmn.ty \)  
\( hr \ h^3.t \)  
\( hr \ h^3.t \)  
\( Wtn.t \ nr = w^3.d-wr \)  
\( i^3b.ty \ b = \text{sn} \ pw \ i^3h.t \)  
\( i^3b.ty \) | Bentiu is their name, Punt is their city. They are in the land of the Kenemtiu-faced-monkeys; the hill-country, Wetjenet (is) its name, (in) the eastern ocean. Their land is the eastern horizon. | Funerary Text | 19 |
| **[81.15]** | Lapp, *The Papyrus of Nu (BM EA 10477)*, pl. 37, 19-20 | (19)...rw h(y) im.y Wtn.t (20) iw=k im=d iw=d im=k irw=k irw=d ink b+h km-wr (21) rm=d | (19)...Lion, youth, who is in Wetnet, (20) you are in me, I am in you, my form is your form, I am the flood, Kem-wer (21) is my name. | Funerary Text | New Kingdom |
| **[81.16]** | Munro, *Totenbuch Handschriften der 18. Dynastie*, pl. 130; Lapp, *The Papyrus of Nu (BM EA 10477)*, pl. 37, 19-20 | pMaiherperi, 440) I shr.y pri m Wtn.t n thi=d iwn n i' ntr | 440) Oh advisor who comes forth from Wetnet, I have not transgressed character and not washed the god. | Book of the Dead | New Kingdom |

### 82: Bia-Pwnt

#### 82.1 Qubbet el-Hawa, biography of Harkhuf

**Urk. I, 130.14-15**

(21) *mr hm=f mß nng pw r in.w Bia-(22)Pwnt* | (21) His majesty desires to see this pygmy more than the produce of Bia-(22)Punt | Expedition Text; rhetorical point | 6: Pepi II

#### 82.2 Wadi Gasus, Shrine of Ankhow

**Sayed, RdE 29, 162**

(2) /// /// /// mß r Bia-Pwnt (3) /// /// | (2) /// /// /// leading to Bia-Punt (3) /// /// | Expedition Text | 12: Senwosret I
Mersa Gawasis, Stele of Antefoker

Sayyed, *RdE* 29, 171

100... Iqt f-Iqr mDH Haw pn [hr?] (4) whr.wt n(wt) Gbwt sb.t <r> Bt3-Pwnt r ph m htp r iwi.t m htp

(3)... Antefoger, build these ships [upon] (4) the shipyard of Coptos (and) go <to> Bia-Punt in order to reach (it) in peace and return in peace

Expedition Text

12: Senwosret I

Mersa Gawasis, stele no. 5

Bard, Fattovich, *Harbour of the Pharaohs*, fig. 90, 91; Pirelli, *RdE* 58, pl. 17

(5) im.y-r3 'hn.wty n(y) Tp-rs.y (6) Nbsw (7) rdi.n hm=f iwt=i r Bt3-(8)Pwnt hn im.y-r3 pr wr (9) Snb=f hr mnh shr=4

(5) the chamberlain of the Head-of-the-South (6) Nebus (7) His majesty caused that I may go to Bia-(8)Punt together with the steward (9) Senbef because of the excellence of my plan

Expedition Text

12: Amenemhat III

Mersa Gawasis, Wadi Gawasis, stele no. 29


(2) ///mty (?) mrj.y=f im.y-r3 zbi.t Bt3-Pwnt wn.t hsf.y ///(3) spr.n=f Hw.t-ntr Mnw m ib n(y) hm=f m(t).t(y)t

(2) /// the precise-one, his beloved, the overseer of the cargo (?) of Bia-Punt who went out (?) (3) (after) he reached the Temple of Min, though the desire of his majesty likewise (?).

Expedition Text

12: Senwosret II
| [82.6] Mersa Gawasis, Stele of Imeru | Sayed, RđE 29, pl. 13 | (1) /// Bβ-η(γ)-Pwn[t] (2) /// // t I-mrw mš²-ḥrw | (1) /// to Bia-en-Pun[t] (2) /// // the hall, Imeru, justified | Expedition Text | Middle Kingdom |
| [84] Pwnt | Urk. 1, 246.3-5 | (x+8) ini.t m ht.yw (x+9) Mfk.t (? 6000 (x+10) Pwnt (x + 11) ṯntiyw 80,000 d^m 6,000 šsm.t 2,900 [n]hw 23,020 | (x+8) That which was brought from the Terraces (x+9) of Turquoise, 6000 (x+10) pieces of (from) Pwnt. (x+11) 80,000 pieces of Myrrh, 6,000 pieces of electrum, 2,900 pieces of malachite. | Expedition Text | 5 |

For the likely reading of ṯndw see El Awady, Abusir XVI, 256.
| [84.2] | Abusir, Calcite vase of Teti | dd *mdw* (*in*) *Pwnt* *in.n* (=i) *n=ktntwy bw nb(w)* | Words spoken by **Punt**, I have brought to you all myrrh | Dedication text on a vase. | 6: Teti |
| [84.3] | Qubbet el-Hawa, Tomb of Pepinakht | (10)...*iw gr h3b.n w(i) hmn n(y) nb=i (11) r h3s.t c3mw r in.i.t n=f smr w=f ty Nḥn Ká3-ṣpr wn hr sp.t kbn.t im r *Pwnt* (12) sk sm3.n nw c3mw n.w hr.(y)w-ṣ ḫn=c tz.t n.t ms=c n.t ḫn=c=f | (10)...Now the majesty of my lord sent me (11) to the hill-country of the Aamu in order to bring for him the sole friend, controller of Nekhen Kaaper, and his son, Ananakhta who were assembling a kebenet-ship to **Punt** there, (12) when the Asians of the sand-dwellers killed him together with the troop of the expedition which was with him. | Expedition Text | 6: Pepi II |
| [84.4] | Qubbet el-Hawa, Tomb of Harkhuf | (6)...*wn.t in.i=n=k dng lb3(7)w nṯr m ti-ḥadyw m.i.t dng in(i) (8) ḫmn ty-nṯr B3-wr-dd m *Pwnt* m rk ḫs (8) The god's sealer Bawerdjed brought from **Punt** in the time of Isesi... | (6) That you brought a dancing pygmy of the god from the land-of-horizon-dwellers, the like of the pygmy (that) (8) the god's sealer Bawerdjed brought from **Punt** in the time of Isesi... | Expedition Text | 6: Pepi II |
| [84.5] | Qubbet el-Hawa, Inscription of Khui | Newberry, *JEA* 24, 182; *Urk.* 1, 140-16-17. | hrḥ-h₃b Ḥnm.w-ḥtp.w dd iw pr₃.k(wi) ḫn= nb= ḫ₂ty-n hr₃.ty-n ṭḥ₃.mty-n ṭr ṭtṛ Ḥwi r Ḿuy Pwn | Director of the kiosk, Khnumhotep, who said: I went forth together with my lord, the mayor, the sealer of the god, Tjetji and Khui to Byblos and Punt | Expedition Text | 6: Pepi II |
| [84.6] | Coffin Texts II, 127 | CT II, 126-127 | 126e) �ouston. s₃ḥ (127a) ḫr r₃mn.wy ḫ₃(.w) ḫḥ gs-t(w)t Pwn | 126e) The knees of Orion (127a) are upon the shoulders of the one-who flies (and) who damages a full half of Punt | Funerary Text | FIP |
| [84.7] | Coffin Texts I 204 | CT I, 204 | d) iw rḥ₃.t n= n= k ṭn (e) ḫḥ₃.t Pwn (f) ḫ₃.e$t (i) ḫ₃.t Pwn (j) ḫ₃.e$t nb₃.t Pwn (1 205a) wsḥ. ṭḥ₃.w | d) I gave to you these (e) offerings, which Hathor, mistress of Punt gave to you (f), she giving to you myrrh in the great-mansion amongst the ones who go forth on the bark of flesh | Funerary Text | FIP |

See Faulkner, *Coffin Texts* I, 42 for notes on different renditions
### 84.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coffin Texts VI, 214</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT VI, 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffin Texts, III, 90 + Coffin Texts, III 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) [The spell for an armband]: (b) How beautiful is the favourite place of my son;(c) then said Geb, prince of the gods: As for his son Osiris,(d) gold of the hill countries, malachite of God’s-Land, and (e) jasper of Punt were brought to him.

### 84.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coffin Texts, III, 90, 114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT III, 90, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffin Texts, III 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90e) That I found Khonsu on the road, was (after) he had come down from Punt.

114d) This N found Khonsu standing in his road (e) (while) he was coming down from Punt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84.10</td>
<td>Coffin Texts IV, 182</td>
<td>(n) īẁ ẖhm lw ñiw n(y) ḫw lw (o) gmǐ.n(=) wi m Pwnt (p) ḫd.l.n(=) pr im msẖn.t= (q) īw mw.t= ḫr nh.t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.11</td>
<td>Coffin Texts VII 249</td>
<td>///(o) s.t= īnī= n(=) ?nt.yw īm.yw Pwnt ///</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.12</td>
<td>School book Kemit: Collated Text from multiple documents</td>
<td>sn ∼dm-i.b(=t) rḏl(=t) īw t lw mṯ.t-n.wt= rṇpt ḡwr lw m ?nt.yw n(y) Pwnt ḡmn lw ṯt-nṯr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.13</td>
<td>The teaching of a Man to his son</td>
<td>(8,1) mṯ= ḡḥs.t nb.t ḫr ḫr.yt= (8,2) īw ḡwr lw= sn ḫr ḡnb n= ṯt (8,3) ḡḏī bṯ. ḡw= ḡwḏ-wr (8,4) nb.t ḫr snḍ.w= (8,5) Pwnt ṯdb lw ḡḥs.w nb ḡtwy (8,6) īw ṯṛ ḫr snḥ n= ṯt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document ID</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.13A]</td>
<td>The Tale of Sinuhe</td>
<td>Koch, Die Erzählung des Sinuhe, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.14]</td>
<td>The Story of the Shipwrecked Sailor</td>
<td>Golenischeff, Les Papyrus Hiératiques nos. 1115, 1116 A et 1116 B, pl. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **[84.15]** | Inscription of Henu (Hammamat no. 114) | *Couyat & Montet, Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât, 83, pl. 31* | (9) $h\tilde{b}n$ (10) $[w(i)\ nb(=i)]\ 'n(h,w) w\tilde{d}(w)\ snb.w\ r\ shi.t\ kbn.yt\ r\ Pwnt\ r\ ini.t\ n=f \ 'nt.yw\ w3d\ m-c.w\ h\tilde{k}3.w\ h\tilde{r}.y-ib\ dsr.t\ n\ snd=f\ h.t\ h\tilde{h}s.wt\ 'h\ n\ pri.kwi\ m\ Gb tw… \\
(10) [[My lord l. p.] h. sent me to conduct kebenet-ships to **Punt** in order to bring for him fresh myrrh from the rulers who are in the middle of the desert, because of his fear throughout the hill-countries. Then I went forth from Coptos… | Expedition Text | 11: Montuhotep III |
<p>| <strong>[84.16]</strong> | Theban Tomb of Antefoqer (TT60) | <em>Davies, The Tomb of Antefoker, pl. 10</em> | $n\ k\tilde{s}.w\ =\ 'nt.yw\ mwd.n\ P\tilde{m}\ m3\ h. nb.t\ Pwnt$ | For your kas: myrrh which Ptah pressed, and which the mistress-of-<strong>Punt</strong> brought. | Epithet of Hathor | 12: Senwosret I |
| <strong>[84.17]</strong> | Mersa Gawasis, Shrine of Ankhow | <em>Sayed, RdÊ 29, 159</em> | Eastern Jamb: $mr.y\ Hr.w-wr-R^C.w\ nsw-bi.ty\ H\tilde{p}r-k\tilde{l}-R^C.w\ mr.y\ Hnt.y-h.ty\ s^l-R^C.w\ Sn-wsr.t\ mr.y\ Hw.t-hr\ nb(t)\ Pwnt$ | Central Block: (2) <strong>hrp</strong> | Eastern Jamb: 1) Beloved of Haoaeris, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Kheperkare, beloved of Khenty-khety, Son of Re, Senwosret, beloved of Hathor, mistress of <strong>Punt</strong>…. | Expedition Text | 12: Senwosret I |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[84.18]</td>
<td>Nibbi, <em>JE</em> A 62, pl. 9.</td>
<td>(2) <em>(rDi.t i3w) w n (r) y-p</em> <em>(t) Hm</em> <em>(h3.ty)-†</em> bi t im y-r3 rw.yt (3) <em>Hnt y-h.t wr m-h</em>t iw t=f m (4) <em>Htp m Pwnt</em> ms=f (5) <em>hn=f wd3h.w</em> snb.w h=f htp.w (6) n Z3ww rnp t 28</td>
<td>(2) (Giving praise) by the hereditary noble, the mayor, the sealer of Lower-Egypt, overseer of the law court (3) Khentykhetwer, after his return in (4) peace from Punt, his army (5) together with him, being healthy and sound, his fleet resting (6) in Sawuww, year 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.19]</td>
<td>Bard, Fattovich, <em>Harbour of the Pharaohs</em>, fig. 90, 91; Pirelli, <em>Rd</em> 58, pl. 17</td>
<td>(13) <em>(rDi.n hm=f iwt(=i) r sb.t (14) im.y-r3 pr wr Snb=f (15) r Pwnt)</em></td>
<td>(13)... (He says): his majesty caused that I go in order to transport (14) the steward Senbef (15) to Punt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Ref.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.20]</td>
<td>Wadi el Hol no. 5</td>
<td>Damell, <em>Theban Desert Road Survey</em>, I, 99</td>
<td>(12) <em>Hr.w-wr hr.y-tp h3s.wt Wrr.t nb.t Pwnt</em> (13) <em>Nw.t Hr-wr-R5.w Spdw-Nfr-b3w-n(y)-R5.w Smsrw Hr.w-3b.ty</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.21]</td>
<td>Mersa Gawasis, inscribed Box-lid of Dedi (BG 20)</td>
<td>Mahfouz et al., in Bard, Fattovich (eds), <em>Harbour of the Pharaohs</em>, fig. 99-100; Fattovich, <em>BMSAES</em> 8, fig. 48</td>
<td>(1) <em>rnp.t sp 8 hr hm n(y) nsw-bi.ty N(y)-M5°.t-R5°.w dt 5nh d.t</em> (2) <em>in.w bI3 wt Pwnt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.22]</td>
<td>Mersa Gawasis Ostraca WG 102</td>
<td>Mahfouz et al., in Bard, Fattovich (eds), <em>Harbour of the Pharaohs</em>, fig. 99-100; 228</td>
<td>/// 260 Pwnt rnm.yt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Museum/Reference</td>
<td>Name/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.23</td>
<td><strong>Cylinder Seal, Brooklyn Museum</strong> 44.123.76</td>
<td>3d bn y-ri sš kmm(?) Sn-wsr.t-nḥ (i)mḥ.w iri.n Sš.t-Pwnt</td>
<td>The judge, overseer of the scribes of the blind (?), Senwosretankh, the venerated, born of Sat-Punt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.24</td>
<td><strong>Abydos, Funerary Stele JdE 20722</strong></td>
<td>Lange &amp; Schäfer, <em>Grab- und Denkstein des Mittleren Reiches</em>, II, 351</td>
<td>n k3 n(.y) sn.t=f Sš.t-Pwnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.25</td>
<td><strong>Abydos (?), stele of Sa-Punt JdE 207490</strong></td>
<td>Lange, Schäfer, <em>Grab- und Denkstein des Mittleren Reiches</em>, II, 383</td>
<td>sš hr.t-ntr Sš-Pwnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.26</td>
<td><strong>Langres Stele no. 110</strong></td>
<td>Gauthier-Laurent, <em>BIFAO</em> 30, 111</td>
<td>hm.t=f n.t Pwnt Sš-msw.yt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.27</td>
<td><strong>Wien, Stele ÄS 186</strong></td>
<td>Hein &amp; Satzinger, <em>Stelen des Mittleren Reiches</em>, 12/16</td>
<td>Sš-Pwnt iri.n Tw-sni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.29]</td>
<td>Davies, Sudan &amp; Nubia 7, 53</td>
<td>El-Kab, Tomb of Sobeknakht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.30]</td>
<td>Luiselli, Der Amun-Re Hymmus des P. Boulaq 17, 43, pl. 1</td>
<td>Hymn to Amun-Re (various texts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...sr pn m hnty.t hft</td>
<td>(14) ... This official went south in accordance with (15) that which his majesty commanded for him. He arrived at [Abydos], (at) the appearance of this god. The majesty of this god proceeded to the Neshmet-barque, mistress of eternity, [in order to make his crossing], the [great] river flooded [with] the scent of Punt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...iyi.t Ks (2) [hst.t] fgA(w) r 3w= shnp wh.w.t W3w.3.t (3) /// nb.wt n.w [Hn.t-hn-nfr Pwnt Md3.w ]</td>
<td>(1) ...[Vile (?)] Kush (2) came and was aroused along its length, and stirred up the settlements of Wawat (3) and /// (?) of Khenthennefer, Punt, and Medja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...nb Md3.w hkp3 Pwnt wr n(y) p.t sms.w n(y) T3...</td>
<td>(1.4) Lord of Medja, ruler of Punt, greatest of heaven, oldest one on earth…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...2.4) mrr.w ntr.w sty= hft iyji= m Pwnt wr iid.t (2.5) {hbi=fb} &lt;h3i=fb&gt; m Md3.w nfr-ḥr iyji&lt;= m&gt; T3-nfr</td>
<td>(2.4) Whose (Amun’s) fragrance the gods desire when he comes from Punt, great</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **84.31** | De Morgan et. al, *Catalogue des monuments et inscriptions de l’Égypte antique I: Haute Égypte*, 126  
Gebel Tingar (Aswan), stele fragments | Bottom left fragment, (pBM 9988)  
X+4) /// /// /// /// /// $\text{sn} \ (?) \ ti-\text{sh}ps$  
$s\text{g} nb \text{n}dm \text{n} (\text{y}) \ h\text{s}.\text{wt}$  
(X+5) \ [\text{yw}] \ [g]\text{f}\text{w} \text{t}\text{(?)}  
n.\text{w} \text{Pwnt}$  
\(x+4\) their arms (?), $ti$-shepes-wood, and  
every sweet fragrance of the hill-countries,  
(x+5) [leo]pards, and monkeys of *Punt*.  
Royal Stele (?), 18 (?) |  
of scent (2.5) as he descends from the  
Medja, beautiful-of-face as he comes from  
God’s-Land |  
| **84.32** | Caminos, *Literary Fragments in the Hieratic script*, 17  
Fragment of a mythological text | (12) /// $\text{nb}.\text{t} \ P$ /// /// /// \[P\]  
(13) $\text{wnt} \ \text{pw} \ \text{[dd}.\text{t} \ \text{in} \ \text{nt} \ \text{r} \ \text{in}$  
n.\text{n} \ \text{nt} \ \text{r}.\text{w} \ \$\text{t}$ ///  
(12) /// the mistress of  
Pe /// /// /// \(13\) is (?) \[P\]\text{unt}, then this  
goddess said to these gods: go ///  
Hymn 18 |  
| **84.33** | Urk. IV, 319.15  
Deir el-Bahari, Middle Colonnade,  
Punt Expedition of Hatshepsut  
Urk. IV, 319.16-17  
Urk. IV, 319.9 | Fragment L: \[nt\.\text{r}.\text{w} \ \text{c} \text{hr}.\text{y}-\text{ib} /// \[P\]\text{wnt} ///  
Fragment D: \text{.h}r \ s.t=\text{s} \ \text{m-}  
\text{hnt} \ \text{Ht}\text{yw}-\text{nt} \ \text{[yw}.\text{n}.\text{w}$  
\text{P}\text{wnt} \ \text{s}.\text{t} \ \text{d} \  
\text{r}\text{t} \ \text{[n}.\text{t} \ \text{sh}\text{m}\text{h}$  
Fragment L: /// [the great gods who are in  
P\text{unt}  
D: \text{.u}\text{p} \ \text{upon} \ \text{their} \ \text{place}  
\text{before} \ \text{the} \ \text{Terraces-}  
of \text{Myrrh} \ [\text{of} \ P\text{unt},  
\text{the} \ \text{sacred} \ \text{place} \ \text{of}  
\text{enjoyment}  
N: \text{[\text{Amun-Re,} \ \text{Lord} \ \text{of} \text{Me} \text{dj}a, \ \text{ruler} \ \text{of} \text{Punt}}  
Her majesty made this  
Expedition Text 18: Hatshepsut |
while [sending the army to this hill-country] which [her father] foretold to [her long ago] in order to cause that this hill country may see her majesty with her father, the ruler of Punt…

[This army] of her majesty [arrived] being whole, intact [and healthy to the Terraces-of-Myrrh of] P[un]t…

Now [the chiefs of Punt, they worked for he her together]…

Travelling on the ocean, receiving the good road to God’s-Land, putting to land in safety at Punt…

…for Hathor, mistress of Punt…
"Arrival of the expedition:

spr wp.ty-nsw r T3-ntr ḫn mê
mê n ty m-ḥt=f tp-m wr.w
n.w Pwnt zbi m lh.t nb.t
nfr.t m štp-sê w.s n ḫw.t-
hr nb.t Pwnt

Over the people of Punt:

iyi.t in wr.w n.w Pwnt m
ksw m w3h-tp r šsp mê pn
n(y) ns w

Above the chief of Punt:

wr n(y) Pwnt Pṣrhw
hm.t=f Ity

Setting up camp:

hr ḫm mê wpw.ty-nsw ḫn mê
mê f m ḫty[w]-nt, yw-n.w-
Pwnt ḫr gs.wy w[d]-wr r

Arrival of the ambassador at God’s-Land, together with the army that was following him, before the chiefs of Punt. Transporting every good thing in the palace (l. p. h) to Hathor, mistress of Punt…

The coming by the chiefs of Punt with bowed heads, in order to receive this army of the king

The ruler of Punt, Parehu, his wife Ity

Preparing the tents of the ambassador together with his army in the Terraces-of-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 326.2-3</td>
<td>Above the emissary: šsp (\text{in.} w n(.w)) (\text{wr n(.y)}) Pwnt (\text{in wpw.} \text{ty-nsw})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 326.5-7</td>
<td>Over the Puntites: iy.i.t (\text{in wr n(.y)}) Pwnt (\text{hr in.} w=)fr gs.wy (w^3d)-wr (tp-m) wpw. (\text{ty-nsw})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 328.15</td>
<td>Next to a chapel of Hathor: ir.i.t snfr /// /// /// [n Hw.t-hr.w nb.t Pwnt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 328.17-329.11</td>
<td>Loading the ships: (\text{lp} ) (^3)lz.w r (\varepsilon^3.t) (\text{wr.t} m) bi3.w (\text{hi.s.t} Pwnt ) hi3.w nb(.w) nfr(.w) (n(.w)) T3-nfr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Receiving the produce of the chiefs of Punt by the ambassador.
- The coming by the chief of Punt under his produce on both sides of the sea in front of the ambassador.
- Making incense /// [for Hathor, mistress of Punt].
- Loading the ships very greatly with wonders of the hill-country of Punt, every good myrrh of Punt on both sides of the sea in order to receive the chiefs of this hill-country.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 116  | Landing in Thebes:  

| | plant of God’s-Land, heaps of gum of myrrh from trees of fresh myrrh, in ebony and pure ivory, in gold and malachite of Amu, in *ti-sheps-*wood and *khesyt-*wood, in *ihemet-*resin, incense, eye-paint, in baboons, vervet-monkeys and hounds, in skins of Upper-Egyptian leopards and peasants together with their children |

| | Sailing and coming in peace, putting to land at Ipet-sut in joy by the expedition of the lord-of-two-lands, the chiefs of this hill-country in their retinue. They brought their like of which had not been brought to the other Kings, namely wonders of the hill-country of *Punt,*
| Urk. IV, 331.3-5 | Above the chiefs, kneeling before the king: 
```
rdt dw1 n M3t-k3.w-R.w sn-t3 n Wsr.t-k3.w in wr.w n.w Pwnt
```|
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Urk. IV, 332.7-13 | Caption to the Chiefs of Punt 
```
wr.w n.w Pwnt dd.hr=sn dbh=sn htp.w hr hm.t=sn i-nq hr=t nsw T3-mri r5.yt psd.t mi itn nb.t=qt)n nb.t Pwn[t]
```|
| Urk. IV, 334.4-11 | because of the greatness of the might of this god, Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the two-lands 
```
above the chiefs, kneeling before the king:
```
```
rdt dw1 n M3t-k3.w-R.w sn-t3 n Wsr.t-k3.w in wr.w n.w Pwnt
``` |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving praise to Maatkare, kissing the earth for Useretkau by the chiefs of Punt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The chiefs of Punt; Then say (when) they request peace before her majesty and hail to you, king of Egypt, Rayet who shines like the sun-disc, our mistress, the mistress of Punt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The King himself (sic), the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Maatkare; dedicating the wonders of Punt, the costly-things of God’s-Land, together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 334.16-335.1</td>
<td>Over the Myrrh trees: ( nh.wt \ 5nt.yw \ w3 \ d \ ini.y \ m \ bi3.w \ Pwnt \ n \ hm \ n(y) \ ntr \ pn )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captions for goods:</td>
<td>Captions for goods:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( dm )</td>
<td>( dm )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>msdm.wt</td>
<td>msdm.wt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 5m.w \ n.w \ Pwnt.yw \ hbn(y) )</td>
<td>( 5m.w \ n.w \ Pwnt.yw \ hbn(y) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3b.w )</td>
<td>( 3b.w )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K3-)km</td>
<td>( K3-)km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 335.6</td>
<td>Over piles of Myrrh ( 5b.(y) \t \ 5nt.yw \ w3 \ d \ r \ 5z.t \ wr.t \ n \ lm.n.w \ nb \ ns.wt \ t3.wy \ bi3.wt \ h3s.wt \ P \ wnt \ $pss(w) \ n(w) \ T3-ntr )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captions:</td>
<td>Captions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrum</td>
<td>Electrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye-paint</td>
<td>Eye-paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw-sticks of the</td>
<td>Throw-sticks of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntites</td>
<td>Puntites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebony</td>
<td>Ebony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory</td>
<td>Ivory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-ka</td>
<td>Black-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 335.13-15</td>
<td>with the produce of the southern hill-countries, reckoning upon the taxes of vile Kush, the dues of Nehesy-Land for Amun…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trees of fresh myrrh, which were brought as wonders of Punt for the majesty of this god</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring fresh myrrh very greatly, for Amun, lord of the thrones of the two lands; the wonders of the hill-country of Punt, and the costly-things of God’s-Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 336.6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⬣</td>
<td>$smn.t\ m\ sš.w\ ḫšb\ tnw.t\ dmd(\ w)\ sm(\ w)\ m\ ĥḥ\ ḫḥ\ dḥf\ hš.t\ ššp\ bř.t\ w\ hšs.wt\ Pwnt\ n\ ḫmn.w-R^c.w\ nb\ ns.wt\ tš.wy\ nb\ p.t$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishing in writing, the counting of the census, assembled and united as millions, hundreds-of-thousands, tens-of-thousands, thousands and hundreds, receiving the wonders of the hill-countries of Punt for Amun-Re, lord of the thrones of the two-lands, lord of heaven…

Measuring fresh myrrh for Amun, lord of the thrones of the two-lands, lord of heaven; the best of the harvest was brought as wonders of the hill-country of Punt…

…its smells were as the god’s, its perfume mixed with Punt…
**Urk. IV, 342.9-17**

The King himself (sic), the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Maatkare. Arrival of the majesty of the palace l.p.h at the stair of the lord of the gods. Hearing the command at the great place, an oracle of the god himself: “Seach out the ways to **Punt**, open the roads to the Terraces-of-Myrrh, guide the expedition on water and on land in order to bring wonders from God’s-Land for this god who created its beauty.

I have given to you **Punt** (in) its entirety, as well as the Lands-of-the-Gods, the God’s-Land which has not been trodden and the Terraces-of-Myrrh which the people did.

---

**Urk. IV, 344.6-8**

$nsw \text{ ds}=\text{f nsw-bi.ty M}^3 \text{t-k3-R}^5 \text{w spr hm n(y) stp-s3} \text{c.w.s r (w)d n(y) nb ntr.w sdm wd m s.t-wr.t nd.wt-r3 n.t ntr ds}=\text{f d}^5 \text{r wt r Pwn} \text{t} wb3 ntn.w r Ht.yw-\text{nt.yw sSm mS8} \text{ hr mw hr }\beta r \text{ ini.t bi}3.w m T3-ntr n ntr pn km3 nfr.w=x$

$di.n(=i) \text{ n} = \text{Pwn} \text{t mi-}kd=s r-mn-m T3.w-ntr.w T3-ntr tmm hnd=\text{f Ht.yw-}\text{nt.yw hm}.n rmt$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Urk. IV, 345.6-9 | | not know. 
I created it (the garden) for myself in order to gladden my heart with your mother Hathor, mistress of {the crown of} Punt, mistress of heaven, the great of magic, mistress of all the gods. 
Establishing for him Punt inside his temple, extending the trees of God’s-land upon both sides of his temple |
<p>| Urk. IV, 353.2-3 | | I will make for him Punt in his garden. |
| Urk. IV, 353.16-17 | | Now one gave a command in the majesty of the palace, l.p.h to the hereditary- |
| Urk. IV, 354.15-17 | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mythological Text 18: Hatshepsut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.34]</strong> Myth of the Divine birth (Deir el Bahari, Middle Colonnade; Luxor west-wall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble, seal-bearer of the King of Lower Egypt, sole companion, overseer of sealers, Nehesy to conduct an expedition to Punt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was he who let her see him in his form as a god after he came before (her), she rejoiced in seeing his perfection, his love, it travelling in her body, the palace being flooded (with) fragrance, all his perfumes (being) from Punt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mythological Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Hatshepsut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mythological Text 18: Hatshepsut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.35]</strong> Myth of the Divine Birth, Medinet Habu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunner, <em>Die Geburt des Gottkönigs</em>, pl. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) How happy (is) the dew and scent of God’s-Land, the pleasant-smells of Punt, behold establishing my son as king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mythological Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Hatshepsut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mythological Text 18: Hatshepsut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.36]</strong> Speos Artemidos Inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner, <em>JEA 32</em>, pl. 6; <em>Urk. IV</em>, 385.13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Ra-Shaut and Iuu, they were not hidden to my majesty, Punt has arisen for me upon the fields, (14) trees bear fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Hatshepsut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatshepsut Obelisk Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urk. IV, 1097.7-9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urk. IV, 1143.12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.48]</strong> Theban Tomb of Qenamun (TT93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.49]</strong> Kom el-Hettan Topographical List (fragment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.50]</strong> Soleb Temple Festival to Amun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.52] Theban Tomb of Amenmose (TT89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.53] Sinai, doc. 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.54] Sinai no.211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [84.55] | Sinai nos. 238 + 427 | Edel, *NAWG* 1/6, 178-179; Gardiner, Peet & Černý, *The Inscriptions of the Sinai* 67; 89; Tallet, *La zone minières pharaonique du Sud-Sinaï*, doc. 203. | (1) /// /// /// m pr-nsw phr dw.w *Pwnt* r ini.t (2) /// /// /// /// /// /// dd=f [i]w(=) (hr) s^d /// [hb]ny m *Wtnt* k^w (3) /// /// /// ti-s^ps (4) /// /// kmy.t m *Wk[m.t]?
(1) /// in the palace, who travelled through the mountains of *Punt* in order to bring (2) /// /// /// /// which (?) he said, (I) cut [eb]ony (from) W'tnet, kau (?) (3) /// *ti-shapes-wood /// /// gum from Weke[met]. | Expedition Text | New Kingdom |
<p>| [84.56] | Soleb Temple, Stele of Amenhotep III | Urk. IV, 1657.2-5 | $dl=i$ $hr=i$ ri $wbn(t)$ $bi3{i} = i$ n=f $dl=i$ iwt n=f $h3s.wt$ n.w <em>Pwnt</em> $hr$ $h3w$ nb.w $ndm$ n.w $h3s.wt$ = $sn$ r $dbh$ htp.w $m-5^w$ = $ssn.t$ n(y r^nh) dd=f | I turned my face to dawn (lit. rising-place) and I made a wonder for you, I caused the hill-countries of <em>Punt</em> to return for you, under every sweet plant of their hill-countries, in order to ask for peace from him (and for) the breath (of life) which you give. | Rhetorical Text | Amenhotep III |
| [84.57] | Luxor Temple Southern Room | Brunner, <em>Die Südliche Räume</em>, pl. 57 | (3)… $hn\dot{m}=k$ m-(hr) nt(4)r (i)m(y) <em>Pwnt</em> $hn\dot{m}.w$ T3-ntr mi-kd=f | (3)... may you breathe in the presence of the go(4)d who is in <em>Punt</em>, the scents of the entirety of God's-Land | Rhetorical Text | Amenhotep III |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Rhetorical Text</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[84.58]</td>
<td>Luxor Temple, Southern Room</td>
<td>(9) <em>ini.n</em> = <em>k hr hꜣs.t nb.t km.yt</em> (10) <em>nt.yw n(w)</em> Pwnt</td>
<td>9) You have brought from every hill-country gum (10) and myrrh of Punt</td>
<td>18: Amenhotep III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.59]</td>
<td>Martin, The Memphite Tomb of Horemheb, pl. 22</td>
<td>(20) ...<em>ḫr(y)-pꜣ.t</em> Hꜣrꜣ.w-m-hꜣb tꜣw msꜣ p.t mi ḫn[m] nb.t Pwnt ḫnm=s m š (mr?) <em>nt.yw</em></td>
<td>(20) ...Praise (21) to you, Maat, mistress of the north-wind, who opens the nose of the living, and gives breathe to the ones who are upon his bark. May you cause (that) the Hereditary-prince Horemheb may breathe the wind which the sky creates, as the mistress of Punt breathes her scent from the lake (garden?) of myrrh.</td>
<td>18: Tutankhamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.60]</td>
<td>Karnak Temple Inscription of Horemheb</td>
<td><em>ms in.w in ḫm=f n ṭ(=f)</em> Imn.w m in.w n.w Pwnt n kn.t nḥ t rḏ.ī.n=k wr.w=sn m h&lt;m&lt;s&gt; n sn=d=k ḫr in.w=sn nb ḫr psd.t=sn ḫy ḫ.t y=pḥ.ty=k ḫr ḫis.t nb(t)</td>
<td>Presenting the products by his majesty to his father Amun, namely the tribute of Punt, because of the bravery and strength that you gave. Their chiefs are in humility, because of fear of you, bearing all their produce upon their backs, your</td>
<td>18: Horemheb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emendation of ( hm ) to ( hims ) follows Davies, <em>Egyptian Historical Records of the Later Eighteenth Dynasty</em>, VI, n. 471 where it is explained as a hieratic error.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **[84.61]**  
Karnak Temple Inscription of Horemheb  
Wreszinski, 1935, 60; *Urk.* IV, 2128.2-9  
\[ d\,t\,n\,w\,r\,w\, r^5 n\,w\, P\,w\,n\,(t) \]  
\[ \text{ind} \, h\,r=k\, n\,s\,w\, n(y)\, K\,m\,t \]  
\[ R^6,\, w\, n(y)\, p\,d\,t\, p\,s\,d\, t\, w\, i\,h \]  
\[ k=\, k\, n\, r\,h\, n\,=\, n\, K\,m\,t\, n\, h\,n\]  
\[ s\,w\, i\,m\, n=\, n\, p\, l\, i\, b\, w\, n,\, y \]  
\[ d\,d=k\, b,\, w\, h\, r\, t\, b\, w,\, t\, y=k \]  
That which the great chiefs of Punt said:  
"Hail to you, King of Egypt, the sun of the nine-bows: As your ka endures, we do not know Egypt, (our) fathers did not tread (on) it; give us the breath that you grant; all lands (are) under your soles. |
| Rhetorical Text 18: Horemheb |
| **[84.62]**  
Karnak Temple, Asiatic Topographical List  
*KRI* I, 31  
\[ S\,i,\, s\, w\, 43.\, T\, r\, t\, w\, 44.\, P\, w\, n\, t \]  
42. Shasu 43. Irtju 44. Punt 45. Nehau 46. Mbutu 57. Sethebu  
42. Shasu 43. Irtju 44. Punt 45. Nehau 46. Mbutu 57. Sethebu  
Topographical List 19: Seti I |
| **[84.63]**  
Karnak, Triumphal scene above Topographical List  
*KRI* I, 26.12-14  
\[ d\,i = h\,t = i\, b\,t,\, t\, y\]  
\[ b\,i\, t=\, k\, n\, w\, h\, n=\, k\, r-\, s\, w \]  
\[ d\,m\, d\, m\, h\, f=k\, s\, h\, w\, y\, h\, i,\, s\, w\, t \]  
\[ (14) \, [d\, t=\, h\, t\, =\, i\, b\, t,\, t\, y\]  
\[ b\, i\, t=\, n=\, k\, n\, w\, h\, n=\, k\, r-\, s\, w \]  
\[ d\, m\, d\, m\, h\, f=k\, s\, h\, w\, y\, h\, i,\, s\, w\, t \]  
\[ (15) \, [n=\, b,\, (w)t\, n=\, (w)t\, P\, w\, n\, t \]  
\[ h\, r\, i,\, h\, i,\, w\, i\, s\, t\, y,\, y\, w \]  
\[ t\, i=\, s\, p\, s\, h\, i,\, s\, w\, n=\, b,\, (w)\, n=\, d\, m\, (w)\]  
\[ n=\, w\, T\, d-t\, n \]  
[I set my face to the east, so that I might perform a wonder for you] it being tied up for you entirely and brought together in your fist. I collected (15) [every] hill- |
<p>| Rhetorical Text 19: Seti I |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.64]</strong></td>
<td>KRI I, 30.13-14</td>
<td>Karnak, Caption to Triumphal Scene Caption</td>
<td>(12) I (Amun-Re) have opened for you the ways to Punt; which is there Rhetorical Text 19: Seti I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.65]</strong></td>
<td>KRI I, 48.9-10</td>
<td>Nauri stele - Abydos Decree</td>
<td>The myrrh therein (in the treasury) of Punt is measured in heaps Royal decree; dedicatory section 19: Seti I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.66]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Book of Nut (Multiple copies, here follows Oseiron at Abydos)</td>
<td>This god exists in her (Nut’s) south-eastern side, behind Punt Funerary Cosmography 19: Seti I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.70]</td>
<td>Luxor, Litany of Min-Amun</td>
<td>KRI II, 626.5,</td>
<td>(89) *tnt.wy ti-šps n(y) Pwnt n lmn.w-Rˁ.w ḫštw.t (99) <em>išš ihm(t) ŋnd.w n lmn.w iri Pwnt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KRI II, 627.3</td>
<td>113) <em>hmhm.wt=f k.t m Pwnt n lmn.w ptpt ḫš.t</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>Luxor Temple, List of Mining Regions</td>
<td>KRI II, 619.13-14</td>
<td>Fig. 15) <em>dđ-mdw (i)n dìw n(y) Pwn</em>t n nsw bi.ty Wsr-mˁ.č-Rˁ.w štp-n(y)-Rˁ.w ḫy.n(ˁ) ini.n(ˁ) n=k klm[y].yf* //</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 84.72 | Aksha/Amara, Punt Expedition Text (parallel versions in enigmatic script) | KRI II, 210.15-211.1; KRI II, 215.6-7; Rodrigo, JSSEA 15, 69. | ...nsw-bi.ty Wsr-Mš.t-r. w-Stp-n(y)-R. w... sby mš=fr Pwnt ini (w) n=f Pwnt.yw m // b.ḥ(w) ʿṭp(w) inn.w mn.w ṣnt.yw išš /// ir.tw ʿnd šw ʿd (?) bỳ Pwnt ḫḏ pr.w nb.w špss(w) šmn.t R. w hr šr=f | brought to you kemyt-gum  
The King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Usermaatre-Setepenre... who sent his expedition reached towards Punt. The Puntites were brought to him /// the boats were loaded with inem-skins, trees of myrrh, ishesh-fruits /// irtiu-fruits, dried myrrh and fat (?). The marvels of Punt are intact, every noble temple prospers, (what) Re encircles is under his guidance. |
| 84.73 | Brussels Statue, E7500 | KRI II, 855.3-4 | Hr.w nb ʿḥ.t mh(,w) w3rḥ (<w3ḥ) m sty /// ḥnn.t=s mi[.t] Pwnt | Biographical Inscription of Queen Isetnofret  
Horus, lord of the palace, she who fills the pillared-hall with scent ///, her fragrance is like (the fragrance of) Punt... | Expedition Text 19: Ramesses II |
<p>| [84.74] | Leiden Hymn to Amun-Re | J. Zandee, <em>De Hymnen aan Amon van Papyrus Leiden I</em> 350, pl. 1 | □ | (5)...iwi n=k im.yw Pwnt šhk n=k Tj-ntr n mrw.t=k hnh (6) /// /// /// hr,y kmy.t r s(h)b r-pr.w=k m sty ḥb.w | The ones who are in Punt come to you, God's-Land is verdant for you, for your sake. Rowing (?) (6) /// /// /// with resin to make festive your temple with the fragrance of festivals. | Hymn (Amun-Re) | 19: Ramesses II |
| [84.75] | Sinai no. 263 | Gardiner, Peet &amp; Čemý, <em>The Inscriptions of the Sinai</em>, pl. 72 | □ | Plinth base: <em>mr.y Dḥw.ty nb-Pwnt</em> | Plinth base: Beloved of Thoth, lord of Punt | Expedition Text; epithets | 19: Ramesses II |
| [84.76] | Magical Papyri (pLeiden I 348) | Borghouts, <em>The magical texts of Papyrus Leiden I</em> 348, pl. 10, 27 | □ | (10.4)...ini.tw n=k gzi.y hr Wḥ̀3.t ʿnt.w m &lt;P&gt;ʷwn̄t (10.5) m ḏ́rt šps.t | (10.4)...Plants from the Oasis and Myrrh from Punt were brought to you from the hand of the noble-one. | Magical Text | 19 |
| [84.77] | Magical Papyri (pLeiden I 346) | Bommas, <em>Die Mythisierung der Zeit</em>, Beilage Faksimile | □ | I, 2) [I Šš]m.tyt nb.t Pwnt | I, 2) Oh Shesemtet, Mistress of Punt | Magical Text | 19 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 135</th>
<th>Book of the Dead 15c</th>
<th>Budge, <em>The Book of the Dead</em>, I, pl. 20.</th>
<th>(18)...[\text{rwd skdd.w hrf hmr=k stw.t=k m hr.w(=sn)}] [\text{nn rh st d5m nn smi (19) im3.w=k T3.w n.w ntr.w m33=(s)=n tw hr sš.w hš.wt n.w(t)}] [\text{Pwnt r sip (20) tw immn}]</th>
<th>(18)... Prospering and travelling under your majesty, your (Re's) rays are in their faces, electrum not knowing it (your rays), there being no reporting (19) of your brilliance. The Lands of the Gods, they saw you through writings. The hill-countries of Punt will inspect (20) you, the hidden one.</th>
<th>Funerary Text</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84.78</td>
<td>Book of the Dead 15c</td>
<td>Budge, <em>The Book of the Dead</em>, I, pl. 20.</td>
<td>(18)...[\text{rwd skdd.w hrf hmr=k stw.t=k m hr.w(=sn)}] [\text{nn rh st d5m nn smi (19) im3.w=k T3.w n.w ntr.w m33=(s)=n tw hr sš.w hš.wt n.w(t)}] [\text{Pwnt r sip (20) tw immn}]</td>
<td>(18)... Prospering and travelling under your majesty, your (Re's) rays are in their faces, electrum not knowing it (your rays), there being no reporting (19) of your brilliance. The Lands of the Gods, they saw you through writings. The hill-countries of Punt will inspect (20) you, the hidden one.</td>
<td>Funerary Text</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.79</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Topographical List next to Year 11 poem</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> V, 67</td>
<td>1. \text{Pwnt} 2. \text{Pimw} 3. \text{IspA} 4. {\text{M}} st 5. \text{Dqs} 6. \text{Hwš.t} 7. \text{T3-sm} 8. \text{Mšy} 9. \text{Pwnt}</td>
<td>1. \text{Punt} 2. \text{Pamu} 3. \text{Ispa} 4. \text{Meset} 5. \text{Djadjes} 6. \text{Hewat} 7. \text{Ta-semi} 8. \text{Masy} 9. \text{Punt} 10. \text{Pamu}</td>
<td>Topographical List</td>
<td>20: Ramesses III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.80</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Topographical List</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> V, 98</td>
<td>39. \text{Yw} 40. \text{Djawa} 41. \text{Mnd} 42. \text{IspA} 43. \text{Pimw} 44. \text{Pwnt} 45. \text{hšw} 46. \text{msw}</td>
<td>39. \text{Yu} 30. \text{Djawa} 41. \text{Menedj} 42. \text{Ispa} 43. \text{Pamu} 44. \text{Punt} 45. \text{Ahau} 46. \text{Amsu}</td>
<td>Topographical List</td>
<td>20: Ramesses III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.81]</strong></td>
<td>Karnak, Festival of Amun, scene H</td>
<td><strong>KRI V, 225.1</strong></td>
<td>// m 3.t m 3.t h 3k ¼ n =k Pwn t r /// /// // in real stones. I plundered Punt for you to ////</td>
<td>Festival Dedication</td>
<td>20: Ramesses III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[84.82]</strong></td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Festival of Min, bandeau text</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, IV, 200: <strong>KRI V</strong>: 201.5-7</td>
<td>rdi.t w d3 Mnw nb sn.(w)t s 3 = nsw-bi.ty Wšr-Mš.t- t R 5.w Mr. y-Imn.w h r-h 3.t = f ist k 3 h d h r-h 3.t n tr pn šw. ty r tp = f s 5 h h r mn h.t r h h = f h r 5.w = f 5b.y h r.y-h 3.b.t h r.y-tp h r šd.t i hb Mnw i m.y-r 3 hs.w m i.tt ir.y n h.s.yw n.(w) Pwn t h r s b 3.k n tr pn Causing the procession of Min, lord of the senut, his son, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Usermaatre Meryamun before him. Now a white bull is before this god, the two plumes on his head, (his) sah-ornament of cloth at its neck, his maa-ornament on his left arm. The chief lector priest recites the dance of Min, the overseer of singers likewise, the Nehesy of Punt exalt this god.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hymn; 20: Ramesses III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.83]</td>
<td>pHarris I Punt Expedition</td>
<td></td>
<td>(77, 8)…I hewed great menesh-ships and ber-ships before them, equipped with many crews and followers in number. Their (9) troop-commanders of the ships were in them under the agents and superiors in order to supply (them). Loading with the things of Egypt without their number, they were as 10,000. Proceeding in The-great-sea-of(10)-mu-qed, they arrived to the hill-countries of Punt, without approaching evil (or) proceeding under terror. Loading the menesh-ships and the ber-ships with the things of The two-lands-of-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandet, <em>Le Papyrus Harris I</em>, pl. 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expedition Text 20: Ramesses III-IV (referring to events under Ramesses III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
god namely (11) every hidden wonder of their hill-country; much myrrh of Punt, loading as thousands without number. The children of the chiefs of The-two-lands-of-god came before their produce (12) as far as Egypt. They arrived, they being healthy, at the hill-country of Coptos, they landed in peace bearing the things which they brought. They loaded in the land-journey on donkeys and people, (then) loaded (it) to ships upon the Nile of the harbor of Coptos
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[84.84]</th>
<th>Grandet, <em>Le Papyrus Harris I</em>, pl. 7, 33, 49, 71</th>
<th>Thebes. 7, 7) $s^\delta\rightarrow i\ n=k$ <em>Pwn</em> $m\ t\ nt,yw\ r\ pfr\ h\ w.t-ntr=k\ h\ r\ t\ p-dw\i.yt$</th>
<th>7,7) I brought <strong>Punt</strong> to you with myrrh in order to surround your temple at dawn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heliopolis, 33b, 12) $mnn\ nfr\ n(y)\ Pwn\t\ dbn\ 300$</td>
<td>33b, 12) good <strong>menen-en</strong>-resin of <strong>Punt</strong>, 300 deben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Memphis, 49, 6) $m{t}=i\ n=k\ in.w\ kn.w\ m\ t\ nt,yw\ r\ pfr\ h\ w.t-ntr=k\ m\ sty\ Pwn\ t\ sr.ty=k\ \sp, y\ h\ r\ t\ p-dw\i.yt$</td>
<td>49, 6) I brought to you much produce of myrrh in order to surround your temple with the scent of <strong>Punt</strong> for your two august nostrils at dawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70b, 14) $mnn\ nfr\ n(y)\ Pwn\ t\ dbn\ 300$</td>
<td>70b, 14) good <strong>menen-en</strong>-resin of <strong>Punt</strong>, 300 deben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.85]</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> V, 220.3-5</td>
<td>(12) $d\rightarrow i\ h=r\ [r\ i\ b\ tyt\ bi\z\ y=i]\ (13)\ n=k\ sh=i\ h\ s\ t\ nb(w)\ n.w\ P{n}\ wnt\ in.w=n\ m\ (14)\ km.y(i)\ t\ nt,yw\ (ti)-\sp\ h\ s\ [.w\ nb.w\ ndm(w)\ n.w\ T\i-ntr]$</td>
<td>12) I turned my face [to the east, so that I may perform a wonder] (13) for you. I collected every hill-country of <strong>Punt</strong> and their produce in (14) gum of myrrh (ti)-<strong>shepes</strong>-wood, and [every sweet] plant [of <strong>Rhetorical Text</strong>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Bark procession of Theban Triad</td>
<td></td>
<td>20: Ramesses III-IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.86]</td>
<td>Festival of Min, Ramesseum and Medinet Habu</td>
<td>Medinet Habu IV, pl. 203; 213; KRI V, 206.2-3</td>
<td>Words spoken by the Nehesy of Punt...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.87]</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Treasury, West Wall</td>
<td>KRI V, 321.11-12</td>
<td>(8) Words spoken by the lord of the two-lands, Usemaatre-Meryamun (9) I have brought to you electrum, gold, copper (10) royal-linen, gum (11) of Punt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.88]</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, Treasury Room, Caption for Aromatics</td>
<td>KRI V, 322.2</td>
<td>Gum of Punt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.89]</td>
<td>Karnak, Year 20 Stele</td>
<td>KRI V, 240.12-13</td>
<td>15)... Your fear reached the end of the earth, it broke the hearts of Khent-hen-nefer, and it pierced the lands of Fenekhu, it entered Punt and the sand-dwellers...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 down</td>
<td>Piankoff, <em>Tomb of Ramses VI</em>, 151-152. Lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 across</td>
<td>( h'r \ f.(y)t = s )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( s.n.d = s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 across</td>
<td>( m.b.w ) ( c.n.t ) ( m i ) ( n.b.(t) - P.wnt )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 across</td>
<td>( h'r \ h'.t y = m ) ( m ) ( c.n.t.y w ) ( n.w ) ( P.wnt ) ( m ) ( i.n.i = s.n )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 across</td>
<td>( h'r ) ( s.f.(y)t = s )</td>
<td></td>
<td>( s.n.d = s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 down</td>
<td>( p.t ) ( n.(t) ) ( T.t.m ) ( t ) ( n.i.w.t ) ( W.i.s.t ) ( n ) ( M.w.t ) /// ( h.k.t ) ( n.b.(t) - P.wnt )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 down</td>
<td>( p.t ) ( w.b ) ( m.m.n ) ( w ) ( m ) ( n.n.y = / / / / / P.wnt )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The one who is pure of herb (trees?) greets (moves?) /// Punt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 19 | being under her respect, her fear, and her terror, the ruler of Punt /// |
| 46 | Lower Egypt is beautiful, like the mistress of Punt |
| 47 | under your mayors with myrrh of Punt, namely that which they brought. |
| 18 | Heaven belongs to Atemit and the city of Thebes is of Mut /// the ruler and the lady of Punt |

<p>| 20: Ramesses VI |
|---|---|
| Bn.t.y.w ( r.n {m } = s.n ) ( n.i.w.t = n ) ( p.w ) ( P.wnt ) ( i.w = w ) ( m ) ( t ) ( k.m.n.t.y w ) ( h.r ) ( h'.s.t ) { ( h.r ) ( h'.s.t ) } |
| Bentiu is their name, Punt is their city. They are in the land of Funerary Text |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ramesses VI.</strong></th>
<th>unnumbered, begins 7th line from left, top register, p. 151.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wm.t rm</strong></td>
<td><strong>wtd-wr i3b.ty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t3=n pw 3h.t i3b.ty</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For notes on enigmatic writings see Müller-Roth, <em>Das Buch vom Tage</em>, 155-156. <em>Knmtwy</em> is determined with a baboon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[84.92] Hymn to Ramesses VII (CG 54031)</th>
<th>Condon, <em>Seven Royal Hymns of the Ramesside Period</em>, 11, pl. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(22,3) <em>f3i sw n=k p3 ym r nhm P3wnt</em></td>
<td>(22, 3) The Sea will raise itself for you rejoicing; <strong>Punt</strong>, it gives fragrances /// 4) the sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) <em>hr.t</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(13) <em>iwi tw m h5i=k sh.d.n=k p.t t sw t=k m mfk3.t m35.t</em></td>
<td>(13) Come as you appear and after you have enlightened heaven and earth. Your rays are as true turquoise (14) of <strong>Punt</strong> which will endure as the scent which you smell in front of your nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) <em>Pwnt mn.ti hr st y hnm=k r-tp n(y) fnw=k</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[84.94] Liebeslieder (pHarris 500=pBM EA 10060)</th>
<th>Mathieu, <em>Poésie Amoureuse</em>, pl. 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)...<em>d=i n=k m33 iri.t (?)</em></td>
<td>(2)... I said to you, see that which has happened, I came making (3) my bird-trap with my hand, my bird-catcher, and my sack. All the birds of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>i.y.n=k hr grg (3) p3y=i p3h.w{t} &lt;4&gt; m dr.t=i p3y=i tbw p3y= skyk.t (?) i3p.d.w nb(w) n(w) P3wnt (4) st(hr) hnw hr Km.t wrh m</em>ntyw iwi.t m tp.t*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[84.93] Funerary Text</th>
<th>Ramesside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[84.94] Love Song Ramesside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.95] Liebeslieder (oCairo CG 25218 + ODeM 1266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.96] Liebeslieder (pDeM 43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[84.97] Leiden Magical Papyrus (343 + 345), recto 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liebeslieder**

Mathieu, *Poésie amoureuse*, pl. 19

Koenig, *CRIPEL* 7, fig. 1

Massart, *The Leiden Magical Papyrus* I 343 + I 345, 30

**Love Song Ramesside**

**Magical Text Ramesside**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment D:</th>
<th>Deir el-Bahari, Middle Colonnade, Punt Expedition of Hatshepsut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 319.17-320.1</td>
<td>D: …upon their place before the Terraces-of-Myrrh of Punt, the sacred place of enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 320.13-14</td>
<td>[This army] of her majesty [arrived] being whole, intact [and healthy to the Terraces-of-Myrrh of] Punt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 321.2-3</td>
<td>…having arrived at the Terraces-of-Myrrh, they took myrrh as they desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urk. IV, 325.12-14</td>
<td>Preparing the tents of the ambassador together with his army in the Terraces-of-Myrrh of Punt on both sides of the sea in order to receive the chiefs of this hill-country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[85] *Ht.yw-ṣnt.yw*
| Urk. IV, 342.11-17 |  | \[\ldots \text{sdm wdl} m s.t-wr.t nd.wl-r3 n.t ntr ds=\text{dfr}\ w3.wl r Pwnm wb3 mln.w r \text{Ht.yw-nt.yw}\ ss\m m\text{s} hr mw hr \beta r ini.t bi3.w m T3-ntr n ntr pn km3 nfr.w=\] | \[\ldots \text{hearing the command in the great place, an oracle of the god himself: “Search out the ways to Punt, open the roads to the Terraces-of-Myrrh…}

(I) have given Punt to you in its entirety as far as the Lands of the Gods, (namely) the God’s-Land which has not been trodden, and the Terraces-of-Myrrh which the people (Egyptians) do not know…

(I) will indeed cause that your expedition tread upon it after (I) have guided it upon water and upon land, opening for them the secret ways, I have trodden on the Terraces-of-Myrrh, it is a sacred region of God’s-Land. \] |
| Urk. IV, 344.6-8 |  | \[\text{dl.n} (=) n=\text{tn Pwnm mi-kd=s r-mn-m T}3.w-ntr.w T3-ntr tnm(.w) \text{hndk,w} =\text{Ht.yw-nt.yw}\ \text{hm nn rmt} \] |
| Urk. IV, 345.1-4 |  | \[\text{iw} (=) \text{hm r rdl.t hnd st m}\text{s= ssm.n} (=) ssm.n (=) st hr mw hr \beta hr wb3 n=\text{sn w3.wl st3.t(y)p hbn} (=) \text{Ht.yw-n.w-nt.yw}\ w pw \text{dsr n(y) T}3-ntr \] |
| Urk. IV, 352.2-3 | iw grt wd.n hm.t(=i) rdi=(w) m ḫr r sbi.t r ḫt.yw-쾃.yw | Now my majesty has decreed that one is appointed to go to the Terraces-of-Myrrh |
### Toponyms of the Toponomastica (Chapter 6) [86-133]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Number and Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Date (Dynasty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Topographical Lists

#### [87] 3msw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[87.3]</td>
<td>Topographical List of Seti at Kamak</td>
<td>KRI I, 28</td>
<td>42. 3msw 43. Mnsiw 44. ḫw 45. {Nw} &lt; G &gt; ḫw 46. Mḥdm 47. ṭdm 48. Mmntw 47. ṭdm 48. Mmntw 49. M{ti} bww 50. Wdr 51. ḫwwr 52. Sḥbw 53. Śḥtm</td>
<td>19: Seti I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[88] Mnsiw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>18: Thutmosis III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[88.2]</strong> Topographical List of Amenhotep II at Luxor</td>
<td><em>Urk.</em> IV, 1339</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 3msw 2. <strong>Mnsiw</strong> 3. ṣwh 4. Gwḥw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18: Amenhotep II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[88.3]</strong> Topographical List of Seti at Kamak</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> I, 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>42. 3msw 43. <strong>Mnsiw</strong> 44. ṣwh 45. {Nw}&lt;G&gt; ṣhw 46. Mḥdm 47. ṣdm 48. Mmtw 47. ṣdm 48. Mmtw 49. M[i] bww 50. Wdr 51. ḥwrrw 52. Sḥbw 53. Șidm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19: Seti I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19: Seti I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20: Ramesses III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**[89]** 3wh

| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>[89.2]</strong> Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</th>
<th><strong>Urk. IV, 1339</strong></th>
<th>[Diagram]</th>
<th>E1. 3msw 2. Mnsiw 3. 3wh 4. Gwṣhw</th>
<th>18: Amenhotep II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


**[90]** Gwṣhw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[90.2] Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</th>
<th><em>Urk.</em> IV, 1339</th>
<th>E1. מונה 2. מسى 3. גוֹחַ 4. גוֹחַ.</th>
<th>18: Amenhotep II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[90.3] Topographical List of Seti at Karnak</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> I, 28</td>
<td>42. מונה 43. מسى 44. גוֹחַ 45. {נְוִי&lt; כְּבָרָה}</td>
<td>19: Seti I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46. מִדִּים 47. תֵּדִים 48. מְתָו 49. מִּדִּים 50. וֹדְרָה 51. גוֹחַ 52. סְתָּב 53. שִׁיטִּים</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[90.4] Topographical List of Seti I at Karnak</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> I, 31</td>
<td>38. תֵּדִים 39. גוֹחַ 40. נְוִי 41. מִדִּים 42. סְיסָּה 43. תֵּדִים 44. פְּנִי 45. וֹוָו 46. מְבָו 47. סְתָּב 48. שִׁיטִּים 49. מְסִי 50. מִסָּה 51. נְוִי 52. הָקִש 53. פְּנִי 54. מְבָו 55. קְרָמ 56. סְתָּב 57. דִּיט 58. נְוִי 59. הָקִש 60. וֹו 61. בֵי 62. מְסָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[90.5] Medinet Habu, North Pylon Topographical List</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> V, 99</td>
<td>39. יָו 40. דַּבִּים 41. מִדִּים 42. תֵּדִים 43. פְּנִי 44. פְּנִי 45. הָקִש 46. מְסָה 47. מִדִּים 48. גוֹחַ 49. W36 50. מְבָו 51. הָקִש 52. תֵּדִים 53. מָנ 54. מְבָו 55. קְרָמ 56. סְתָּב 57. דִּיט 58. נְוִי 59. הָקִש 60. וֹו 61. בֵי 62. מְסָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[91] <em>Mְדִים</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transcription is a series of hieratic mistakes for גוֹחַ, see Zibelius, <em>AOVN</em>, 101.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. 18: Thutmose III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Textual Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18: Amenhotep II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19: Seti I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19: Seti I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19: Ramesses II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20: Ramesses III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1339</td>
<td>F1. Ṣḥdm 2. ṣḥwrw 3. ṣṭdm 4. Mmtw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List of Seti</td>
<td>KRI I, 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List of Seti I</td>
<td>KRI I, 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>Medinet Habu, North Pylon Topographical List</td>
<td>KRI V, 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[93.2]</td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1339</td>
<td>F1. Ḡḏm 2. 𓊜wrrha 3. 𓊬́w 4. MmTw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[93.3]</td>
<td>Kamak, Topographical List of Seti I</td>
<td>KRI I, 28</td>
<td>42. 𓊡𓊝 43. Mnsiw 44. 𓊜𓊟 45. {Nw}&lt;G&gt; 46. Ḡḏm 47. 𓊬́w 48. MmTw 49. M{ti} bbw 50. Wdr 51. 𓊜wrrha 52. Sḥbw 53. 𓊢́t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### [94] Mmtw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[94.2]</th>
<th>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</th>
<th>Urk. IV, 1339</th>
<th>F1. ṭḥdm 2. ṭḥwrw 3. ṭḥdm 4. Mmtw</th>
<th>18: Amenhotep II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42. 3msw 43. Mnsww 44. 3wh 45. {Nw}&lt;G&gt;ṭḥw 46. ṭḥdm 47. ṭḥdm 48. Mmtw 47. ṭḥdm 48. Mmtw 49. M{ti}bww 50. Wdrṭ 51. ṭḥwrw 52. Sthbw 53. Ṣṭṭm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| [94.3] | Karnak, Topographical List of Seti I | KRI I, 28 | 19: Seti I |
|---|---|---|---|---|

|---|---|---|---|

### [95] Mbttw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[95.1]</th>
<th>Kamak, Topographical List of Thutmose III</th>
<th>Urk. IV, 798</th>
<th>18: Thutmose III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>///bwšw</td>
<td>18:</td>
<td>Thutmosis III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>18:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seti I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>19:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramesses III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Map References</td>
<td>Additional Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[96.1]</td>
<td>Karnak, Supplementary List of Thutmose III</td>
<td>195. <strong>Hmrwtt</strong></td>
<td>18: Thutmose III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[97] <em>Stkhw</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[97.1]</strong> Kamak, Topographical List of Thutmosis III</td>
<td><em>Urk.</em> IV, 798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18: Thutmosis III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[97.2]</strong> Kamak, Supplementary List of Thutmosis III</td>
<td><em>Urk.</em> IV, 804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>194. <em>Issrhbw</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18: Thutmosis III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[97.3]</strong> Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td><em>Urk.</em> IV, 1340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18: Amenhotep II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[97.4]</strong> Kamak, Topographical List of Seti I</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> I, 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. ẖsw 43. Mnsiw 44. ẖhw 45. {Nw}&lt;G&gt;ẖhw 46. Mḥḏm 47. ḫḏm 48. Mṁwr 47. ḫḏm 48. Mṁwr 49. ḫḏm bwṭ 50. Wḏṛ Ṣḏtm 51. Ṣḏtm 52. <em>Stkhw</em> 53. Ṣḏtm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19: Seti I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[97.5]</strong> Topographical List of Seti I at Kamak</td>
<td><em>KRI</em> I, 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19: Seti I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [98] Śiḍṭm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>KRI, Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[98.3]</td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List of Seti</td>
<td>I, 28</td>
<td>19: Seti I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[98.5]</td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List, Asiatic and African names</td>
<td>I, 177</td>
<td>19: Ramesses II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[98.6]</td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List</td>
<td>II, 261</td>
<td>19: Ramesses II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[99]</td>
<td>Nwhtm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[99.1]</td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List of Thutmose III</td>
<td>IV, 798</td>
<td>18: Thutmose III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Topographical List</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[99.2]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td><em>Urk.</em> IV, 1340</td>
<td>H1. <em>Nwḥtm Hk3whḫ</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### [100] Ḥk3wḥt

#### [100.1] Topographical List of Thutmosis III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urk. IV, 798</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18: Thutmosis III

#### [100.2] Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urk. IV, 1340</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1. Nwḥtm Ḥk3wḥt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18: Amenhotep II

#### [100.3] Kamak Topographical List of Seti I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KRI I, 29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42. 3msw 43. Mnṣiw 44. ṣwḥ 45. {Nw}&lt;G&gt; ṣḥw 46. Ḥḥdm 47. Ḥtdm 48. Mnṭw 47. Ḥtdm 48. Mnṭw 49. M{ṭi} bww 50. Wdr ṣḥw 51. ṣwḥwrw 52. Stḥbw 53. Šidṭm 54. Nwḥtm 55. Ḥk3wḥt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19: Seti I

#### [100.4] Kamak, Topographical List of Seti I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KRI I, 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. Ḥtdm 39. ṣwhwrw 40. Nwḥ 41. Ḥḥdm 42. Šis.w 43. Trṭw 44. Pwnt 45. Nhṭw 46. Mbṭw 47. Stḥbw 48. Šidṭm 49. Mnṣiw 50. 3msw 51. Nwḥtm 52. Ḥk3wḥt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19: Seti I

#### [100.5] Medinet Habu, North Pylon Topographical List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KRI V, 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20: Ramesses III
### [101] B3im

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[101.2]</td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1340</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>I. Wnt.t <strong>B3im</strong> Mst Tb K. T3 Ift Mswt Tm Hb Mb3 Irn</td>
<td>18: Amenhotep II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.2 Mst</td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1340</td>
<td>I. Wtn.t B3lm Mst Tb K. T3 Itf M3wt Tm Hb M3 Trm</td>
<td>Amenhotep II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.5 Mst</td>
<td>Kamak, Topographical List</td>
<td>KRI II, 261</td>
<td>29. Wtn.t 30. B3lm 41. Mst 32. Tb 33. ///</td>
<td>Ramesses II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Thutmose III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>103.1</strong></td>
<td>Topographical List of Thutmoses III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:</td>
<td>Thutmose III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>103.2</strong></td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Urk. IV, 1340</em></td>
<td>1. <em>Wtn.t</em> Bāim Mst Th K. Th ḫft M3wt Tīn Hb Md3 Irēm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:</td>
<td>Amenhotep II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>103.3</strong></td>
<td>Kamak, Topographical List of Seti I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:</td>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>103.4</strong></td>
<td>Kamak, Topographical List of Seti I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:</td>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>103.5</strong></td>
<td>Kamak, Topographical List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:</td>
<td>Ramesses II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>104</th>
<th>Ramesses II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>104.1</strong></td>
<td>Topographical List of Thutmoses III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:</td>
<td>Thutmose III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[105] Kkt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[106] Sd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### [107] Msht

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[107.1]</th>
<th>Urk. IV, 798</th>
<th>C) Pwnt Nhîw Snîk Brbrti</th>
<th>18: Thutmose III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topographical List of Thutmose III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msht 72. K3m 73. T3 74. Ift 75. M3wt 76. Thm 77. Hb 78. M3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[107.3]</th>
<th>KRI I, 29</th>
<th>19: Seti I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List of Seti I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [108] K3m

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[108.1]</th>
<th>Urk. IV, 798</th>
<th>18: Thutmose III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamak, Topographical List of Thutmose III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[108.2]</th>
<th>KRI I, 29</th>
<th>19: Seti I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List of Seti I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>T33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Ift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[111] $M\tilde{sw}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[111.1]</td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List of Thutmose III</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[111.2]</td>
<td>Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[111.3]</td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List of Seti I</td>
<td>KRI I, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[112] $Tnn$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[112.1]</td>
<td>Karnak, Topographical List of Thutmose III</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[112.2] Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1340</td>
<td>1. Wtn.t Bîm Mst Tb K. Tí Ifí Mšwt Tīm Hb Mš ḫrnm 18: Amenhotep II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[113] Hbw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[113.2] Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1340</td>
<td>1. Wtn.t Bîm Mst Tb K. Tí Ifí Mšwt Tīm Hbw Mš ḫrnm 18: Amenhotep II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 114 Btbt

|---|---|---|---|---|---|

### 115 Mnwt

|---|---|---|---|---|---|

### 116 Tst

|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II | Urk. IV, 1340 | L. Grrs Tst Twï Bpsï Twïši Zïtw Ímï (? | 18: Amenhotep II |
### [117] Dwh

**[117.1]** Topographical List of Thutmosis III

| 18: Thutmosis III |

**[117.2]** Topographical list of Amenhotep II at Luxor

| Urk. IV, 1340 | L. Grss TsT Tvši Bpsti Zšw Tvši (? |
| 18: Amenhotep II |

### [118] Bpsti

**[118.1]** Kamak, Topographical List of Thutmosis III

| 18: Thutmosis III |

**[118.2]** Luxor, Topographical List of Amenhotep II

| Urk. IV, 1340 | L. Grss TsT Tvši Bpsti Zšw Tvši (? |
| 18: Amenhotep II |
### [119] Twši

| [119.2] Luxor Topographical List of Amenhotep II | Urk. IV, 1340 | B. | 64. Kššm 65. ///66. ///67. ///68. ///69. Mš 70. Twši | 18: Amenhotep II |

### [120] Tšrt

<p>| [120.1] Topographical List Louvre A18 | Urk. IV, 1742 | Front right: Tšrt Tšr[tyt [Ršš] | 18: Amenhotep III |
| | | Right side: Kš šš.t Twršk Mšškwš Mšškrhwš Sššbšš Sššbšš Rššrwš Tšrš Tšrš Tšrš Tkšz | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[121] Rb3l</strong></td>
<td><strong>Front right:</strong> T3irt Tkyt [R]b[3]</td>
<td><strong>Right side:</strong> Kš hs.t Twrk3 M3kwys Mtik3rwhw Si3h3b3 Si3br Rwytkw Tbht Twrsrw Twršk Tk nz</td>
<td><strong>18:</strong> Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[121.1]</strong></td>
<td>Louvre A18, Topographical List</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[122] M3kwys3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Front right:</strong> T3irt Tkyt [Rb3l]</td>
<td><strong>Right side:</strong> Kš hs.t Twrk3 M3kwys Mtik3rwhw Si3h3b3 Si3br Rwytkw Tbht Twrsrw Twršk Tk nz</td>
<td><strong>18:</strong> Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[122.1]</strong></td>
<td>Louvre A18, Topographical List</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[123] Mtik3rwhw</strong></td>
<td><strong>Front right:</strong> T3irt Tkyt [Rb3l]</td>
<td><strong>Right side:</strong> Kš hs.t Twrk3 M3kwys Mtik3rwhw Si3h3b3 Si3br Rwytkw Tbht Twrsrw Twršk Tk nz</td>
<td><strong>18:</strong> Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[123.1]</strong></td>
<td>Louvre A18, Topographical List</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[124] Si3h3b3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Front right:</strong> T3irt Tkyt [Rb3l]</td>
<td><strong>Right side:</strong> Kš hs.t Twrk3 M3kwys Mtik3rwhw Si3h3b3 Si3br Rwytkw Tbht Twrsrw Twršk Tk nz</td>
<td><strong>18:</strong> Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[124.1]</strong></td>
<td>Louvre A18, Topographical List</td>
<td>Urk. IV, 1742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [125] | Sḥbr  
| [125.1] | Louvre A18, Topographical List  
| | Urk. IV, 1742  
| | Front right: Tšrt lktyt [Rbd]  
| | Right side: Kš ḥš.t Twrk Mškwyš Mtkrwyhw Sḥb r \ Sḥbr Ṭwytkw Ṭbht Twrš Twršk Ṭknz  
| | 18: Amenhotep III  

| [126] | Ṭwṛtkw  
| [126.1] | Louvre A18, Topographical List  
| | Urk. IV, 1742  
| | Front right: Tšrt lktyt [Rbd]  
| | Right side: Kš ḥš.t Twrk Mškwyš Mtkrwyhw Sḥb r \ Sḥbr Ṭwytkw Ṭbht Twrš Twršk Ṭknz  
| | 18: Amenhotep III  

| [127] | Twršw  
| [127.1] | Louvre A18, Topographical List  
| | Urk. IV, 1742  
| | Front right: Tšrt lktyt [Rbd]  
| | Right side: Kš ḥš.t Twrk Mškwyš Mtkrwyhw Sḥb r \ Sḥbr Ṭwytkw Ṭbht Twršw Twršk Ṭknz  
| | 18: Amenhotep III  

| [128] | Twršk  
| [128.1] | Louvre A18, Topographical List  
| | Urk. IV, 1742  
| | Front right: Tšrt lktyt [Rbd]  
| | Right side: Kš ḥš.t Twrk Mškwyš Mtkrwyhw Sḥb r \ Sḥbr Ṭwytkw Ṭbht Twršw Twršk Ṭknz  
| | 18: Amenhotep III  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>128.2</th>
<th>Soleb</th>
<th>Giorgini et al., &lt;em&gt;Soleb V&lt;/em&gt;, pl. 246</th>
<th>&lt;em&gt;Iwrs&lt;/em&gt;[k] &lt;em&gt;Nrkyhb Trbnk Trsn&lt;/em&gt; /// ///</th>
<th>18: Amenhotep III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| 129 | &lt;em&gt;Iknz&lt;/em&gt; |
| 129.1 | Topographical List Louvre A18 | &lt;em&gt;Urk.&lt;/em&gt; IV, 1742 | Front right: &lt;em&gt;Tsirt Ikyt&lt;/em&gt; [Rbt]&lt;br&gt;Right side: &lt;em&gt;Kḥ ls.t Twrk3 M3kwys Mtk3rwhw Sḥ3b3 Sḥbr Rwytklw Tbht Twsrw Twršk &lt;em&gt;Iknz&lt;/em&gt;&lt;/em&gt; | 18: Amenhotep III |
| 129.2 | Soleb, Topographical List | Giorgini et al., &lt;em&gt;Soleb V&lt;/em&gt;, pl. 247 | &lt;em&gt;Ikns&lt;/em&gt; [M3rb M[t]ik/// [S3///] | 18: Amenhotep III |
| 129.3 | Onomasticon of Amenemope (pGolenischeff) | &lt;em&gt;AEO III&lt;/em&gt;, pl. 10 | 9)… 290. &lt;em&gt;S[k]yr&lt;/em&gt; (?) 291. &lt;em&gt;Trgsw&lt;/em&gt; (10) 292. &lt;em&gt;Ikn&lt;/em&gt;s 293. &lt;em&gt;Ihbw&lt;/em&gt;294. &lt;em&gt;Bgr[k]&lt;/em&gt; | 20 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Number and Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Date (Dynasty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[130.1]</td>
<td>Sethe, altägyptischen Tongefässchern des Mittleren Reiches, 39, pl. 11-13</td>
<td><img src="177" alt="Transcription" /></td>
<td><img src="177" alt="Transliteration" /></td>
<td>All the Nehesy of Kush, of Muger, of Shaat, of Ires/// of Nas [of R]ida of Iresukhet, of Imanas, of Ia[a of] ///mamu of Tukes, of Bahasis, of Makia, of Ibis, of Ga[r?s?] of Aushek, of Webat-s(epet) of Iaat, of Iaat, of Tjeksis of Megesruia.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[130.2]</td>
<td>Posener, Prince et pays, 61, pl. 1</td>
<td><img src="177" alt="Transcription" /></td>
<td><img src="177" alt="Transliteration" /></td>
<td>All the Nehesy of Kush of Muger (11) of Shaat, of Gwasai, of Gwabti, of Gwabi, of ///ken///, of Muayu (12) of Iaa, of Khabyt, of Rumegten, of Irsik, of Nasmakh, of Teria, of (13) Irsukht, of Imanas, of Ima/, of Kakay, of Tuksay, of (14) Bahasis of Imanas, of Iaat, of Webat-sepet (15) of</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[130.3]</td>
<td>Helwan Exebratin Text (No 63957, 63959)</td>
<td>Posener, <em>Cinq figurines d'Envoûtement</em>, 33, pl. 6, 8</td>
<td>Kiykš Twksš B3lššys Mškš1 Tbtys Grw Nš smnh /// B3š Tksys Mgššrsy wšš Rwišš</td>
<td>Kayka, Tukesia, Bahasis, Makia, Ibes, Geru, Nasmakh, Iaat, Tjeksis, Megššrsy, Ruish</td>
<td>12 (early)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| [131] | *Tksis* |

| [131.1] | Theban Exebration Texts (multiple versions) | Sethe, *altägyptischen Tongefässcherben des Mittleren Reiches*, 39, pl. 11-13 | Nhš.y nb.w n.w K3š n.w Mwgr n.w Sšš n.w Irš /// n.w Nšš [n.w Ršš] n.w Iršwht n.w Tmšš n.w Bšš /// n.w Mšš n.w Twksš /// n.w Bššš n.w Mšššš n.w Tbtys n.w Gršš [ršš] n.w šmšš n.w Wbšš t-s(pt?) n.w Tšš n.w Tšš n.w Mššrsyš | All the Nehesy of Kush, of Muger, of Shaat, of Ires/// of Nas [of Ršš] of Iresukhet, of Imanas, of Ia[a of] ///mamu of Tukes, of Bahasis, of Makia, of Ibis, of Ga[ršš?] of Aushek, of Webat-s(epet) of Iaat, of Iaat, of Tjeksis of Megššrsyš | 12 |
| [131.2] Saqqara execration texts (Bruxelles E7440) | Posener, *Prince et pays*, 62, pl. 1 | (10) *Nh$s.y n.b.w n.w K$iš n.w Mwgr* (11) *n.w $išt n.w Gws$ī n.w Gwbi n.w Gwbi n.w //kn/// n.w Mw$yw* (12) *n.w B$iš n.w H$išbīt* n.w Rwmgt n.w *Trṣyk n.w N$sm$ḥ n.w T$riš* n.w (13) *Tr$sw$ḥt n.w I$m$ūn*$ s n.w I$m$ūn*$ n.w K$išy n.w T$wks$y n.w (14) *B$ḥ$z$īs n.w M$iš n.w T$bh n.w G$r w n.w OURSE n.w W$b_t* t-s p. (15) n.w T$bt n.w *Tks$īs n.w Mwgsrīš n.w Rw$š* Twn. ty w Sty | All the Nehesy of Kush of Muger (11) of Shaat, of Gwasai, of Gwabti, of Gwabi, of //ken///, of Muayu (12) of Iaa, of Khabyt, of Rumegeten, of Irsiks, of Nasmakh, of Teria, of (13) Irsukht, of Imanas, of Ima//, of Kakay, of Tuksay, of (14) Bahazis, of Makia, of Ibtes, of Gweru, of Aushek, of Webat-sepet (15) of Iaat, of Tetjeksis, of Mugesria, of Rush and the Iuntiu of Sety |
| [131.3] Helwan Execration Text (No 63957, 63959) | Posener, *Cinq figurines d’Envoûtement*, 33, pl. 6, pl. 8 | K$i$y$ḥ T$wks ii B$ḥ$z$īs M$iš T$bh G$r N$sm$ḥ /// T$iš T$k$sys M$g[s]rwi š Rwiš | Kayka, Tukesis, Bahasis, Makia, Ibtes, Geru, Nasmakh, Iaa, Tjeksis, Meg[s]erwa, Ruish |

12 (early)
| 132.1 | Theban Execration Texts | Sethe, altägyptischen Tongefäßscherben des Mittleren Reiches, 39, pl. 11-13 |
| 132.2 | Saqqara Execration Texts (Bruxelles E7440) | Posener, Prince et pays, 62, pl. 1 |

**132.1**

*Nhs.y nb.w n.w K3§ n.w Mwgr n.w Š3t n.w Irs// n.w N5x [n.w R]id3 n.w Irswh t n.w Tmšn’s n.w B[i? n.w] /// m3mw n.w Twk3 n.w B3h/]ss n.w M3[k]3 n.w Tbsy n.w Gʃ[r?]s] n.w 7wšk n.w Wbšt-s(pt?) n.w Tbst n.w Tbst n.w *kṣis n.w MgsrwiA

All the Nehesy of Kush, of Muger, of Shaat, of Ires// of Nas [of R]ida of Iresukhet, of Imanas, of Ia[a of] ///mamu of Tukes, of Bahasis, of Makia, of Ibis, of Ga[r?]s] of Aushek, of Webat-s(epet) of Iaät, of Iaat, of Tjeksis of Megesruia.

**132.2**

*(10) Nhs.y nb.w n.w K3§ n.w Mwgr n.w Š3t n.w Gws’ti n.w Gwbti n.w GwbI n.w ///kn/// n.w Mwʃyw (12) n.w B3s n.w ʃbyt n.w Rwmgšt n.w Irsykt n.w N5smn] n.w Tr6 n.w (13) Irswh t n.w Tmšn’s n.w Timš /// n.w K3k]y n.w Twʃky n.w (14) B3h/]s n.w Mbk] n.w Tbst n.w Grw n.w 7wšk n.w Wbšt-s(pt?) (15) n.w Tbst n.w Tbst n.w *kṣis n.w MwsrwiA n.w Rwš Twn.tyw Sty* All the Nehesy of Kush of Muger (11) of Shaat, of Gwasai, of Gwabti, of Gwabi, of ///ken///, of Muayu (12) of Iaa, of Khabyt, of Rumegten, of Irsik, of Nasmakh, of Teria, of (13) Irsukht, of Imanas, of Ima//, of Kakay, of Tuksay, of (14) Bahazis, of Makia, of Ibes, of Gweru, of Aushek, of Webat-sepet (15) of Iaat, of Tjeksis, of Mugesria, of Rush and the Iuntiu of Sety
| 132.3 | Helwan Execration Text (No 63957, 63959) | Posener, *Cinq figurines d'Envoûtemen t*, 33, pl. 6, pl. 8 | *Kdyk* Twks*ii Bḥḥsys M3ki3 Tḥyys Grw Nšmḥ /// Tḥys Mg[ś]rwīšt Rwišt | Kayka, Tukesia, Bahasis, Makia, Ibtes, Geru, Nasmakh, Iaa, Tjeksis, *Meg<s>erwa, Ruish* | 12 (early) |

---

| 133 |  |  |

**[133.1]**  
Saqqara execration texts  
(Bruxelles E7440)  
Posener, *Prince et pays*, 62, pl. 1  

| 133.1 |  |

| 133.2 |  |

**[133.2]**  
Helwan Execration Text (No 63957, 63959)  
Posener, *Cinq figurines d'Envoûtemen t*, 33, pl. 6, pl. 8  

| 133.2 |  |  |  |

All the Nehesy of Kush of Muger (11) of Shaat, of Gwasai, of Gwabti, of Gwabi, of //ken///, of Muayu (12) of Iaa, of Khabyt, of Rumegten, of Irsik, of Nasmakh, of Teria, of (13) Irsukht, of Imanas, of Ima//, of Kakay, of Tuksay, of (14) Bahazis, of Makia, of Ibtes, of Gweru, of Aushek, of Webat-sepet (15) of Iaat, of Tetjeksis, of Mugesria, of *Rush* and the Iuntiu of Sety | 12 |
Toponyms and labels of the Turin Map (Chapter 7) [T1-T20]

The numbering of the texts follows that of Goyon, *ASAE* 49. There is no [T19] as this text includes no geographic information. Inscription [T17] has two labels, which are treated as [T17] and [T17A]. For an image of the map see Chapter 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Number and Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Date (Dynasty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[T1] T̄3-m̄-t̄-n̄-ty-h̄3̄-r̄-p̄3-ym</td>
<td>Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Text Image" /></td>
<td>T̄3-m̄-t̄-n̄-ty-h̄3̄-r̄-p̄3-ym</td>
<td>The-road-which leads-to-the-sea</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[T2] K(y)-t̄-m̄-t̄-n̄-ty-h̄3̄-r̄-p̄3-ym</td>
<td>Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Text Image" /></td>
<td>K(y)-t̄-m̄-t̄-n̄-ty-h̄3̄-r̄-p̄3-ym</td>
<td>Another-road-which-leads-to-the-sea</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[T3]</td>
<td>T3-mt-nt(t)-tp3-mr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Courtesy of James Harrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3-mt-nt(t)-tp3-mr</td>
<td>The-road-which belongs-to-the harbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[T4]</th>
<th>Dw.w n(w) nbw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Courtesy of James Harrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dw.w n(w) nbw</td>
<td>Mountains-of-gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[T5]</th>
<th>Dw.w n(w) nbw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Courtesy of James Harrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dw.w n(w) nbw</td>
<td>Mountains-of-gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[T6]</th>
<th>N3-pr.w n(w) t3-wh.yt-b3k-nbw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Courtesy of James Harrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3-pr.w n(w) t3-wh.yt-b3k-nbw</td>
<td>The-houses-of-the gold-working-village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

184
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Photograph</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>$T\beta \ hnm.t$</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869</td>
<td>The-Well</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>$Wd\cdot n(.y)\cdot ns\cdot Mn\cdot M\beta^\circ t\cdot R^\circ \cdot w\cdot c\cdot w\cdot s$</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869</td>
<td>Stele-of-the-King Menmaatre, l.p.h</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>$T\beta\cdot ml\cdot t\cdot n(\cdot t)\cdot Mnt\cdot ty$</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869</td>
<td>The road of the menty-stone</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>$P\beta\cdot hnw\cdot n(\cdot y)\cdot lmn\cdot w\cdot p\beta\cdot Dw\cdot w^c\cdot b$</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869</td>
<td>The-shrine of Amun of the Pure-Mountain</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### [T11] $N3\text{-}dw.w-n.ty\text{-}tw=tw\text{-}hr-b3k\text{ }nbw\text{-}hr\text{-}iw=\text{-}w-m-p3\text{-}iwn\text{.}w-d\text{sr.t}$

| pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869 | Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell | $N3\text{-}dw.w-n.ty\text{-}tw=tw\text{-}hr-b3k\text{ }nbw\text{-}hr\text{-}iw=\text{-}w-m-p3\text{-}iwn\text{.}w-d\text{sr.t}$ | $N3\text{-}dw.w-n.ty\text{-}tw=tw\text{-}hr-b3k\text{ }nbw\text{-}hr\text{-}iw=\text{-}w-m-p3\text{-}iwn\text{.}w-d\text{sr.t}$ | The-Mountains-where one-works-gold, they-are-the colour-of-red. | 20 |

### [T12] $N3\text{-}dw.w-n(\text{w})-[hd?]\text{-}nbw$

| pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869 | Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell | $N3\text{-}dw.w-[hd?]\text{-}nbw$ | $N3\text{-}dw.w-[hd?]\text{-}nbw$ | The-mountains-of silver (?) and gold | 20 |

### [T13] $T3\text{ dhn.t///}$

| pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869 | Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell | $T3\text{-}dhn.t///$ | $T3\text{-}dhn.t///$ | The-cliff… | 20 |

### [T14] $T3\text{-}dhn.t\text{-}n.ty\text{-}Imn.w\text{-}im=st$

| pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869 | Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell | $T3\text{-}dhn.t\text{-}n.ty\text{-}Imn.w\text{-}im=st$ | $T3\text{-}dhn.t\text{-}n.ty\text{-}Imn.w\text{-}im=st$ | The-cliff-in-which-Amun-is | 20 |
| [T15] | ///kh |
|-------|
| pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869 | Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell |
| ///kh | ///keh |

| [T16] | N3-dw.w-n(.y)-nbw |
|-------|
| pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869 | Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell |
| N3-dw.w-n(.y) nbw | The-Mountains-of-gold |

| [T17] | P3-dw-n(.y)-bhn.y |
|-------|
| pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869 | Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell |
| n.ty r .RestController m ti wh.yt b3k nbw r kn P3-dw-n(.y) bhn.y h.t n | (Distance) from the beginning, the village of gold as far as The-mountain-of-bekhen, khet (?) |

<p>| [T17A] | T3-wh.yt-b3k.w-nbw |
|--------|
| pTurin1879, 1899 and 1869 | Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell |
| n.ty r RestController m T3-wh.yt-b3k-wnbw r kn p3 dw n(.y) bhn.y h.t nw | (Distance) from the beginning, the-village-of-gold as far as the Mountain of bekhen, khet (?) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>[T18]</strong></th>
<th>$P\hat{3}\cdot dw-n(y)-bhn.y$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[T18]</strong></td>
<td>Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[T18]</strong></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[T18]</strong></td>
<td>$...bhn.y r gm.yt m$ $ P\hat{3} \cdot dw \cdot n(y) \cdot bhn.y$ $///$ $\xi.w.s \cdot n\hat{3} \cdot sr.w$ $\xi.y \cdot r \cdot ini \cdot p\hat{3} \cdot rh.n \cdot f$ $n \cdot bhn.y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[T20]</strong></td>
<td>$T3\cdot h3.t-n.ty \cdot tw=tw-hr-b3k \cdot m-im=s-m-t3-wp.t-\xi3.t-n-bhn(y)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[T20]</strong></td>
<td>Photograph Courtesy of James Harrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[T20]</strong></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>[T20]</strong></td>
<td>$T3 \cdot h3.t-n.ty$ $tw=tw-hr-b3k$ $m-im=s-m-t3$ $wp.t-\xi3.t-n-bhn$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Synopsis of Toponyms

### Areal Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Choronym (?)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>Tšb.tyt</td>
<td>The Eastern-(place)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>Zmy.š-Ṭš.t(y)t</td>
<td>Eastern Desert</td>
<td>1.1+3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>Hšš.t-°šš.w/Tšš.šš.w</td>
<td>Hill-country/Land of Asiatics</td>
<td>Choronym 1.1+6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>Tš-Sšš.w</td>
<td>Land of Shasu</td>
<td>Choronym 1.1+6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>Tš-nbw-ṭš’m</td>
<td>Land of gold and electrum</td>
<td>Choronym 1.1+1.3+1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>Hšš.t-nbw</td>
<td>Hill-country of gold</td>
<td>Choronym 1.1+1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8A]</td>
<td>Hšš.t-nbw ḫmn.w</td>
<td>Hill-country of gold of Amun</td>
<td>Choronym 1.1+1.3+6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8B]</td>
<td>Hšš.t-nbw Kš</td>
<td>Hill-country of gold of Kush</td>
<td>Choronym 1.1+1.3+3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Zone 1: Eastern Desert and Atbai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Hydronym</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>3wsk</td>
<td>φ, mousemove uncertain</td>
<td>Choronym (?) 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>Tšḥb &gt; Tyḥtib</td>
<td>φ,mousemove uncertain &lt; Beja ḳare ‘hill’ + b accusative suffix</td>
<td>Toponym 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>Tšḥžt &gt; Tšḥž</td>
<td>mousemove uncertain &lt; Beja ḳaba ‘wadi’ (?) + t suffix</td>
<td>Choronym 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12A]</td>
<td>Hnm.t-Tšḥyt</td>
<td>mousemove uncertain Well of ṭbheyet</td>
<td>Hydronym 1.4+7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>Ṭkyt</td>
<td>mousemove uncertain &lt; Beja kuayti ‘sifting’</td>
<td>Choronym 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>Ṭḥḥt</td>
<td>mousemove uncertain &lt; Beja adar ‘red’</td>
<td>Toponym 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>Wš.g &gt; Gwž</td>
<td>mousemove uncertain Ravine</td>
<td>Odonym 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>Wš.r.t-in.t</td>
<td>mousemove uncertain District of the Valley</td>
<td>Choronym 2.3+1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>Wšš.t-sp.t</td>
<td>mousemove uncertain Opening of the Shore</td>
<td>Choronym 1.1+1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>T3-wh.yt-b3k-nbw</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>The Village of Gold Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18A]</td>
<td>T3-wh.yt-p3-nbw</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>The village of Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[19]</td>
<td>B3w-d$\delta$r.t</td>
<td>$\equiv$</td>
<td>The Hill/Swamp (?) of the desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[20]</td>
<td>B3k.t</td>
<td>Ø, $\equiv$</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[21]</td>
<td>B3.t</td>
<td>$\equiv$</td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[22]</td>
<td>Bt</td>
<td>$*$</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>B$\bar{3}$.t'$\bar{3}$b.(y)t-3bw</td>
<td>$*$</td>
<td>Eastern Mine of Elephantine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>M$\delta$3</td>
<td>$\equiv$, $\equiv$, $\equiv$</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24A]</td>
<td>T3-M$\delta$3.y/H$3$s.t-n.w(t)-M$\delta$3.y</td>
<td>$\equiv$, $\equiv$, $\equiv$</td>
<td>The Land of Medjay/The Hill-country of Medjay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[25]</td>
<td>R$\bar{i}$-$d$.yt</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Mouth of Sifting (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26]</td>
<td>R$\bar{i}$-hnw</td>
<td>Ø, $\equiv$, $\equiv$</td>
<td>Mouth of the Torrent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26A]</td>
<td>In.-R$\bar{i}$-hnw</td>
<td>$\equiv$</td>
<td>The Valley of the Mouth of the Torrent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[26B]</td>
<td>R$\bar{i}$-hnw-hr(y)</td>
<td>$\equiv$</td>
<td>Upper Mouth of the Torrent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[27]</td>
<td>H$3$b.t-Mr1.y-$R^c$.w</td>
<td>$\equiv$</td>
<td>Which made Meryre Festive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[28]</td>
<td>Hw.-tnbw</td>
<td>Ø, $\equiv$, $\equiv$, $\equiv$</td>
<td>Mansion of Fashioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[29]</td>
<td>Hzt</td>
<td>$*$</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[30]</td>
<td>H$3$f.t-wr.t-Hr.y-$ch^3$</td>
<td>$\equiv$</td>
<td>Great Bank of Old Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[31]</td>
<td>H$3$s.t-$3$b.t(y)t-$\bar{3}$wn.w</td>
<td>$*$</td>
<td>Eastern Hill-Country of Heliopolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[32]</td>
<td>H$3$s.t-nbw-Imn.w-m-T$3$-sty</td>
<td>$\equiv$</td>
<td>Hill-Country of Gold of Amun of Ta-Sety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[33]</td>
<td>H$3$s.t-n.t-hsmn</td>
<td>$\equiv$, $\equiv$, $\equiv$</td>
<td>Hill-Country of Amethyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[34]</td>
<td>H₃$n$-n.$n$-ṣ$w$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hill-Country of Quarries (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35]</td>
<td>H₃$n$-Gbtw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hill-Country of Coptos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35A]</td>
<td>Ðw-Gbtw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain of Coptos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[35B]</td>
<td>Dmi-$n$.(y)-Gbtw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landing-Place of Coptos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[36]</td>
<td>P$i$-ḥtm-$n$.(y) /// /// ˤ$w$,s</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Fortress of /// /// l.p.h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[37]</td>
<td>T$i$-ḥnm.t St.$y$-Mṛi.(y)-n.(y)-Pṛḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Well of Seti I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[38]</td>
<td>T$i$-ḥnm.t Ṭ$ṭ$.$w$-msi-sw Mṛi.$y$-lmn.w kn m ṣnh</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Well of Ramesses II brave in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[39]</td>
<td>Snh</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[40]</td>
<td>Z$w$.$w$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cutting-place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[41]</td>
<td>Ś$p$.$y$.$t$</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Quarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[42]</td>
<td>Šzm.$t$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malachite-place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[43]</td>
<td>Khkh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hammering(-place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[44]</td>
<td>Khb.$w$</td>
<td></td>
<td>The-Scoured-one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[45]</td>
<td>Ṭmp$w$</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[46]</td>
<td>Ðw-w$ṣ$b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pure-Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[47]</td>
<td>Ðw-$n$.(y)-Bḥn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain of Bekhen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[47A]</td>
<td>H₃$n$-Bḥn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hill-Country of Bekhen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[48]</td>
<td>P$i$-ḏw-$n$.(y)-Mnt.$yw$</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Mountain of Mentu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[49]</td>
<td>Ðw-$n$.(y)-Tp-ḥlw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain of Atfih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[50]</td>
<td>Ðw-$n$.(y)-Dbḥ$w$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain of Edfu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[50A]</td>
<td>Dbḥ$w$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edfu [HILL-COUNTRY]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Zone 2: South Sinai and Edom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[51]</td>
<td>ThwIw</td>
<td>&quot;Semitic hwā 'ravine'&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[52]</td>
<td>ʔdm</td>
<td>&quot;NW Semitic ʔdm 'red'&quot;</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[53]</td>
<td>Yhwā (T3-šāw)</td>
<td>&quot;Edomite/Canaanite yhw 'Yahweh (god)'&quot;</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[54]</td>
<td>ʔrk</td>
<td>&quot;NW Semitic ʔrk 'branch'&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[55]</td>
<td>Blā.</td>
<td>&quot;Mineral-place&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[55A]</td>
<td>Blā n(y) ity</td>
<td>&quot;Mining-place of the Sovereign&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>2.1+6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[56]</td>
<td>Prw.t-nfr.w-Hhw.t-Hrw</td>
<td>&quot;Beholder of the Perfection of Hathor&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>5.1+4.1+6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[57]</td>
<td>Mnkhw</td>
<td>&quot;Menkau(hor) (?)&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[58]</td>
<td>Ṛ3-htw</td>
<td>&quot;Mouth of the Terrace&quot;</td>
<td>Oikonym</td>
<td>1.1+1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[59]</td>
<td>Ṛ3-šāw.t</td>
<td>&quot;Mouth of the Quarry&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>1.1+2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[60]</td>
<td>Htw.t-n.t-Pr-šmā.t.w</td>
<td>&quot;Gallery of the House of the Foreigner&quot;</td>
<td>Oikonym</td>
<td>2.1+2.1+2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[61]</td>
<td>Ḥt.t-n.t-Ḥr-šāw.t</td>
<td>&quot;Gallery of ///&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>2.1+?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[62]</td>
<td>Ḥrbd</td>
<td>&quot;&lt;NW Semitic Ḥ/ḥrb 'dry'&quot;</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[63]</td>
<td>Ḥtw.yw-Msfk.t</td>
<td>&quot;Terraces of Turquoise&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>1.1+1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[64]</td>
<td>Ḥts.t-Msfk.t</td>
<td>&quot;Hill-country of Turquoise&quot;</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>1.1+1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[64B]</td>
<td>Msfk.t</td>
<td>&quot;Turquoise [HILL-COUNTRY]&quot;</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[64C]</td>
<td>Pr-Ḥr.w-n(y)-Ḥtw.yw-Msfk.t.t</td>
<td>&quot;House of Horus of the Terraces of Turquoise&quot;</td>
<td>Oikonym</td>
<td>2.1+6.3+1.1+1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[65]</td>
<td>T3-ḥnm.t-Rc-mls-w-Mrī.y-ḥmn.w</td>
<td>&quot;The Well of Ramesses-Meryamun&quot;</td>
<td>Hydronym</td>
<td>1.4+6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[66]</td>
<td>Sr (T3-šāw)</td>
<td>&quot;NW Semitic sr 'grass, thicket'&quot;</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[67]</td>
<td>Swā.t msrs ē s rdi.t n.t tt imē</td>
<td>&quot;Which Prospered its Expedition, which Gave that which is in it&quot;</td>
<td>Latonym</td>
<td>5.1+2.4+5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[68]</td>
<td>Ṣr.t-ḥp-wnd.w/thw</td>
<td>&quot;Nose of Head of the Goat (?)&quot;</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
<td>1.2+1.2+1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[69]</td>
<td>Thnht</td>
<td>&quot;&lt;NW Semitic snh 'bush'&quot;</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Didž</td>
<td>Plateau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>P3-dw n(y) Il</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
<td>The Mountain of El</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>P3-dw-n(y)-Hmrk</td>
<td>Latomonym</td>
<td>The Mountain of Hmrk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Dw n(y) Hz.tyw</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
<td>The Mountain of the Turning-place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>[... ] n rdi.t Mfk3.t n nsw-hi.ty Nbw-k3,w-Rc.w</td>
<td>Latomonym</td>
<td>// for (?) which gave turquoise to the King Nebkaure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Zone 3: Southern Atbai and further Red Sea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Iww</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>&lt; Semitic ʔw(y) ‘shelter, coast’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Tw pn n(y) k3</td>
<td>Nesonym</td>
<td>This Island of Ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>P3-ym-ʔ3-n(y)-mw-kd</td>
<td>Hydronym</td>
<td>The Great sea of Inverted Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77A</td>
<td>Mw-kd</td>
<td>Inverted-Water</td>
<td>Hydronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>ʔmw</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>&lt; Beja ama ‘tree’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>W3d-wr-Tib.ty</td>
<td>Hydronym</td>
<td>Eastern Ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Wkm.t</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>Supplying-place (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Wtn.t</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>Flowing-place (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81A</td>
<td>Iw.w-Wtn.tyw</td>
<td>Nesonym</td>
<td>Islands of Wetenty-people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Bi3-Pwnt</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>Mine of Punt, or Far-place of Punt (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Brhiw</td>
<td>Choronym/Ethnonym</td>
<td>&lt; Beja biqa ‘Beja’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Pwnt</td>
<td>Choronym</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Ht.yw-ʔnt.yw</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
<td>Terraces of Myrrh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter 6: Toponomastica placenames

### Topographical Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[86]</td>
<td>ℓḥw</td>
<td>&lt; Lowland East Cushitic, Agaw ᵇela ‘spring’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[87]</td>
<td>ℓmsw</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[88]</td>
<td>Mslw</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[89]</td>
<td>ℓwh</td>
<td>&lt; Saho-Afar šar ‘house’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[90]</td>
<td>Gwšhw</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[91]</td>
<td>Mḥdm</td>
<td>&lt; Ethiosemitic weḥaz ‘flow, river’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[92]</td>
<td>ℓwhwrw</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[93]</td>
<td>Twdm</td>
<td>&lt; Ethiosemitic šašm ‘bone’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[94]</td>
<td>Mmtw</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[95]</td>
<td>Mbwtw</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[96]</td>
<td>Hmrwtt/Wdrwtt</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[97]</td>
<td>Šthbw</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[98]</td>
<td>Šdtm</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[99]</td>
<td>Nwhtm</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[100]</td>
<td>Ḥkšwht</td>
<td>&lt; Semitic + Ge’ez ḥagl ‘field’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[101]</td>
<td>Bšlm</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[102]</td>
<td>Mst</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[103]</td>
<td>Ḥb</td>
<td>&lt; Beja ḥabba ‘wadi’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[104]</td>
<td>Ḥš</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[105]</td>
<td>Kkt</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[106]</td>
<td>Sd</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[107]</td>
<td>Msḥt</td>
<td>&lt; Ethiosemitic mesah ‘anoint’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[108]</td>
<td>Kšlm</td>
<td>&lt; Cushitic kšer ‘river, valley’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[109]</td>
<td>Ṣ3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[110]</td>
<td>Ḥf</td>
<td>&lt; Cushitic/Ethiosemitic *ṭaf ‘mouth’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>$M^3$wt</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>$Ttn$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>$Hb$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>$Btb$t</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>$Mnwt$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>$Tst$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>$Dwh$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>$Bpst$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>$Twši$</td>
<td>$&lt;$ Beja $yuwaš$ ‘dirty’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>$Tlr$t</td>
<td>$&lt;$ Beja $ʔare$ ‘hill’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>$Rb^3rw$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>$Mbkwys$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>$Mt^3rw$hw</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>$Sǐh^3b$3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>$Sǐb^3r$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>$Rwy^ttkw$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>$Trs$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>$Twršk$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>$Iknz$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exegetical Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>$B^3t$</td>
<td>$&lt;$ Beja $ʔare$ ‘hill’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>$Tǐksis$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>$M(w)grw$i$3$</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>$Rwš$</td>
<td>$&lt;$ Beja $ruša$ ‘rain after flood’</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Turin Map ‘Toponyms’.

The order and numbering follows Harrell, *JARCE* 29 with ‘T’ marking their distinction as Turin Map labels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T3-mi.t-n.ty-h3c-r-p3-ym</td>
<td>The Road which Discharges at the Sea</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>K(y).t-mi.t-n.ty-h3c-r-p3-ym</td>
<td>Another Road which Discharges at the Sea</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>T3-mi.t-n(t).t-p3-mer</td>
<td>The Road of the Harbour (?)</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Dw.w-n(w)-nbw</td>
<td>Mountains of Gold</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Dw.w-n(w)-nbw</td>
<td>Mountains of Gold</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>N3-pr.w-n(w)-t3-wh.3k-bnbw</td>
<td>The Houses of the Settlement of Gold Working</td>
<td>Oikonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>T3-hnm.t</td>
<td>The Well</td>
<td>Hydronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Wd-n(y)-nsw-Mn-M3c.t-Rc.w.3.w.s</td>
<td>The Stele of King Menmaatre, l.p.h</td>
<td>Oikonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>T3-mi.t-n(t).t3-mnt.y</td>
<td>The Road of the Menti-stone</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>P3-hnw-n(y)-Imn.w-p3-dw-w3b</td>
<td>The Shrine of Amun of the Holy-Mountain</td>
<td>Oikonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>N3-dw.w-n.tw-tw-hr-h3k-nbw im=w-hr.3w-m-p3-lwn.w-ds.t</td>
<td>The Mountains in which one Works Gold, they being the Colour Red</td>
<td>Latomonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>N3-dw.w-n(w).-[hd?] -nbw</td>
<td>The Mountains of Silver (?) and Gold</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>T3-dhm.t //</td>
<td>The Cliff //</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>T3-dhm.t.n.ty-Imn.w-im=s</td>
<td>The Cliff in which Amun is.</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>///kh</td>
<td>///keh</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>N3-dw.w-n(y)-nbw</td>
<td>The Mountains of Gold</td>
<td>Oronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>P3-dw.n(y).bhn.y</td>
<td>The Mountain of Bekhen</td>
<td>Latomonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17A</td>
<td>T3-wh.yt-b3k.w-nbw</td>
<td>The Village of Working Gold</td>
<td>Oikonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>T3-h3.t-n.tw-tw-3k.m im=s-m-t3-wp.t7.t-n-bhn(y)</td>
<td>The Quarry Where one works in the Great Mission for <em>Bekhen</em>-stone.</td>
<td>Latomonym</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>