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As part of a wider investigation of Egyptian inscriptions in the Northern Sudan, the British Museum has begun a project of epigraphic survey at Tombos near the Third Cataract, well known as the site of major pharaonic stelae documenting Egypt’s conquest and occupation of Kush in the early Eighteenth Dynasty. I published here the first results of the project: a new record of an important viceregal inscription located on Tombos Island (figs. 1–5; front cover). I also consider related material from the collection of the British Museum and from the temples of Semna and Kumma (now housed in the garden of the Sudan National Museum, Khartoum).

Island of Tombos, Inscription of Year 20 of Thutmose III

Cut into the northern face of a low, granite boulder, located not far from the river-bank in the south-east of the island (fig. 1 [91/17] and 2), the inscription, now incomplete owing to lamination of parts of the surface, is arranged in eight horizontal lines, the hieroglyphs reading right to left (figs. 3–4). Only the final line, damaged in parts, is preserved along its entire length. There is no trace of paint within the hieroglyphs. Marking the successful outcome of a punitive expedition carried out in Year 20 of King Thutmose III, the text invokes benefits for the viceroy responsible (name deliberately damaged), boasting of his effectiveness in delivering southern goods and of his favourable reception by the king. It was discovered by the University of Chicago Egyptian Expedition in 1907, briefly described by Breasted in 1908, and subsequently published in full by Säve-Söderbergh in 1941, since when it has been much cited and discussed.

1 PM VII, 174–5.
2 The basic record was made in November 2006.
3 PM VII, 175 (Island); Edwards and Salih, The Mahas Survey 1991, 24–5, pl. vii (ref. 91/17). The choice of this particular boulder was probably influenced by practical concerns. Its relatively smooth, vertical northern side offered an ideal surface for such an inscription and is set at a convenient height (front cover). It is one of a large outcrop of such boulders (fig. 2) a group of which, further to the north, is decorated with native rock-art (ibid., 24, ref. 91/16). Beyond, near the northern tip of the island, is another Egyptian inscription (ibid., 26–7, pl. viii, ref. 91/13), which appears to comprise a Nile-level, dated to Year 10 of an unidentified king. The position of these stations (and the other major inscriptions on the mainland) is indicated in fig. 1.
4 The length of the final line is approx. 1.16m. The maximum surviving height of the inscription is 630mm.
5 Breasted, American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 25, 47–8.
6 Säve-Söderbergh, Ägypten und Nubien, 175–6 and 207–9, with fig. 16 (publishing Breasted’s photograph with handcopy). Cf. the more recent photograph in Edwards and Salih, The Mahas Survey 1991, 25, pl. vii, and Edwards, The Nubian Past, 103–4, fig. 4.11, and the handcopy (based on the Säve-Söderbergh publication) in Urk. IV, 1375, 3–19.
7 On the military campaign, see, for example, Redford, History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty, 60–1; Reineke in Endesfelder et al., Ägypten und Kusch, 372–3; Zibelius-Chen, Die ägyptische Expansion nach Nubien, 195.
In dispute from the beginning has been the reading of the damaged name of the viceroy, ‘the king’s son, overseer of southern foreign lands’, an issue which has bearing on the question of the number and identity of the viceroys who served during the co-regency of Thutmose III and Hatshepsut. To date, only one viceroy is attested with certainty for the period of the co-regency, namely Amenemnekhu (inm-n-nw). He is known from several rock-inscriptions at different sites in Nubia (see further below), one of which (at Shalfak) is dated to Year 18. In a number of cases (twice in the same context at Shalfak and once at Sehel), his name has been officially effaced. Of the other attested viceroys of the first half of the Eighteenth Dynasty, only Usersatet (temp. Amenhotep II) appears to have certainly suffered similar persecution. There must therefore be a high probability that Amenemnekhu is the viceroy named in the Tombos Island inscription. As will be seen below, this inference is well founded, though there is an unexpected twist to the tale.

The viceroy of the Tombos Island inscription is named twice, at the end of lines 5 and 8 respectively. In the interpretation of the traces remaining in the first case, scholarly opinion has been largely divided between the reading Iny (Any) and Inebny, respectively. In the interpretation of the traces remaining in the first case, scholarly opinion has been largely divided between the reading Iny (Any) and Inebny, the latter reading supported by the fact that a ‘king’s son’ named Inebny is known from a contemporary source, the famous painted limestone statue, British Museum EA 1131 (figs. 6–7). There appears to have been a general assumption that the second example of the name in the

with n. 356, and 222, with n. 168; Säve-Söderbergh and Troy, New Kingdom Pharaonic Sites. Scandinavian Joint Expedition to Sudanese Nubia 5:2, 3; Peden, The Graffiti of Pharaonic Egypt, 90; Redford, The Wars in Syria and Palestine of Thutmose III, 190, with n. 28; Redford, From Slave to Pharaoh, 38, with n. 8; Bryan in Cline and O’Connor, Thutmose III. A New Biography; Spalinger in Cline and O’Connor, Thutmose III. A New Biography, 354; Popko, Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung, 134.

8 Habachi, LÄ 3, 631, nos. 6–7; Säve-Söderbergh and Troy, New Kingdom Pharaonic Sites. Scandinavian Joint Expedition to Sudanese Nubia 5:2, 7; el-Sabbahy, GM 129, 99–102; Pamminger, GM 131, 97–100; Dziobek, GM 132, 29–32; Helck, ZA 121, 39–40; Dziobek, Denkmäler des Vezirs User-Amun, 136–7; Bács in Bács (ed.), Studies Gaál, Laft, Török, 56–8; Gasse and Rondot, Sudan & Nubia 7, 42, Table 1; Davies in Roehrig et al., Hathor’s Bet from Queen to Pharaoh, 53–4; Bryan in Cline and O’Connor, Thutmose III. A New Biography, 102; Spalinger in Cline and O’Connor, Thutmose III. A New Biography, 353.


10 Ibid., nos 365–6, II, 122, nos 365–6; Gasse and Rondot, Sudan & Nubia 7, 43, fig. 4; Gasse and Rondot, Les inscriptions de Sébél, 136 and 481(SEH 241).

11 Schulman, JAACE 8, 36, n. 68; Dewachter, Répertoire des monuments des vice-rois de Kouch I, 534–5; Müller, Die Verwaltung der nubischen Provinz im Neuen Reich, 173–6; no. 8; Habachi, LÄ 3, 632, no. 10; Gasse and Rondot, Sudan & Nubia 7, 43–4, pl. 4; Gasse and Rondot, Les inscriptions de Sébél, 147–154. There is no clear evidence that the name of the viceroy Seni was ever deliberately effaced (Dewarchter, Répertoire des monuments des vice-rois de Kouch I, 534–5). The identity of the king and viceroy figured on the stela from Sai Island, S. 63 (see most recently Minault-Gout, CRIPÉL 26, 282, with n. 35), remains to be clarified (Dewatchter, Répertoire des monuments des vice-rois de Kouch I, 32, C, and 458–9, Doc. X.2).

12 Breasted, American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 25, 47–8; Edel cited in Hintze, Kush 9, 14, n. 12; Dewachter, ReDE 28, 153, n. 20; Dewachter, Répertoire des monuments des vice-rois de Kouch I, 37–8, Doc. 29; Müller, Die Verwaltung der nubischen Provinz im Neuen Reich, 169–70, no. 5, and 478, 57.1; Habachi, LÄ 3, 631, nos 6–7 (sources confused); Edwards and Salib, The Mahas Survey 1991, 24–5, pl. vii (ref: 91/17); Dziobek, GM 132, 30–1; Dziobek in Assmann, Thebanische Beamtennekropolen, 134; Dziobek, Denkmäler des Vezirs User-Amun, 136–7; Klug, Königliche Stelen, 71, n. 561; Edwards, The Nubian Past, 103–4, fig. 4.11.

13 Säve-Söderbergh, Ägypten und Nubien, 175–6 and 208; Urk. iv, 1375, 12 and 19, with n. a; Helck, Urkunden der 18. Dynastie. Übersetzung, 67, no. 416; Bryan, The Reign of Thutmose IV, 7–8; el-Sabbahy, GM 129, 100–1; Redford, From Slave to Pharaoh, 171, n. 8; Spalinger in Cline and O’Connor, Thutmose III. A New Biography, 353.
Tombos Island inscription, in line 8, was a repetition of that in line 5, though it has also been argued that "Imn-m-nhw might be read in line 8 and a shortened or diminutive form in line 5.15

Our new record of the inscription, with details enlarged, is reproduced in photograph and facsimile in figs. 3, 5, 8–9, and figs. 4 and 10, respectively. It can be seen that, despite the ancient attempts to obliterate the names by deliberately lowering the surface of the stone at the appropriate points, the outlines of the individual hieroglyphs are still for the most part preserved (figs. 5, 8–10). There is little doubt that the first name is Inbny (written as in the horizontal line 12 of the British Museum statue, fig. 6), while the second name is certainly "Imn-m-nhw.16 In the case of the former, only the n-sign underneath the nb-sign is not entirely clear. In the latter, the name-determinative, once located under the arm-holding-stick-hieroglyph, is lost.

With these names included (fig. 4), the inscription may be read as follows:17

1. [Ye]ar 20. The good god, who overthrew the one who attacked him […]
2. house (?) of his father, who gave strength (?) [and ?]‘d
3. […]3 Menkheperre’ [beloved of A]mun[…].6
4. A gift that [the king gives] and Amun, [lo]rd of the thrones of the two lands and the Ennead which is in Ta-Sety, that they may give valour, vigilance [and …]h
5. [in fr]ont of the king and life, health, prosperity and alertness in the favour of the king, and eve[ry good] and pure thing for the spirit of the king’s son, overseer of southern foreign lands, Inebny,
6. [he says: I am an] effective [servant] of his lord, who filled his house with [gold], jaspers, ivory, ebony, and tishepes-wood,
7. [with] skin of panthers, khesayet-spice and incense of the Medjau,
8. with the riches of vile Kush; ‘ one who was caused to ascend to the palace of the lord of the two lands,”who entered favoured and left beloved, king’s son, Amenemkh.”

The ‘house’-hieroglyph here is taken (not impossibly) as the substantive ‘house’, ‘temple’ by Säve-Söderbergh, Ägypten und Nubien, 208, fig. line 2, and Urk. IV, 1375,4, with kd ‘build’ restored before it. However, since it lacking the stroke-determinative, which is present in the example of the word in line 6, it could possibly itself

14 PM I, 2, 788, Salt Collection, from Thebes, Ht: 520mm; HT V, 10, pl. 34, no. 374; Urk. IV, 464–5; Schmitz Untersuchungen, 270, no. 3; James and Davies, Egyptian Sculpture, 63, fig. 69; Schulz, Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des kuboiden Statuengestus, 379–80, no. 219, pl. 98e, d; Russmann, Eternal Egypt, 121–2 [45]; Bäcs in Bâcs (ed.), Studies Gaal, Laifi, Török, 57, n. 27; Davies in Rochrig et al., Hathorport from Queen to Pharaoh, 54; Rochrig in Rochrig et al., Hathorport from Queen to Pharaoh, 56–7 [26]. The name (PN I, 5, no. 18) occurs twice, in line 12 of the horizontal inscription on the front of the body of the statue, and line 7 (the final column) of the inscription on the pedestal (fig. 6).
15 Dewachter, Répertoire des monuments des vice-rois de Kouch I, 38; Pamminger, GM 131, 98–100; cf. Budka, Kemet 2, 62, and Budka in Amenta et al. (eds), L’acqua nell’antico Egitto, 113.
16 The disposition of the signs is paralleled in the writing of the name at Sehel; see Gasse and Rondot, Sudan & Nubia 7, 43, fig. 4; Gasse and Rondot, Les inscriptions de Sébel, 136 and 481(SEH 241).
17 Among previous translations, in whole or part, see Breasted, American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 25, 47–8; Säve-Söderbergh, Ägypten und Nubien, 208; Helck, Urkunden der 18. Dynastie. Übersetzung, 67, no. 416; Cumming, Egyptian Historical Records of the Later Eighteenth Dynasty fasc.2, 92, no. 416; Bryan, The Reign of Thutmose IV, 8; Budka, Kemet 2, 62; Budka in Amenta et al. (eds), L’acqua nell’antico Egitto, 112–13.
be a determinative, of a word like ṣnTw, 'storeroom', 'labour establishment', 'ṣnT-Betriebe', which is commonly attested in the context of military victory by the king with prisoners taken to 'fill the ṣnT of his father (Amun)' or similar; cf. Wb 7a, 6, 43, 507, 12; Polz, ZA 117, 47, n. 28; Eichler, *Die Verwaltung des "Haus des Amun"*, 97–8, with n. 451; Morris, *The Architecture of Imperialism*, 182; Hallmann, *Die Tributzonen des Neuen Reiches*, 42, n. 288, 226, n. 1532, 233 and 299.

b There is a natural hole in the surface above the ft, which the sculptors avoided and worked around.

c With Säve-Söderbergh, *Ägypten und Nubien*, 208, Urk. IV, 1375, 5, and Helck, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie. Übersetzung*, 67, no. 416, taking ḫt here as a writing of ṳḥ/ḏḥt or ṳḥtw, 'Stärke' or 'Sieg', an attribute or outcome granted by Amun to the king (cf. WFb. 2, 316, 13; Galán, *Victory and Border*, 52–3 (IV) and 54–5 (VI)).

d The remains of a sign, or possibly two signs, are discernible above the cartouche in line 3.

e Of the first half of the line there survives a tiny remnant only, located immediately above the third nswt-sign (of nb nswt ṭ3wy) in line 4.

f Despite the partial loss of the end of the name, the reading Menkheperre, the prenomen of Thutmose III (as opposed to Menkheprure, the prenomen of Thutmose IV), is assured (cf. Bryan, *The Reign of Thutmose IV*, 6–9).

g Reading the remnant following the cartouche as the bottom of the i of 'Inn' (cf. Urk. iv, 1375, 7; Helck, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie. Übersetzung*, 67, no. 416, n. 3.

h I take the vertical sign following the ḫp (of ṭ3w-ḫp) as its stroke determinative. The identity of the fragmentary sign following remains uncertain. On the attributes commonly included in this version of the offering formula, see Barta, *Aufbau und Bedeutung der altägyptischen Opferformel*, 97 and 122 (Bitte 122).

i Reading [m]-ḥ3h nswt. For the expression in such formulae, see Barta, *Aufbau und Bedeutung der altägyptischen Opferformel*, 97, Bitte 122, b, with n. 3; cf. Urk. iv, 1614, 13. For the seated king hieroglyph as a writing of nswt, cf., for example, Urk. IV, 74, 14 (Fecht, ZÄS 91, 58).

j Note the abbreviated writing of nswt, with a t displacing the normal r of ṭ3 (Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 482, M 24), as in the inscription of Amenemnekhu from Tanur; see Hintze and Reineke, *Felsinschriften aus dem sudanesischen Nubien*, 1, 173, no. 564, II, 240, no. 564, and possibly also I, 171, no. 558, II, 237, no. 558.

k Reading [dd.f ink b3k] ṭ3 n nb.f mb pfr m nbw. The suggested restorations fit the lacunae and suit the context; cf. the Ibrim inscription of the viceroy Nehy, Caminos, *The Shrines and Rock-Inscriptions of Ibrim*, 41, pl. 10, line 2 (= Urk. IV, 984, 7–9); Hallmann, *Die Tributzonen des Neuen Reiches*, 19. Other suggestions (Urk. IV, 1375, 13; Gutgesell and Schmitz, SAK 9, 133, n. 14) are less convincing. On the phrase b3k ṭ3 n nb.f, including the Tombos example, see Guksch, *Königsdienst*, 86 and 223–4 (106) 01–03, to which add HT vi, 11, pl. 47, no. 371 (BM EA 1199), line 2 = Frood, *JE A* 89, 60, fig. 1, line 2, and 65, pl. iv, and Davies, *The Tomb of Ḥen-amin in Thbes*, 44, pl. xiv, 7.

l On the various commodities listed here, see Drenkhahn, *Darstellungen von Negen*, 125–6, 130–1, 132–3, 137–8; Zibelius-Chen, *Die ägyptische Expansion nach Nubien*, 73–80, 85–86 (with n. 152), 91, 93–4 (with n. 253), 96–8 (with n. 291), 99–100 (with n. 306), 107–8 (with n. 393), and 112–4; on khesayet and tishepes, see Edel 1984, 190, no. 5, and 191, with n. 6; Koura, *Die "7-Heiligen Öle"*, 234–5 and 238–40; on Nubia as a source of gold, ivory and ebony, see Hikade, *Das Expeditiionswesen im ägyptischen Neuen Reich*, 71–5 and 92–5, ns. 402, 515.

m Restoring . The n-sign is clear, the bottom of the nn-sign survives, and the skin-determinative is certain. There is room for an m at the beginning of the line, preceding inn.
It follows from the inscription that the viceroy Amenemnekhu had two names, Inebny/Amememhekhu, which are used here alternatively, and that he was still in active service in Year 20, when he conducted or effected the military campaign in question, one of at least two southern campaigns known to have taken place during the period of the co-regency. It also (almost certainly) confirms his identity with the ‘follower of his lord upon his footsteps in the southern and northern foreign lands, king’s son, troop-commander, overseer of weaponry of the king, Inebny’ of the British Museum statue (figs. 6–7). Although their secondary titles are different, both served as ‘king’s son’ during the same period (that of the co-regency) and share a name, Inebny, which appears to be otherwise unknown. With the statue and Tombos inscription included, the total number of attestations of this viceroy rises to nine, as he is known from seven other rock-inscriptions, located at various points within the Nubian Nile Valley: at Sehel, Shalfak (twice), Kumma, Tangur (twice), and Dal. Two more cases can probably be added to this corpus. One is a stela in the British Museum (EA 1015), probably from Buhen, again from the period of the co-regency, the other an ex-voto in the temple of Kumma. These are considered below, as is a relevant context in the temple of Semna.

**Stela British Museum EA 1015**

The stela (figs. 11–12), made of sandstone (max. ht 510mm), is decorated with a scene showing two figures of a viceroy, facing inwards, giving praise to the prenomen ([Maatka]re) of Hatshepsut on the left and that of Thutmose III (Menkheperre) on the right, surmounting an inscription arranged in four horizontal lines, giving the viceroy’s titles, epithets and name: ‘(1)
Hereditary nobleman, governor, royal treasurer, sole companion, eyes (2) [of the king], ears of the lord of the two lands, one who is in the heart of the perfect god, one whom the king has advanced (3) [knowing his effectiveness, mouth of the king of Lower Egypt in Khent-h[en]-nefer, tongue of the king of Upper Egypt amongst the Rekhyt, king’s son, overseer of southern foreign lands (4) [inscription destroyed]’. Deliberate damage has been inflicted on the name of Hatshepsut, the figures of the viceroy and the last line of the inscription, which once identified the viceroy. The extent of the latter damage, which encompasses the entire line, suggests that a double name was once written here. The obvious candidate is now ‘Inebny/Amenemnekhu’.  

Temple of Kumma, Court B, ex-voto

The second case occurs in a viceregal ex-voto in the temple of Kumma, placed beneath a larger scene of Thutmose III worshipping the god Khnum on a pilaster in Court B. The ex-voto consists of five columns of inscription (fig. 13) followed by the figure of a viceroy standing with hands raised in adoration of the god. Once again the figure of the viceroy has been almost entirely removed (faint traces survive) and the viceroy’s name has been obliterated. The area of damage in the inscription, occupying over half the final column, invites the same conclusion: it once contained two names. The double-name ‘Inebny/ Amenemnekhu’ would again suit the space. In this case, the suggestion is supported by the vestige of a hieroglyph which survives towards the bottom of the column (see the recent drawing, fig. 14). It looks like the front leg of a bird, probably the quail-chick (w), its location suitting a vertical disposition of the name Imp-m-nxw (followed by a determinative). The attribution of this ex-voto to Amenemnekhu also works well within the context of the other decoration in Court B, echoing in content, style, size and situation two nearby ex-votos (associated with inscriptions of Thutmose II honouring the god Khnum) left by a close predecessor, the viceroy Seni. Independent evidence that Amenemnekhu was active at Kumma is provided by the rock-inscription (already noted above) marking the presence at the site of one of his close attendants.

The indications are that, like a small number of other senior officials who served during the co-regency, Inebny/Amenemnekhu suffered a damnatio memoriae, possibly because of his close association with Hatshepsut, although the persecution, as in the case of others so targeted, appears to have been unsystematic. While his name (together with image where present) was effaced at Tombos, Shalfak, Buhen, Kumma (temple), and Sehel, it was left untouched at Kumma (rock-inscription), Tangur and Dal, as well as in the two

27 Or possibly ‘Inebny called (dhwmn.f) Amenemnekhu’ or vice-versa (Vernus, Le Surnom au Moyen Empire, 85, n. 17; Säve-Söderbergh and Troy, New Kingdom Pharaonic Sites. Scandinavian Joint Expedition to Sudanese Nubia 5:2, 205–6).


29 Caminos, Semna-Kumma II, 22–5, pls. 20–3.

30 Hintze and Reineke, Felsinschriften aus dem sudanesischen Nubien I, 116, no. 419, II, 154, no. 419.

31 Dziobek in Assmann, Theludische Beamtennekropolen, 132–5; Dorman in Roehrig et al., Hatshepsut from Queen to Pharaoh, 108–9; Gasse and Rondot, Les inscriptions de Séhel, 131–4.
examples on his statue from Thebes where the name of Hatshepsut was actually removed (fig. 7).  

**Temple of Semna, Year 2 inscription**

On the basis of the known dates for Amenemnekhu’s period of office – Year 18 (Shalfak) and now Year 20 (Tombos) – it is a reasonable assumption that he remained in post up to the disappearance of Hatshepsut in Year 22 (Thutmose III appointed a new viceroy, Nehy, who was in post in Year 23). However, it is yet to be determined when Amenemnekhu took up office. That it occurred after Year 2 can be established from the text dated to that year inscribed on the exterior east wall of the temple of Semna, which tells of an order given by Thutmose III to his viceroy relating to the commemoration of a renewal of offerings. The viceroy’s name occurs at the very bottom of the second column (fig. 15) and is almost entirely lost (not through deliberate damage but from natural decay of the stone surface). All that survives of the name is a small trace, roughly triangular in shape (figs. 15–16). It was taken by Caminos (perhaps too definitively) as ‘the rear protuberance or horny crest on the head of the  -bird’, on the basis of which he read the name as Nehy, which suits the available space but is difficult to reconcile with the fact that Nehy is known to have followed Amenemnekhu as viceroy, being first certainly attested in office (as noted above) in Year 23. The reading ‘Inebny’ can also be discounted (the surviving trace is incompatible with the orthography of that name), as can ‘Amenemnekhu’ (on grounds of space as well as orthography). Among the remaining (known) viceregal candidates (comprising Seni, Se, and now possibly Penre), only ‘Seni’ (vicereoy probably for most of the reign of Thutmose I and the reign of Thutmose II) would seem to meet the requirements of the context. The remaining trace could be the right (top) end of an n -sign (       ; cf. the n -sign in column 1, fig.15) and there is room for the vertical sn -sign to its right. The name might have been

---

32 On the proscription of Hatshepsut, see Dorman in Roehrig et al., Hatshepsut from Queen to Pharaoh, 267–9; also Arnold in Roehrig et al., Hatshepsut from Queen to Pharaoh, 270–6; Roth in Roehrig et al., Hatshepsut from Queen to Pharaoh, 277–83.

33 Dorman in Cline and O’Connor, Thutmose III. A New Biography, 57–8.

34 Dewachter, RdE 28, 153; Dewachter, Répertoire des monuments des vice-rois de Kouch I, 48–9, Doc. 41; Müller, Die Verwaltung der nubischen Provinz, 170–2, no. 6; Habachi, L A 3, 631–2, no. 8; Bács in Bács (ed.), Studies Gaál, Luft, Török, 57–8.

35 Dunham and Janssen, Second Cataract Forts, I. Semna, Kumma, 9, fig. A (23), 11, pl. 30; Dewachter, Répertoire des monuments des vice-rois de Kouch I, 411–2, Doc. III; Caminos, Semna-Kumma I, 14, 43–7, pls 23–5.

36 Cf. Caminos, Semna-Kumma, pl. 25, col. 2.

37 Ibid., 14, n. 4.

38 Ibid., 44, with n. 2.

39 Davies in Roehrig et al, Hatshepsut from Queen to Pharaoh, 54, with n. 56; Dorman in Cline and O’Connor, Thutmose III. A New Biography, 42 and 61, n. 26.

40 Bács in Bács (ed.), Studies Gaál, Luft, Török; Valbelle, RdE 58, 157–75.

41 Already cited above with reference to his ex-votos in the temple of Kumma, Seni is probably the viceroy of the biographical text inscribed on the exterior south wall of the temple of Semna (Dewachter, Répertoire des monuments des vice-rois de Kouch I, 409–11, Doc. II; Caminos, Semna-Kumma I, 27–31, pls 18–19; Bács in Bács (ed.), Studies Gaál, Luft, Török, 56–7, n. 25; Valbelle, RdE 58, 162, n. 11, and 173–5).
completed with the inclusion of a man-determinative underneath the \textit{n} (as in other cases of
his name), a grouping compatible with the available space.

Whether this suggestion is correct or not, the exclusion of Inebny/Amenemnekhu as a
candidate means that two viceroyos are currently attested for the Thutmose III-Hatshepsut
period, the first (possibly Seni) in office at the very beginning of the period (Year 2), the
second (Inebny/Amenemnekhu) towards the end (at least from Year 18 onwards). It remains
to be ascertained if (and when) the former succeeded the latter or whether another viceroy
intervened. However, there is currently no evidence for a rapid turn-over of viceroyos and
consequent instability in the colonial administration during the co-regency, a period which
saw an active programme of temple and other building in the Nubian Nile Valley and
consolidation of the Egyptian presence in Kush – the latter strikingly manifested in the
major new fortified town of Pnubs (Dokki Gel), just south of Tombos, its religious complex
including a temple (the western temple) decorated by Hatshepsut.

Summary

These first results of the British Museum Tombos survey show again the value of revisiting
original material, long known but inadequately documented. It has produced useful new
prosopographical data, extending our secure evidential base for the history of the period and
the Egyptian appropriation of the Middle Nile Valley, a process in which the viceroy Inebny/
Amenemnekhu appears to have played an active role during his (possibly long) period of
office. It has also opened up an interesting possibility: that other viceroyos (and indeed officials
at large) currently known only by a single name (for example, Seni, Se, Penre, Nehy, Usersatet)
may actually have had two names – perhaps deployed alternatively on different monuments –
that have yet to be connected.

Inebny/Amenemnekhu is, to date, the earliest known viceroy to have left his mark
at Tombos. A future report will consider the inscriptions on the Tombos mainland (east
bank of the Nile, see fig. 1), a corpus which comprises the famous stelae of Thutmose I
and commemorative texts left by two later viceroyos, Usersatet and Merymose, and other
favoured officials, a presence which, together with the recent discovery of a nearby pharaonic
cemetery including a large pyramid-tomb of a senior government official, possibly of the mid-

\[\text{PM VII, 174–5}\]  
\[\text{CRIPEL 4, 57–6; cf. Der Manuelian, Studies in the Reign of Amenophis II, 93–4 and 111–2; Gasse and Rondot, Sudan & Nubia 7, 45, pl. 6 and col. pl. xx; Gasse and Rondot, Les inscriptions de Séhol, 155 and 498 (SEH 261); Valbelle, RdE 58, 170.}\]
Eighteenth Dynasty, supports the growing picture of Tombos as a significant node of the colonial administration.\textsuperscript{48}
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**Abbreviations**


Fig.1: Satellite image of Tombos Island (photo Google Earth), with location of inscription of Thutmose III (91/17) indicated.
Fig. 2: Tombos Island. General location of the Thutmose III inscription (91/17) viewed from the east, indicated by the arrow.

Fig. 3: Tombos Island. Inscription dated to Year 20 of King Thutmose III (91/17).
Fig. 5: Tombos Island. Year 20 inscription, detail showing effaced names.

Fig. 6: Statue of Inebny (British Museum EA 1131), detail.
Fig. 7: Statue of Inebny (British Museum EA 1131).
Fig. 8: Tombos Island. Detail of the inscription of Thutmose III, showing the viceroy’s first name.

Fig. 9: Tombos Island. Detail of the inscription of Thutmose III, showing the viceroy’s second name.
Fig. 10: Tombos Island. Detail of the inscription of Thutmose III, with the two names.
Fig. 11: Stela British Museum EA 1015.
Fig. 12: Stela British Museum EA 1015, new copy of decoration.
Fig. 13: Temple of Kumma, ex-voto in Court B.

Fig. 14: Temple of Kumma, ex-voto in Court B. Copy of damaged area in last column with vestige of hieroglyph.
Fig. 15: Temple of Semna, Year 2 inscription. Bottom of columns 1-3.

Fig. 16: Temple of Semna, Year 2 inscription. Bottom of column 2 with vestige of viceroy’s name indicated.
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