

CHAPTER 6: PEOPLE ON SAI: PROSOPOGRAPHICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ‘SOCIAL FABRIC’ OF SAI IN THE NEW KINGDOM

by Johannes Auenmüller

6.1 INTRODUCTION

One integral part of the European Research Council project AcrossBorders was to understand more about the people of Sai in the New Kingdom. Within work task 4: “The world of the living and the world of the dead – the occupants of Sai Island”, a specific aspect of the available evidence was amongst others tackled: prosopographical data. The prosopography of the Pharaonic foundation Sai is constituted by data from three larger archaeological contexts that are typical for ancient Egyptian towns especially in New Kingdom Nubia:¹¹⁷⁴ the walled settlement with its administrative buildings and magazines (SAV1; SAF5), the Temple A with its architectural and inscriptional remains, and the elite necropolis outside of the town in the nearby desert hinterland, with funerary goods bearing names and titles of the buried (SAC5) (cf. Tab. 39). In this contribution a comprehensive evaluation of the prosopographical data from Sai Island is undertaken. It first aims at answering the question which people are attested on Sai in the New Kingdom. Secondly, the different archaeological contexts of the evidence are taken into account to say something about function, roles and attachments of these people.

6.2 PROSOPOGRAPHY – METHODS AND EGYPTOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS

Prosopography can be understood as a specific means of shedding light onto the social fabric and historical development of chronologically and geographically defined milieus or populations. For the present case, it is the ‘social elite’ of Sai Island in the New Kingdom as attested through various kinds of epigraphical evidence. The first part of a prosopographical study is to “bring together all relevant biographical data of groups of persons in a systematic and stereotypical way.”¹¹⁷⁵ This data is then used to investigate the “common background characteristics” of the prosopographical target people “by means of a collective study of their lives.”¹¹⁷⁶ Such a collective study aims, however, not at drafting a “collective biography”,¹¹⁷⁷ but rather at “presenting evidence about the individual and the exceptional – i.e. the true subject of biography – [...] in order to uncover the collective and the normal.”¹¹⁷⁸ Thus, individual and

¹¹⁷⁴ On the architectural constituents of the walled town, see Adenstedt 2016; for the cemetery SAC5, see Minault-Gout and Thill 2012; for Sai in the New Kingdom, see also Vercoutter 1973; Azim 1975; Thill 1997; Minault-Gout 2007; Gabolde 2012; Budka and Doyen 2013; Budka 2015a; Budka 2015b; Budka 2015d; Budka 2016a; Budka 2017h; Budka 2017g; Budka 2017c; Budka 2017k; Budka 2018b. For recent and concise characterisations of New Kingdom Nubia in general, see Török 2009, 157–283; Spencer et al. 2017.

¹¹⁷⁵ Verboven, Carlier and Dumolyn 2007, 37.

¹¹⁷⁶ Stone 1971, 46.

¹¹⁷⁷ See Verboven, Carlier and Dumolyn 2007, 39 and 59; Charle 2015; Hawkins et al. 2016 for the term ‘collective biography’, which sometimes stands in terminological competition with ‘prosopography’. But indeed, there are a number of important conceptional differences (cf. Keats-Rohan 2007, 141, 143–146). An example for a recent Egyptological ‘collective biography’ would be Allon and Navratilova 2017.

¹¹⁷⁸ Keats-Rohan 2007, 141.

exceptional cases are part of the endeavour to find out typical – or rather typological – features within administrative or institutional bodies or geographically defined entities such as regions or towns. Based on the indispensable and fruitful discussion of individual cases, it is the larger picture that is aimed at in unveiling general characteristics that can be made meaningful for describing and explaining culturally specific phenomena from an anthropological viewpoint. In breaking down this rather elaborate conceptualisation, prosopography can simply be understood as ‘historische Personenforschung’, i.e. research on historical individuals.¹¹⁷⁹

Prosopography looks back at a long history in the field of Egyptology.¹¹⁸⁰ It was more often directly employed as a research tool than being scrutinised from a theoretical or methodological standpoint. Next to a myriad of studies discussing important and well-attested elite individuals based on their epigraphical evidence,¹¹⁸¹ one perennial topic of Egyptological research can easily be identified that has always been tackled with the aid of prosopography: this is ‘Pharaonic administration’.¹¹⁸² Current prosopographical research relies on a number of fundamental studies. As for New Kingdom Egypt, the most influential study on its civil administration based on prosopographical data is Wolfgang Helck’s “Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches”.¹¹⁸³ His prosopographical approach on topics such as Pharaonic economy is also more than evident in his monumental data collection “Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Neuen Reiches”.¹¹⁸⁴

As for New Kingdom Nubia, Ingeborg Müller’s “Die Verwaltung Nubiens im Neuen Reich” is the foundation for any further research into both the efforts and strategies of the Pharaonic state to govern and manage this region as well as about the individuals who represent the administrative apparatus behind this endeavour.¹¹⁸⁵ Müller’s study is based both on a prosopographical catalogue in topographical order and a collection of texts and text excerpts dealing with administrative issues of more general and specific nature concerning the Nubian provinces. Her prosopographical target groups therefore encompass all known people and functionaries that bear any connection to Nubia and/or that are epigraphically attested there.¹¹⁸⁶

In view of the main topic ‘Pharaonic administration’, two common research objectives generally go together hand in hand. Whilst the first is the unveiling of administrative structures,¹¹⁸⁷ the other is to understand more about Pharaonic society and its people.¹¹⁸⁸ Potential shortcomings and problems of the administration of Egypt and its institutions are, however, only rarely discussed.¹¹⁸⁹ Inseparable from the general topic ‘administration’ are studies about individual kings that include assessments of the known high elite functionaries of the respective reigns in order to shed light on historical events, administrative structures and personal responsibilities.¹¹⁹⁰ Besides different members of the royal family,¹¹⁹¹ particularly the highest civil officials and the institutions over which they preside as well as people around the king

¹¹⁷⁹ Cf. Raedler 2009b, 310, who uses the German term “Personengeschichte” next to ‘prosopography’.

¹¹⁸⁰ Cf. Raedler 2009b, 311–313.

¹¹⁸¹ To name just a few out of many: Gomaà 1973; Meyer 1982; Bryan 1986; Dorman 1988; Amer 1999; Meurer 2015; Štubňová 2016.

¹¹⁸² Moreno García 2013a.

¹¹⁸³ Helck 1958.

¹¹⁸⁴ Helck 1961.

¹¹⁸⁵ Müller 2013. Cf. also Morkot 2013b, with more literature.

¹¹⁸⁶ Since the time of publication of Müller 2013, several new epigraphical sources have been re-studied or were newly discovered. All new sources relevant for this contribution are taken into account in the following paragraphs and are listed in the prosopographical tables.

¹¹⁸⁷ Cf. for example the diagrams in O’Connor 1983, 208, fig. 3.4; Steinmann 1984, 32, 34, 37 and 40; Shaw 1999, 27, fig. 15; Raedler 2012, 125, fig. 1.

¹¹⁸⁸ See also Helck 1963; Auenmüller 2017; Auenmüller 2018a; Auenmüller 2018b; Auenmüller in press.

¹¹⁸⁹ Eyre 2004; Eyre 2009; cf. also Kóthay 2013; Moreno García 2013b; Moreno García 2013c.

¹¹⁹⁰ Cf., e.g., Hari 1976; Aling 1976; Der Manuelian 1987; Bryan 1991; Cline and O’Connor 2006; Cline and O’Connor 2012; O’Connor and Cline 1998.

¹¹⁹¹ E.g. Dodson 1990; Fisher 2001.

and in the palace have been studied extensively.¹¹⁹² The same holds true for religious institutions and their staff, particularly of the Pharaonic main state temples.¹¹⁹³ The Egyptian military and its professional hierarchy is also a well-researched demographic.¹¹⁹⁴

Since the responsibilities, relationships and dependencies of individual people to any government institution, bureaucratic entity or occupational group of the Pharaonic state manifest themselves in specific administrative titles, there is a myriad of dedicated studies on such office titles and all kinds of professional métiers.¹¹⁹⁵ Additionally, also particular ranking titles that indicate social position and status of their holders have undergone scrutiny.¹¹⁹⁶ Individual people that received the prestigious ‘Gold of Honour’ have also been discussed on a prosopographical basis.¹¹⁹⁷ A further important perspective on administration and particularly prosopography as a means to learn more about people and certain communities focuses on places and defined regions. This encompasses, e.g., studies on workers’ settlements blessed with a rich epigraphical and archaeological record, such as Deir el-Medine,¹¹⁹⁸ Egyptian provincial towns and capital cities¹¹⁹⁹ and larger topographical units within Egypt¹²⁰⁰ – and beyond, such as the provincial territories and vassal states of the Pharaonic state in the Levant¹²⁰¹ or in Nubia.¹²⁰² While prosopographical data has been used in studies to answer chronological and historical questions with more precision,¹²⁰³ it is in most cases adduced to understand the development and functioning of institutions and to understand the role and elite social fabric of certain towns and cities which are archaeologically – except from monumental temple architecture – only partially known.¹²⁰⁴ In this way, prosopography also helps to answer sociological questions in which the affiliation of an individual with a certain administrative body, his belonging to a specific group of officials or a specific place are used as proxies to determine social prestige and status.

6.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND AIMS

Sai provides us with a prosopographical data set of a New Kingdom Pharaonic foundation in Upper Nubia. Its rather typical constituents have already been discussed in comparing the social fabrics of Sai, Soleb and Amara West with each other.¹²⁰⁵ Here, the main focus shall lie on Sai only. In order to assess the people present on Sai either temporarily or permanently during the New Kingdom, some general research questions were already formulated in the introduction. To answer the first question of which people are attested on Sai, prosopography is used to identify all historical actors beyond the royal sphere for whom a relation with and presence at the walled town can be determined by the available epigraphic evidence. This evidence may derive from quite different contexts and media, in the form of various categories of objects bearing names and titles of the individuals from funerary, temple or domestic spheres,

¹¹⁹² E.g. Raedler 2004; Raedler 2006; Raedler 2009a; Raedler 2012; Dresbach 2012; Auenmüller 2013 (viziers); Awad 2002 (treasury officials); Bohleke 1991 (granary overseers); Simonet 1987; Geßler-Löhr 1989; Geßler-Löhr 1990; Schulman 1990 (royal butlers); Roehrig 1990 (royal nurses, tutors, foster mothers and brothers); Feucht 1985 (*hrd.w-n-k3p*).

¹¹⁹³ E.g. Lefebvre 1929; Kees 1953; Moursi 1972; Graefe 1981; Maystre 1992; Raue 1999; Haring 1997; Awadalla 2000; Eichler 2000; Raedler 2011; Leblanc 2012; Staring 2015.

¹¹⁹⁴ Schulman 1964; Yoyotte and López 1969; Chevereau 1994; Gnirs 1996; Pamminger 1997; Raedler 2009; Spalinger 2013; Ashmawy 2014; Gnirs 2013.

¹¹⁹⁵ E.g. Haring 2000 (*sh3.w-n-tm3*); Balanda 2009 (*hr.j-sšt3*); Onstine 2005 (*šm^c.yt*); Steinmann 1980 (craftsmen); Valloggia 1976; El-Saady 1999 (royal envoys); Ghalioungui 1983 (physicians); Polz 1990 (*šn^c-personnel*).

¹¹⁹⁶ Pomorska 1987 (*β.y-hw-hr-wmn.j-n-nsw*); Onasch 1998 (*sh3.w-nsw*).

¹¹⁹⁷ Binder 2008.

¹¹⁹⁸ E.g. Černý 1973; Janssen 1997; Davies 1999; Häggman 2002.

¹¹⁹⁹ E.g. Van Dijk 1989; Raue 1999; Betrò 2001; Herzberg 2016.

¹²⁰⁰ Zecchi 1999; Long 2012; Esposito 2014; Mahfouz 2017.

¹²⁰¹ Mohammad 1959; Helck 1960; Hirsch 2006.

¹²⁰² Habachi 1981, 155–168; Müller 1982; Gasse and Rondot 2003; Müller 2013.

¹²⁰³ Bierbrier 1975.

¹²⁰⁴ Martin 2000; Raue 1999; Auenmüller 2017; Auenmüller 2018a; Auenmüller in press.

¹²⁰⁵ Auenmüller 2018b.

or more stationary text records such as, e.g., rock inscriptions. The first aspect of the prosopographical method, a systematic collection of person-related information, is met here with the compilation of New Kingdom personal data that includes the evidence from Sai itself and beyond (cf. Tab. 39).¹²⁰⁶

This is, however, only one side of the endeavour. It becomes evident that the person-related data derive from a quite varied range of sources and objects on the one hand, but from a rather restricted number of contexts on the other hand, which in turn have a bearing on the typical range of potential and actual prosopographical documents. This holds especially true for the evidence from Sai itself. Here, three main archaeological and/or social contexts can be differentiated: the elite necropolis SAC5, the main Temple A and the southern part of the town with the so-called governor's palace and the magazine facility (SAF2 & SAF5). However, it must be pointed out that the archaeological context is not always specifically known for all the epigraphical sources from Sai. Nevertheless, a typical range of name and title bearing objects can be specified for these three contexts in general: shabtis and other funerary equipment from the tombs, statues from the temple and inscribed door jambs from the magazines.¹²⁰⁷ The data from outside Sai also have their specific contexts, as will be discussed with the individual cases. The different archaeological locations and find-spots of the individual epigraphical pieces will finally be considered to tell something about function, role and attachments of their owners.

In line with this research, the social and professional structure of the Pharaonic town as mirrored by prosopographical data will become visible, at least in parts. But it is not only the structure, but also the individual moments of belonging, embeddedness and identity of the respective people that could be explored. All the people that are discussed in the following can be understood as integral parts of Sai's social and professional fabric, visiting, populating and administering the town, might they have worked in the governor's residence or the adjacent storage facilities or might they have been engaged in either temple rituals or artisanal activities. Especially the permanent Sai residents were significant players in the local milieu. They were part of families or other social professional groups and networks, they experienced Sai's architectural and social environment, shaped and transformed their own town, houses and societal groups with their presence and engagement, and died and were – as members of their local community – laid to rest in the close-by necropolis in the presence and under involvement of their fellow people.

While individual biographies and experiences are in most cases hidden behind the epigraphical and archaeological evidence, the single texts, images, objects and archaeological contexts seen together allow at least for a general description and understanding of Sai's social structure during the New Kingdom. The general aim behind this line of research interest in New Kingdom prosopography is to develop 'localised prosopographies' of New Kingdom urban landscapes, assessing both towns and their elite cemeteries, in order to understand more about different kinds of local attachments of the people.¹²⁰⁸ The question of whether the individuals we are going to encounter here on Sai were – or considered themselves as – 'Egyptians' or 'Nubians' is not of immediate concern for this paper. The fact that they are present on Sai is proof that they belonged to the Sai community in one way or the other, regardless of their origin or ethnicity.¹²⁰⁹

¹²⁰⁶ While the epigraphic evidence deriving from Sai itself constitutes the principal part of the data set, additional individual-related epigraphical sources from outside Sai are included where necessary for discussing the full range of data pertaining to the people of Sai and those individuals known to have had a specific relationship with the New Kingdom town. The data set from Sai presented here is based on currently available published information. There is still a large number of inscribed blocks on Sai with prosopographical data that have not been published yet. They are under study by Anne Minault-Gout (Paris-Sorbonne) and Luc Gabolde (CNRS). Future publications of these blocks will enhance our prosopographical picture of Sai in the New Kingdom.

¹²⁰⁷ See Tab. 39, column 'Attestation', for more details.

¹²⁰⁸ Cf. Auenmüller 2017; Auenmüller 2018a; Auenmüller 2018b; Auenmüller in press.

¹²⁰⁹ On the issue of cultural entanglements and hybridities, cf. Smith 2003a; Buzon 2008; Török 2009, esp. 263–283; Morkot 2013b, 944–950; Binder 2017; Budka 2017g, 443–444; Smith and Buzon 2017; Spencer et al. 2017, 41–50. See also this volume, Chapter 8.1.

6.4 THE PROSOPOGRAPHY OF SAI IN THE NEW KINGDOM

In the following paragraphs, the prosopographical data from and related with Sai are discussed in a top-down order that is based on the social rank and professional position of the individuals. The backbone of this endeavour is Tab. 38, where the published prosopographical data pertaining to Sai is collected in a chronologically organised manner. Each entry has a consecutive identifying number that will be used as its individual reference code. The next columns give titles and name of the persons as attested on the individual prosopographical sources, which are listed in the following column with their object type as well as their museum or site-specific inventory numbers. A general find context and individual bibliographic references of the objects are specified in the next section. The ‘Date’ column serves to roughly position objects and people chronologically. Depending on the available information, the date given there is either more general or more precise. 74 individual sources are listed, out of which seven (Docs. 2–4, 29–31, 57; 9,46%) do not come from Sai itself. The 74 sources account for 28 named individuals, whose titles are completely or at least partially preserved.¹²¹⁰ This is generally a quite large number for a New Kingdom ‘temple town’ in Nubia,¹²¹¹ only Aniba has a more extensive prosopography with more than 140 names and individuals.¹²¹² Not all entries in Tab. 39 will be individually discussed in the following paragraphs (cf. esp. Docs. 45–46, 55–56, 72, 74). Due to their rather fragmented state or a lack of significant prosopographical data (title and name), they are less informative. Nevertheless, they add at least some piece of evidence to more members of the local Sai society.

Doc.	Title	Name	Attestation	Provenance and Reference	Date
1	<i>mh-jb-ʕ3-m-nʹ.t-[rs.jt] [s3-nsw-n-Kš]</i>	<i>[Jmn-m-nhw]</i>	Stela S.1100 with two joining pieces	SAF5, north-west of town site and Qoeiqa el-Gama’ (Rondot 2017, figs. 1–2)	Hatshepsut/Thutmose III
2	<i>h3.tj-ʕ-n-Š3ʕ.t</i>	<i>Jʕh-ms</i>	Statuette Kairo CG 42047 (JdE 38234)	Karnak, Naqya es-Zaptieh (Legrain 1906, 28–29; Müller 2013, 209, Tabelle 2.5.2, no. 16, 387, Beleg 8.2.5)	Thutmose III
3	<i>h3.tj-ʕ-n-Š3ʕ.t sh3.w</i>	<i>Jʕh-ms</i>	Statue Bologna KS 1823	Unknown, probably Thebes or Elephantine (Pernigotti 1980, 37–39; cat.-no. 8; Müller 2013, 209, Tabelle 2.5.2, no. 16, 464, Beleg 54.20)	
4	<i>sh3.w</i>	<i>Jʕh-ms</i>	Statue Khartoum No. 93	Buhen (Randall-Maciver and Woolley 1911, 111; H.S. Smith 1976, 209; Müller 2013, 209, Tabelle 2.5.2, no. 16, 440, Beleg 38.72)	
5	<i>whm.w-nsw jm.j-rʹ-r[w.yt] s3-[ns]w jm.j-rʹ-h3s.wt</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Sandstone pillar S.1 originally from Temple A	Town/fort (Minault-Gout 2007, fig. 3; Müller 2013, 106–108, 456, Beleg 45.1; Davies 2014a, 7–9, figs. 7–9, pl. 6)	Thutmose III
6	<i>s3-nsw jm.j-rʹ-h3s.wt-rs.jt whm.w-nsw</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Cuboid statue fragment S.734a	Reused in ‘ <i>mur ture</i> ’ (Müller 2013, 106–108, 456, Beleg 45.5; Thill 2016, 288)	
7	<i>jr-j-pʕ.t h3.tj-ʕ htm.tj-bjt smr-wʕ.tj rs-tp.j-n-nb-t3.wj n-[rh.yt ʕhʕ]-hr-h3.t=f s3-nsw jm.j-rʹ-h3s.wt-rs.jt</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Door jamb fragment seen by Lepsius, no No.	Town (Müller 2013, 106–108, 456, Beleg 45.2)	

Tab. 38 The prosopography of Sai in the New Kingdom. The lines highlighted in grey indicate that the evidence listed there does not originate from Sai itself

¹²¹⁰ The entries lacking a name and/or a title as basis for a proper prosopographical assessment are not individually discussed in the following paragraphs.

¹²¹¹ Cf. Auenmüller 2018b.

¹²¹² Steindorff 1937, 248–250.

Doc.	Title	Name	Attestation	Provenance and Reference	Date	
8	<i>s3-nsw jm.j-r'-h3s.wt-rs.jt</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Door jamb fragment used as threshold F 1030	SAF5 (Müller 2013, 106–108, 456, Beleg 45.3; Adenstedt 2016, pl. 31.1)	Thutmose III	
9	<i>s3-nsw</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Door jamb S.119 = bloc 387	Reused in Temple A (Müller 2013, 106–108, 456, Beleg 45.4; Thill 2016, 285, pl. Ib, Doc.Sai.14)		
10	[...]	[<i>Nhy</i>]	Lintel S.417 = bloc 027	Reused in Temple A area (Thill 2016, 274–276, fig. 7, Doc.Sai.01)		
11	[...]	[<i>Nhy</i>]	Lintel fragment S.25 = bloc 6 + bloc F2018)	Reused in 'mur turc' (Thill 2016, 276–277, fig. 8, Docs.Sai.02–03)		
12	<i>jr.j-p^c.t h3.tj-^c whm.w-nsw jm.j-r'-rw.yt s3-nsw</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Lintel fragment S.1085 = bloc 385	SAF5 (Thill 2016, 277–278, fig. 9, Doc.Sai.04)		
13	[...] <i>jm.j-r'-rw.yt</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Lintel fragments S.109 = bloc 030; S.781 = bloc 022; blocs 195, 221, 200)	Reused in 'mur turc' (Thill 2016, 278–280, fig. 10, Docs.Sai.05–09)		
14	[...] <i>jm.j-r'-rw.yt s3-nsw jm.j-r'-h3s.wt-rs.jt</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Lintel fragment S.6 = bloc 156	Probably SAF5 (Thill 2016, 280–282, fig. 12, Doc.Sai.11)		
15	[...]	<i>Nhy</i>	Lintel fragment bloc 3008	Sai, no precise findspot given (Thill 2016, 282, fig. 14, Doc.Sai.13)		
16	[<i>s3</i>]- <i>nsw</i>	[<i>Nhy</i>]	Door jamb bloc F 1031	Sai, no precise findspot given (Thill 2016, 285, pl. Ic, Doc.Sai.15)		
17	<i>jm.j-jb-Hr-nb-^ch whm.w-nsw jm.j-r'-rw.yt</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Door jamb S.1079 = bloc F 1044	SAF5 (Thill 2016, 292, pl. IIf, Doc.Sai.20)		
18	<i>s3-nsw jm.j-r'-h3s.wt-rs.jt whm.w-nsw jm.j-r'-rw.yt</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Door jamb fragment bloc 3048	From Morka (Thill 2016, 292, pl. IIC, Doc.Sai.21)		
19	[<i>jm.j-r'</i>]- <i>rw.yt</i>	[<i>Nhy</i>]	Door jamb fragment S.1139 = bloc 186	SAF5 (Thill 2016, 292, pl. IIg, Doc.Sai.22)		
20	[...] <i>wh[m.w-nsw]</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Door jamb fragment bloc F 1032 in situ	SAF5 (Adenstedt 2016, pls. 20.1–3; Thill 2016, 292, pl. IIh, Doc.Sai.23)		
21	<i>whm.w-nsw</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Lintel fragment S.1146	SAF5 (Thill 2016, 292, Doc.Sai.24)		
22	<i>jm.j-r'-rw.yt</i>	<i>Nhy</i>	Seal with sealing impression SAV1E 2326	SAV1E Feature 15 (Budka 2015a, 45; http://acrossborders.oeaw.ac.at/nehya-and-hornakht-at-sai-island/sav1e-2326-thumbnail/ [last accessed 5 January 2018])		
23	<i>jm.j-r'-h3s.wt-rs.jt</i>	[<i>Nhy</i>]	Stela fragment, no No.	Gebel Abri 'next to cairns' (Müller 2013, 106–108, 455, Beleg 44.1)		
24	<i>hm-ntr-?...?</i>	<i>Hn-sb3</i>	Shabti T8C679; <i>Nn3</i> identified as mother of <i>Hn-sb3</i>	SAC5, Tomb 8 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 183–187, pls. 62, 67, 92)		Thutmose III–Amenhotep II
	-	<i>Nn3</i>				
25	<i>h3.tj-^c</i>	<i>Jpy</i>	Heart scarab T5C32 (Inv. 1009, Khartoum SNM 23392)	SAC5, Tomb 5 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 219–220, pls. 57, 102, 111)		Thutmose III–Thutmose IV

Tab. 38 *continued* The prosopography of Sai in the New Kingdom. The lines highlighted in grey indicate that the evidence listed there does not originate from Sai itself

Doc.	Title	Name	Attestation	Provenance and Reference	Date
26	<i>šm^c.yt</i>	<i>Hn.wt-^c.t</i>	Faience vase T5C62 (Inv. 1020, Khartoum SNM 23299)	SAC5, Tomb 5 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 384, pls. 57, 170)	Thutmose III–Amenhotep III
27	<i>h3.tj-^c hrp/šhm-n-h3s.t (h3.tj-^c-n-Šhm)</i>	<i>Nby</i>	Shabti T5C33 (Inv. 1005; Khartoum SNM 23425)	SAC5, Tomb 5 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 180–183, pls. 57, 94)	Thutmose IV–Amenhotep III
28	<i>h3.tj-^c-n-[Šhm] (?)</i>	<i>Nby</i>	Copper-alloy vessels T5C38-44 (Inv. 1015a–f)	SAC5, Tomb 5 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 381–383, pl. 169, Cressent and Raimon 2016, pls. 2–13)	
29	<i>h3.tj-^c hrp (h3.tj-^c-<n>-Šhm?)</i>	<i>Nby</i>	Rock inscription 21-E-1/1 553a	Tangur (Hintze and Reineke 1989, 170, pl. 235; Müller 2013, 209, Tabelle 2.5.2, no. 18, 451, Beleg 42.20)	18 th Dynasty
30	<i>h3.tj-^c hrp (h3.tj-^c-<n>-Šhm?)</i>	<i>Nby</i>	Rock inscription 21-E-1/2 554a	Tangur (Hintze and Reineke 1989, 171, pl. 236; Müller 2013, 209, Tabelle 2.5.2, no. 18, 451, Beleg 42.19)	
31	<i>h3.tj-^c hrp (h3.tj-^c-<n>-Šhm?)</i>	<i>Nby</i>	Rock inscription 21-E-4/11 573	Tangur (Hintze and Reineke 1989, 170, pl. 244; Müller 2013, 209, Tabelle 2.5.2, no. 18, 450, Beleg 42.18)	
32	<i>jr:j-p^c.t h3.tj-^c [htm.w]-bjt [smr-w^c.tj]; wb3.w-nsw-w^cb-^c.wj s3-nsw jm.j-r²-h3s.wt-rs.jt</i>	<i>Wsr-stj.t</i>	Statue fragment(s) SNM 33130	Statue cache (Davies 2017a, 134–137, no. 1, figs. 1–6)	Amenhotep II
33	<i>s3-nsw</i>	<i>Wsr-stj.t</i>	Statue fragment(s) SNM 33225	Statue cache (Davies 2017a, 138, no. 2, figs. 7–8)	
34	<i>wb3.w-nsw-w^cb-^c.wj hrd-n-k3p s3-nsw jm.j-r²-h3s.wt-rs.jt</i>	<i>Wsr-stj.t</i>	Statue fragment(s) SNM 34947	Statue cache (Davies 2017a, 138–139, no. 3, figs. 9–10)	
35	<i>[s3-nsw] jm.j-r²-[h3s.wt]-rs.jt</i>	<i>Wsr-stj.t</i>	Statue fragment, no No.	Statue cache (Davies 2017a, 140, fig. 14, no. 6)	
36	<i>jr:j-[p^c.t] h3.tj-^c mh-jb-n-n[sw]</i>	<i>[Wsr-stj.t]</i>	Statue fragment SNM 36537	Statue cache (Davies 2017a, 140, fig. 15, no. 7)	
37	<i>s3-nsw</i>	<i>Wsr-stj.t</i>	Stelae fragment(s) SNM 33224	Statue cache (Davies 2017a, 142, figs. 18–19, no. 10)	
38	[...]	<i>[Wsr-stj.t?]</i>	Stela or statue fragments, no No.	Statue cache (Davies 2017a, 143–145, fig. 24, no. 14)	
39	<i>[s3-nsw-n-Kš]</i>	<i>[Wsr-stj.t?]</i>	Stela S.63 of Amenhotep II	Town/fort (Gabolde 2012, 130–135, fig. 13)	
40	<i>nb.y</i>	<i>Hnm.w-ms</i>	Shabti SAC5 350	SAC5, Tomb 26, Feature 6 (Budka 2017l, 52–63, figs. 1, 11–12, 15; Budka 2017c, 77–78, pl. 5; Budka 2017k, 119–121, fig. 15; Budka 2018e, 189–191, fig. 5)	Amenhotep II–Thutmose IV
41	<i>nb.y</i>	<i>Hnm.w-ms</i>	Faience vessel SAC5 353	SAC5, Tomb 26, Feature 6 (Budka 2015a, 46–50; Budka 2017h, 18–19; Budka 2017l, 58, fig. 13; Budka 2017c, 75–79; Budka 2018e, 190, fig. 6)	
42	[...]	<i>Hnm.w-ms</i>	Faience vessel SAC5 355	SAC5, Tomb 26, Feature 6 (Budka 2015a, 46–50; Budka 2017h, 18–19; Budka 2017c, 75–79)	

Tab. 38 *continued* The prosopography of Sai in the New Kingdom. The lines highlighted in grey indicate that the evidence listed there does not originate from Sai itself

Doc.	Title	Name	Attestation	Provenance and Reference	Date
43	<i>jm.j-r'-nb.yw</i>	<i>Hnm.w-ms</i>	Faience vessel SAC5 352	SAC5, Tomb 26, Feature 6 (Budka 2015a, 46–50; Budka 2017h, 18–19; Budka 2017c, 75–79)	Amenhotep II– Thutmose IV
44	<i>nb.t-pr</i>	<i>Hnn=f(?)</i>	Heart scarab SAC5 349	SAC5, Tomb 26, Feature 6 (Budka 2015e; 2015a, 46–50; 2017h, 18–19; Budka 2017l, 58, fig. 14; 2017c, 75–79; Budka 2018e, 191, fig. 7)	
45	<i>jr.j-p^c.t ḥ3.tj-^c [...]</i>	[...]	Statue fragment, no No.	Statue cache (Müller 2013, 456, Beleg 45.11; Thill 2016, 286)	18 th Dynasty
46	–	[...]y[...]	Stela T11Ca2	SAC5, Tomb 11 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 163, pls. 68, 84).	18 th –19 th Dynasty
47	<i>nb.t-[pr]</i>	<i>3s.t</i>	Stela T16S21	SAC5, Tomb 16 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 162, pl. 84).	18 th –19 th Dynasty
48	<i>ḥm-ntr-[(m)-r'-pr?]</i>	<i>Sj</i>	Heart scarab T8Cb45	SAC5, Tomb 8 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 223–224, pls. 103, 108)	18 th –19 th Dynasty
49	<i>ḥm-ntr</i>	<i>Mr-ms</i>	Heart scarab T2C50	SAC5, Tomb 2 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 216–217, pls. 53, 105, 109)	18 th –19 th Dynasty
50	<i>ḥr.j-w3d.tj</i>	<i>Hwy</i>	Heart scarab pectoral T2C25	SAC5, Tomb 2 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 212–215, pls. 53, 113)	18 th –19 th Dynasty
51	<i>w^cb</i>	<i>Ky-jry</i>	Shabtis T2C41 + T2C47	SAC5, Tomb 2 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 191–120, pls. 53, 97a–b)	Early 19 th Dynasty
52	– / <i>w^cb</i>	<i>Ky-jry</i>	Heart scarab T2C48	SAC5, Tomb 2 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 215, pls. 103, 108)	
53	<i>sh3.w-n-š^c(.t)</i>	<i>Hr-m-ḥ3b</i>	Shabti T2C24	SAC5, Tomb 2 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 190, pls. 53, 97a)	Early 19 th Dynasty
54	<i>sh3.w</i>	<i>Hr-m-ḥ3b</i>	Heart scarab T2C11	SAC5, Tomb 2 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 212, pls. 53, 108)	
55	?...?	<i>Wsr-ḥ3.t</i>	Shabtis T2C20 + T2C34	SAC5, Tomb 2 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 189, pls. 53, 96b)	
56	–	<i>Wsr-ḥ3.t</i>	Amulet T2C23	SAC5, Tomb 2 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 276, pl. 119)	
57	<i>ḥ3.tj-^c-n-ḥw.t-Š3^c.t</i>	<i>Hr.jw=f</i>	Mentioned on stela Louvre C.103 as father of stela-owner <i>B.y- sry.t P3-wr</i>	Unknown (Pierret 1878, 41; Posener 1958, 58, with fn. 172)	19 th Dynasty
58	<i>wr-m-j3.t=f wpw.tj-nsw-r- ḥ3s.t-nb(.t) [jdnw]-n-Kš</i>	<i>Hr-nḥt</i>	Door jamb SNM 466 I	Town/fort (Fouquet 1975, 135–136, doc. 8, fig. 5; Budka 2001, 211, doc. no. 196; Müller 2013, 201, Tabelle 2.5.1, no. 14, 457, Beleg 45.13)	Ramesses II
	<i>jdn.w</i>	<i>H3t[j3y]</i>			
59	<i>[jdn.w-n]-Kš</i>	<i>Hr-nḥt</i>	Door jamb SNM 466 II	Town/fort (Fouquet 1975, 136, doc. 9, fig. 7; Budka 2001, 211, doc. no. 197; Müller 2013, 201, Tabelle 2.5.1, no. 14, 457, Beleg 45.14)	
60	<i>jdn.w-n-Kš</i>	<i>Hr-nḥt</i>	Door lintel, no No.	From Saisab (Geus 2012, 170, fig. 21; Budka 2015e, 63, fig. 19)	
	<i>nb.t-pr</i>	?T3-...?			

Tab. 38 *continued* The prosopography of Sai in the New Kingdom. The lines highlighted in grey indicate that the evidence listed there does not originate from Sai itself

Doc.	Title	Name	Attestation	Provenance and Reference	Date
61	<i>jdñ.w-n-Kš</i>	<i>Hr-nht</i>	Pyramidion SAC5 335	SAC5, Tomb 26, end of shaft (Budka 2015e, 62–63, figs. 17–18; Budka 2015a, 46–50; Budka 2017h, 18–19; Budka 2017c, 75–79).	Ramesses II
62	<i>jdñ.w-n-Kš</i>	<i>Hr-^rnht</i>	Door lintel SAC5 083	SAC5, Tomb 26, end of shaft (Budka 2015a, 48)	
63	<i>jdñ.w-n-Kš</i>	<i>Hr-nht</i>	Door jamb SNM 14412	Abri (Fouquet 1975, 135, doc. 7; Budka 2001, 210, cat. no. 195; Müller 2013, 201, Tabelle 2.5.1, no. 14, 455, Beleg 44.3)	
64	[...]	<i>Hr-nht</i>	Door jamb SNM, Exc.-No. 2-R-A/2	Amara East, Karassin (Fouquet 1975, 133–135, doc. 6, fig. 6)	
65	<i>β.y-hw-[...] hsy-n-hm=f</i> (<i>β.y-hw-[hr-wn]m.j-n-nsw?</i>)	<i>Hr-nht</i>	Door jamb S.772	Town/fort (Fouquet 1975, 136, doc. 10, fig. 8; Budka 2001, 211–212; doc. no. 198; Müller 2013, 168–169, Tabelle 2.2.2 A, no. 6, 457, Beleg 45.12)	
66	<i>sh3.w-nsw jm.j-r²-pr-n-s3-nsw-St3w [hrp-hsb?]-n-Jmn sh3.w-m3^c-m-[Kš?]</i> <i>jm.j-r²-jh.w-n-Jmn-[m-Kš?]</i> <i>sh3.w-hsb-nbw jm.j-r²-h3s.wt-nbw-Kš-n-[s3]-nsw 3-n-pr sh3.w-[...]</i>	<i>Hr-m-h3b</i>	Stela fragment S.103	SAF ‘mur d’enceinte nord’ (Vercoutter 1958, 156–157, pl. XLVI b; Kitchen 1980, 110.6–14; Habachi 1981, 139–144, fig. 46; Müller 2013, 257–259, Tabelle 2.6.2, no. 1, 457, Beleg 45.19)	Ramesses II, late
67	<i>[jm.j-r²-h3s.wt-nbw-[n]-Jmn sh3.w-nsw</i>	<i>St3w</i>	Ex-voto inscription on temple block, no No.	Town/fort (Breasted 1908, 98; Müller 2013, 131–136, Tabelle 2.1 A, no. 21, 456, Beleg 45.9; Oriental Institute Chicago Photo P 3262)	Ramesses II, yrs. 38–60
68	<i>s3-nsw-n-Kš</i>	<i>R^c-mss-nht</i>	Rectangular plaque T3Ca87	SAC5, Tomb 3 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 243, pls. 55, 117)	Ramesses III / IX–XI
69	<i>jm.j-r²-hm.w-ntr-n-ntr.w-nb.w jdn.w-n-Kš</i>	<i>Wsr-M3^c.t-R^c-nht</i>	Doors jambs seen by C. R. Lepsius, no No.	Town/fort (Vercoutter 1956, 76–77; Budka 2001, 212, doc. no. 199; Müller 2013, 205, Tabelle 2.5.1, no. 26, 457, Beleg 45.15)	Ramesses IX
70	<i>jm.j-r²-hm.w-ntr-n-ntr.w-nb.w jdn.w-n-Kš</i>	[<i>Wsr-M3^c.t-R^c-nht</i>]	Door jamb fragment S.11 (may be one of the jambs seen by C. R. Lepsius?)	Town/fort (Vercoutter 1956, 76–77, no. 18; Budka 2001, 212, doc. no. 200; Müller 2013, 205, Tabelle 2.5.1, no. 26, 457, Beleg 45.16)	
71	–	<i>Pth-?...?</i>	Seven faience shabtis T20Ca92	SAC5, Tomb 20 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 197, pls. 77, 98)	Ramesside
72	[<i>s3/sh3.w/whm.w?</i>]- <i>nsw</i>	[...]	Stela T25P6 from shaft	SAC5, Tomb 25 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 163, pls. 82, 85)	Ramesside
73	<i>jdñ.w-n-Kš</i>	[...]	Door jamb fragment	Town/fort (Vercoutter 1956, 76, fn. 65; Müller 2013, 205, Tabelle 2.5.1, no. 26, 457, Beleg 45.17)	Ramesside
74	–	[...]- <i>nht</i>	Painted plaster fragment T9S1	SAC5, Tomb 9 (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 68–69, pl. 20.1)	Ramesside

Tab. 38 *continued* The prosopography of Sai in the New Kingdom. The lines highlighted in grey indicate that the evidence listed there does not originate from Sai itself

6.4.1 Viceroys of Nubia

The so-called Viceroys of Nubia (*s3-nsw-[n-Kš]*, lit. ‘King’s son [of Kush]’) mark the beginning of the assessment of Sai’s social fabric. They are one of the best known and most intensely studied groups of New Kingdom high elite officials thanks to a rich body of epigraphical evidence that stands out in num-

ber, format, quality and distribution.¹²¹³ Since the duties of the viceroys have been outlined a number of times, there is no need to repeat this here.¹²¹⁴ One specific characteristic of the viceroys with regard to Sai can, however, be mentioned in advance. In contrast to all the other individuals attested on Sai, the viceroys are only short-term or temporary members of Sai's social fabric.¹²¹⁵ The geographical radius of all their attestations on the one hand, but also of their responsibilities on the other is evident proof enough. More detailed assessments of their relationship with Sai Island will be provided in the following paragraphs.

6.4.1.1 *Jnbny Jmn-m-nḥw*

Recently, Vincent Rondot was able to put together two stelae fragments from secondary contexts on Sai and one additional piece from Qoeïqa belonging to a viceroy of Nubia whose identity signature and image were intentionally erased (Doc. 1).¹²¹⁶ Based on stylistic dating criteria and remaining hieroglyphic traces, Rondot argues that this stela belongs to the viceroy *Jnbny Jmn-m-nḥw*, who was in office during the joint reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III.¹²¹⁷ If this identification is correct, this stela would mark the first epigraphically attested presence of an earlier 18th Dynasty king's son of Kush on Sai Island. However, this identification can also be challenged based on the full writing of the viceregal title in the form of *s3-nsw-n-Kš* that is attested for the first time with *Jmn-ḥtp*, viceroy under Thutmose IV.¹²¹⁸ The original location of the stela is difficult to determine. A temple on Sai would be an appropriate setting, however, there is no immediate evidence for a temple structure on Sai built during the joint reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. The earliest phase of Temple A is associated with Thutmose only.¹²¹⁹ Having said this, there is, however, another more monumental attestation possibly associated with Hatshepsut on Sai. The piece in question is the sandstone statue of a seated female Khartoum SNM 443,¹²²⁰ whose owner is identified in the inscription as *jr.jt-p^c.t wr(.t)-ḥsw.t ḥm.t-ntr ḥm.t-nsw-[wr.t] ḥnm(.t)-nfr-ḥd(.t)* ([name erased])| *ḥnj.tj d.t*. This statue is either considered as belonging to Hatshepsut¹²²¹ or depicting queen *Mr.yt-Jmn*.¹²²² Be it Hatshepsut or *Mr.yt-Jmn*, such a statue would require a proper emplacement in a pre-Thutmose III temple or cult chapel (*ḥw.t-k3*) context, for which there is a fair amount of circumstantial evidence.¹²²³

The putative presence of *Jnbny Jmn-m-nḥw* at Sai during the joint reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III could also be tied in with another category of evidence. In Feature 15 in SAV1 East, a subterranean room build of red bricks and with a vaulted roof, at least 20 sealing impressions naming Hatshepsut were found in the lower filling.¹²²⁴ Thanks to the stratigraphy of the deposits, these clay seals can be related to a use phase of this subterranean magazine under Hatshepsut until mid-Thutmose III. These finds thus “indicate an Egyptian presence and administrative activities in Nubia immediately after the Kerma revolt under Thutmose II during the era of Hatshepsut.”¹²²⁵ The seal impression of *Nḥy* (Doc. 22) from this context hints at the involvement of the viceroys in the administrative activities taking place here, an action framework that could also be presumed for his predecessor *Jnbny Jmn-m-nḥw* on Sai under Hatshepsut, if the identification on the stela is correct.

¹²¹³ Cf. Müller 2013, esp. 18–31, 97–153, Tabelle 2.1 A–B.

¹²¹⁴ Cf., e.g., Habachi 1981, 169–183; Török 2009, 169–181; Morkot 2013b, 926–936, esp. 934–936; Müller 2013, 18–30; see also Budka 2015b, 70–72.

¹²¹⁵ For the viceroys on Sai, cf. also Budka 2015b, 72–73; Auenmüller 2018b, 239–256.

¹²¹⁶ Rondot 2017.

¹²¹⁷ Cf. Davies 2008; Müller 2013, 105–106, Tabelle 2.1 A, no. 4.

¹²¹⁸ Davies 2017b, 66, Fn. 50; cf. Müller 2013, 112–150.

¹²¹⁹ Cf. Thill 1997; Azim and Carlotti 2012; Adenstedt 2016, 34.

¹²²⁰ Hinkel and Ali Mohammed 2002, 24; Gabolde 2012, 127, figs. 11a–d.

¹²²¹ Valbelle 2006, 48; Minault-Gout 2007, 282.

¹²²² Gabolde 2012, 125–126.

¹²²³ Cf. Minault-Gout 2007; Gabolde 2012; Budka 2015b, 68–69.

¹²²⁴ Budka 2015a, 44–45.

¹²²⁵ Budka 2015a, 45.

Jnbny Jmn-m-nhw is known from eight rock inscriptions a Sehel, Shalfak (2×), Kumma, Tangur (2×), Dal and Tombos as well as a statue from Thebes, a stela probably from Buhen and an *ex-voto* in the Kumma temple.¹²²⁶ Possibly, one could add the Sai stela (Doc. 1) to his epigraphical record, which would indicate his at least temporary presence on Sai during the joint reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. Otherwise, one should add this stela to the dossier of a later viceroy whose identity is yet to be determined. *Jnbny Jmn-m-nhw*’s occupational presence on Sai may have provided him with the appropriate context of action in administrative, religious and political terms for setting up and consecrating his temple stelae there. The geographical distribution of *Jnbny Jmn-m-nhw*’s attestations does not only circumscribe his individual sphere of action, it also agrees well with the viceregal territoriality of both his successors *Nhy* and *Wsr-stj.t*. He would, therefore, be no exception to the non-local Egyptian elite administrators, who came to visit Sai during their different missions on certainly several occasions. One of these occasions became apparent – or medialised – in the form of the temple stela (Doc. 1).

6.4.1.2 *Nhy*

Nhy is one of the best known mid-18th Dynasty viceroys thanks to a large number of surviving and informative monuments.¹²²⁷ *Nhy* flourished under Thutmose III, from year 22 to the end of his reign. He is attested at Sai with at least 14 epigraphical monuments, making Sai one of the places with the highest number of individual sources (Docs. 5–17, 19–22). The most famous one of these is the sandstone pillar bearing the historical inscription which describes the building of the Amun temple (Temple A) on Sai under *Nhy*’s direction in year 25 of king Thutmose III (Doc. 5). This temple, or an adjacent chapel, may also be the place where *Nhy* installed his cuboid statue (Doc. 6).¹²²⁸ He is furthermore evidenced on Sai with a large amount of fragmentary architectural elements, such as door jambs and lintels from different sorts of find contexts that once adorned a number of doorways especially in the administrative city centre with the magazine area (Docs. 7–10, 12–15, 17–18, 20–21). The AcrossBorders mission also contributed to the list of *Nhy*’s attestations on Sai Island with an intriguing seal impression from Feature 15 in SAV1 East (Doc. 22). And finally, there are four fragmented inscribed artefacts from Sai and environs that can be attributed to *Nhy* on stylistic and epigraphical grounds with reasonable certainty (Docs. 11, 16, 19 and 23).

Nhy’s professional responsibilities are reflected in his administrative titles. Next to his viceregal title and some epithets, he is identified as *jm.j-r’-h3s.wt-(rs.jt)* ‘overseer of (southern) foreign countries’ (Docs. 5–8, 14, 18 and 23), *whm.w-nsw* ‘royal herald’ (Docs. 5–6, 12, 17, 18 and 20) and *jm.j-r’-rw.yt* ‘overseer of the *rw.yt*-administrative building’ (Docs. 5, 12–14, 17–19 and 22) on the objects from Sai. While the first title can be understood as designating an administrative responsibility in and for the southern frontier zone of Kush,¹²²⁹ the other two titles are, according to a recent study of Florence Thill, closely related to *Nhy*’s role in the administration and supply of storage places such as the magazines on Sai and at Aniba,¹²³⁰ while underlining the status of both towns as administrative centres of Lower and Upper Nubia under Thutmose III.¹²³¹ The seal impression from Feature 15 (Doc. 22) is further proof of the direct involvement of *Nhy* in administrative activities undertaken on Sai. Interestingly, *Nhy* seems to refer to both these two mentioned offices, *whm.w-nsw* and *jm.j-r’-rw.yt*, in his biographical texts as stages in his earlier career before his promotion to the viceregal office, provided, the reconstruction of the titles in the inscriptions is correct.¹²³²

In assessing the geographical distribution of *Nhy*’s attestations, it becomes apparent that he was, in contrast to those people living and buried at Sai (see below), not really a long-term resident of Sai. He,

¹²²⁶ Davies 2008, esp. 44, with references.

¹²²⁷ Budka 2001, 114–115; Leblanc 2009; Müller 2013, 106–108, Tabelle 2.1 A, no. 6; Thill 2016; Budka 2015b, 71–73.

¹²²⁸ Cf. Budka 2015b, 72–73.

¹²²⁹ Morkot 2013b, 934–944.

¹²³⁰ Thill 2016, 290–294, 298. Müller 2013, 191, puts the *jm.j-r’-rw.yt*-title into her group of messengers from Egypt.

¹²³¹ For the ideological – political and loyalistic – dimension of such inscribed blocks, see Budka 2017h.

¹²³² Müller 2013, 285–286, Anhang 2.1.1, nos. 4–5.

however, should have been present in the fortified town – possibly living and working in the governor’s residence with access to the magazines storing the goods for maintaining the operations of the ‘temple town’ and for shipment to Egypt proper – for quite long periods of time. For such an interpretation, one can take the high number of epigraphical sources from Sai and especially his involvement in the Temple A building project into account. Since genealogical sources are lacking, the social and geographical provenance of *Nhy* is unknown. The presence of his tomb in Thebes might be an argument for his origin from there. He could, however, also have originated from an Egyptian provincial elite family while he was, thanks to his elevation into the function as viceroy,¹²³³ allowed and able to build a tomb in the mid-18th Dynasty residence necropolis *par excellence*: Thebes.¹²³⁴

Nhy’s sphere of influence and presence ranges from Thebes, where his tomb is located, to the end of New Kingdom state control at the Hagar el-Merwa at Kurgus.¹²³⁵ As member of the peripatetic elite responsible for the Egyptian province territories in Upper and Lower Nubia under Thutmose III, he established the seat of administration and power for Lower Nubia (Wawat) at Aniba, while Sai was inaugurated as headquarters for Upper Nubia (Kush).

6.4.1.3 *Wsr-stj.t*

One of *Nhy*’s successors as viceroy of Nubia was *Wsr-stj.t*.¹²³⁶ Like his predecessors, he was recruited from within the Egyptian elite. He acted in this office under Amenhotep II and was later subject to a *damnatio memoriae*.¹²³⁷ He is attested on Sai with at least five (Docs. 32–35, 37), if not several more statue and stela fragments (Docs. 36, 38–39) that were found in a statue cachette in 1939 and have been recently pieced together by William Vivian Davies and his collaborators.¹²³⁸ They were once installed in a temple setting in Sai, most likely the aforementioned Temple A, whose construction continued under Amenhotep II.¹²³⁹ They form one, if not the most important private statuary ensembles in Nubia for the New Kingdom. In view of the type of evidence left by *Nhy* on Sai, one can observe a very stark contrast. While *Nhy* dedicated only one cuboid statue into the temple on Sai (Doc. 6) and is first and foremost associated with a large number of architectural elements such as door jambs and lintels, which adorned doorways in the magazine sector SAF5,¹²⁴⁰ it is his successor *Wsr-stj.t* who appears on Sai with a huge array of three-dimensional statuary representations of his person of varying type and size and most likely coming from a royal workshop.¹²⁴¹ According to Davies, all these statues of the viceroy *Wsr-stj.t* “provide firm evidence, adding to that of other monuments from the site [...], that a significant programme of renewed investment took place under Amenhotep II and certainly during Usersatet’s period of office, the viceroy’s large number of statues indicative of his special status and involvement in the process.”¹²⁴²

Sai is just one of the places in Egypt and Nubia where *Wsr-stj.t* is attested. The distribution of his sources also mirrors his functional duties as viceroy, particularly with regard to his appearances in Nubia. Based on Davies’ works, one can create an up-to-date list of *Wsr-stj.t* documents,¹²⁴³ which includes a statue from Deir el-Medine, a shabti of unknown provenance, a shrine at Gebel el-Silsileh, several rock

¹²³³ The short ‘biographical’ texts from Semna and Sai (Doc. 6) refer in the typical manner to the favours of the king with regard to *Nhy* in promoting him into his different career stages; Müller 2013, 285–286, Anhang 2.1.1, nos. 4–5.

¹²³⁴ Cf. the considerations in Auenmüller 2012 about provincial New Kingdom mayors with a tomb in Western Thebes.

¹²³⁵ Müller 2013, 106–107, with the list of his attestations from Western Thebes (cf. also Leblanc 2009), Elephantine, Sehel, Aniba, Qasr Ibrim, Faras, Buhen, Semna, Kumma and Sai; for *Nhy* at Akascha West and Kurgus, see Davies 2017b, 85, no. 31, fig. 22 upper, 93, fig. 22 lower.

¹²³⁶ Davies 2009, 26–31; Müller 2013, 110–112; Davies 2017a; Davies 2018. On the two officials acting as viceroys of Nubia chronologically between *Nhy* and *Wsr-stj.t*, see Müller 2013, 108–109.

¹²³⁷ Der Manuelian 1987, 158; Davies 2009, 23; Gabolde 2012, 134.

¹²³⁸ Davies 2017a.

¹²³⁹ Azim and Carlotti 2012; Adenstedt 2016, 34.

¹²⁴⁰ Adenstedt 2016, 35–44.

¹²⁴¹ Davies 2017a, 145.

¹²⁴² Davies 2017a, 145.

¹²⁴³ Cf. also Müller 2013, 110.

inscriptions at the First Cataract, particularly at the Gebel Tingar and on Sehel, another rock-cut shrine at Ibrim, a stela from Wadi Halfa (originally from Buhen), a statue from Uronarti, two stelae from Semna, a stela found at Amara West (most probably originally from Sai?), the statues and stelae from Sai as well as a rock inscription together with *Hk3-m-s3=sn* at Tombos.¹²⁴⁴ The geographical range of documents is not as wide as the one of *Nhy*, but conforms to the typical display of members of the peripatetic high elite concerned with administering ancient Nubia. With the statues (Docs. 32–36) and the other stelae fragments (Docs. 37–39), Sai is now second amongst the hotspots of *Wsr-stj.t*’s monumental presence. Most of his attestations are to be found at the First Cataract, where he inscribed himself into the social and ritual landscape particularly in the form of rock inscriptions. Due to the clustering of rock inscriptions at the First Cataract and his theophorous name meaning ‘Satis is powerful’, it is generally assumed that *Wsr-stj.t* originated from the Aswan area. *Wsr-stj.t*’s burial place is still to be found, however, it has recently been suggested that TT 116 at Sheikh Abd el-Qurna could belong to the viceroy *Wsr-stj.t*.¹²⁴⁵ *Wsr-stj.t*, originating from a provincial background, would have risen in rank and function until he was promoted as viceroy, while he decided to have his burial at Thebes.¹²⁴⁶ In his function as viceroy, *Wsr-stj.t* visited Sai a number of times and installed his monumental statuary ensemble there. While he was an external member of the social fabric, taking only temporary residence at Sai, he might have had personal or professional contacts with people such as the priest *Hn-sb3* (Doc. 24), the mayor *Jpy* (Doc. 25) or the overseer of goldworkers *Hnm.w-ms* (Docs. 40–43), who represent the local social milieu of Sai during Amenhotep II in all its occupational dimensions.

6.4.1.4 *St3w*

The viceroy of Kush *St3w* is one of the most prominent Egyptian officials attested in the late reign of Ramesses II. He is known from an extraordinary high number of around 100 sources providing details about his career, his presence, his works and his social networks and attachments.¹²⁴⁷ They circumscribe a geographical sphere from the Ramesside capital city of Pi-Ramesse in the Eastern Delta down to Tombos at the Third Cataract and even beyond to the Hagar el-Merwa at Kurgus.¹²⁴⁸ On Sai, his name is present at least two times. Once in the biographical inscription of *Hr-m-h3b* where this official gives details about his career under successive viceroys, including *St3w* (Doc. 66).¹²⁴⁹ So, this very piece of evidence cannot be taken as proof for *St3w*’s personal presence on Sai. There is, however, rather unambiguous proof of *St3w* on Sai. During his expedition to Nubia, James Henry Breasted visited Sai and came across an *ex-voto* inscription on a possible temple block mentioning an [*jm.j-r’-h3s.*]wt-nbw-[n]-*Jmn sh3.w-nsw* ‘[overseer of the] gold-[countries of] Amun and royal scribe’ *St3w* (Doc. 67). This person can be identified as the viceroy *St3w*, based on parallels to the particular *jm.j-r’-h3s.wt-nbw-n-Jmn* title.¹²⁵⁰ While *St3w*’s presence on Sai is proven with this piece, it is interesting to note that he has not been attested (yet?) at nearby Amara West, the administrative centre of Upper Nubia in the 19th and 20th Dynasties.¹²⁵¹ In addition, there are two yet unpublished blocks on Sai that bear his identity signature¹²⁵² and allow enlarging our understanding of *St3w*’s epigraphical presence in the town.

Since the future publication of these blocks will provide more reliable data, this is not the moment to anticipate any results. It can, however, already be said that the appearance of *St3w* on Sai during the later years of Ramesses II provides another significant argument – next to other Ramesside prosopographical

¹²⁴⁴ Davies 2009, esp. 27–28, with references; Davies 2017a; Davies 2018, esp. 354.

¹²⁴⁵ Hartwig 2010, 159–167.

¹²⁴⁶ Cf. Auenmüller 2012 for more provincial officials with tombs in Western Thebes.

¹²⁴⁷ Helck 1975, 85–112; Kitchen 1980, 80–111; Raedler 2003; Kuckertz 2012; Müller 2013, 131–136, Tabelle 2.1 A, no. 21.

¹²⁴⁸ For *St3w* at Kurgus Davies 2017b, 85, no. 32, fig. 22.

¹²⁴⁹ Cf. also Vercoutter 1958, 157; Raedler 2003, 143, no. 84. Helck 1975, 112, no. 39, understood this as direct evidence for *St3w* himself.

¹²⁵⁰ Cf. Müller 2013, 131.

¹²⁵¹ Auenmüller 2018b, 249–254.

¹²⁵² I am indebted to Julie Masquelier-Loorius for providing me with information on unpublished material of *St3w* from Sai.

evidence (Docs. 58–66) – for the continued important status and role of Sai in the 19th Dynasty in parallel to the actual administrative headquarters of Upper Nubia at Amara West a little further north.¹²⁵³ During the 20th Dynasty, as will be seen below, Sai remains to be a place of elite presence and display, albeit limited (cf. Docs. 68–69). Whether *St3w* stood in contact with the deputy of Kush *Hr-nht* (Docs. 58–65) depends on the chronological position of this latter official. The viceroy should, however, definitely have had professional contact with his *jm.j-r'-pr-n-s3-ns-w-St3w* ‘steward of the viceroy *St3w*’ *Hr-m-h3b* (Doc. 66) on Sai itself or elsewhere.¹²⁵⁴ It is, therefore, now possible to link *St3w* to the social fabric of Sai as an at least temporary visitor.

6.4.1.5 *R^c-mss-nht*

One 20th Dynasty viceroy is epigraphically attested on Sai. In Tomb 3 of SAC5, pottery vessels of 18th Dynasty and Ramesside date were found, indicating several use phases of the burial chamber. Next to the skeleton in the north, a rectangular faience plaque with the identity signature *s3-ns-w-n-Kš R^c-mss-nht* ‘king’s son of Kush *R^c-mss-nht*’ on its reverse and the standing official adoring the cartouche of Ramesses III on the obverse came to light (Doc. 68).¹²⁵⁵ This is one of the very few plaques of this type from a reliable archaeological context.¹²⁵⁶ The burial and skeleton, with which this object was found associated, however, is generally not considered as that of the viceroy, who held office either under Ramesses III–VI or IX–XI. The viceroy *R^c-mss-nht* represented on the rectangular faience plaque from Sai has generally been identified as the eponymous *s3-ns-w-n-Kš* who is attested under Ramesses IX and – with an interruption – the early years of Ramesses XI.¹²⁵⁷

The fact that *R^c-mss-nht* adores the cartouche of Ramesses III on the Sai plaque should provide a reason for re-assessing the date of this specific official. Potentially corroborating the idea of the existence of an earlier *s3-ns-w-n-Kš* with this name, there is epigraphical evidence from the Amara West temple of a viceroy *R^c-mss-nht* associated with the cartouches of Ramesses VI.¹²⁵⁸ However, these two tableaux there may also have been added later under the earlier horizontal lines naming Ramesses VI and could, therefore, belong to the later viceroy *R^c-mss-nht* (Ramesses IX–XI).¹²⁵⁹ In the Amara West tableau on the western door jamb, *R^c-mss-nht* is not identified as viceroy, but as *jm.j-r'-mš^c-n-nb-t3.wj* ‘army general of the Lord of the Two Lands’, a title that should be added to his title portfolio if he would indeed be identical with the later Ramesside king’s son of Kush.¹²⁶⁰ In the tableau on the eastern door jamb his name is followed by a text that seems to be a filiation due to the initial *s3*-hieroglyph (meaning ‘son of...’),¹²⁶¹ which currently, however, escapes a satisfactory reading.¹²⁶² If this is indeed a filiation, the name of his father, viceroy *Wn-t3-w3t* (Ramesses IX) could be expected here.¹²⁶³ The present hieroglyphic text, however, does not fit with such a name.

Based on this discussion, it is thus tempting to identify the Sai *R^c-mss-nht* with his Amara West namesake, also considering the fact that for the time between the end of Ramesses’ III reign and that of Ramesses VI there is only weak evidence for viceroys, represented in the person of *S3-3s.t*, who is securely attested at Amara West only.¹²⁶⁴ However, this is a rather speculative proposal that awaits fur-

¹²⁵³ Cf. Auenmüller 2018b, 247.

¹²⁵⁴ The mayor *Hr:jw=f* (Doc. 57) may also be a local subordinate of *St3w* depending on his exact date.

¹²⁵⁵ Cf. Budka 2017d, 38–39.

¹²⁵⁶ For such objects, cf. Hornung and Staehelin 1976, 37–38, 88–89, 301–302; Keel 1995, 89–91; Spieser 2000, 224–227.

¹²⁵⁷ Cf. Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 243; Müller 2013, 146, Tabelle 2.1 A, no. 31; Spencer 2016, 40–41.

¹²⁵⁸ Müller 2013, 453, Beleg 43.16; Spencer 2016, 39–40, pls. 10–11.

¹²⁵⁹ Spencer 2016, 39–40.

¹²⁶⁰ For his other titles, see Müller 2013, 146.

¹²⁶¹ Gardiner sign-list G 39.

¹²⁶² A very provisional reading would be: *s3 sbj* (or *jni?*) *n šfn.w* ‘son (of?) ...?’.

¹²⁶³ On this person Müller 2013, 144–145, Tabelle 2.1 A, no. 30, with further literature.

¹²⁶⁴ Müller 2013, 143, Tabelle 2.1 A, no. 28, Beleg 43.13; Spencer 2016, 39, pls. 58f, 59f, 62–63.

ther substantiation.¹²⁶⁵ If we come back to the conventional identification of the Sai *R^c-mss-nht* with the viceroy of the same name active under Ramesses IX–XI, we can localise his geographical provenance. The origin of *R^c-mss-nht*’s family is Assiut,¹²⁶⁶ where he also could have been buried. Thus, the person in Tomb 3 who was equipped with the rectangular faience plaque or amulet may in consequence have been a member of the late Ramesside administration of Nubia on Sai who was given this amulet as a token of loyalty during his lifetime and not the viceroy himself. More rather circumstantial evidence in support of the idea that this is a plaque of the later Ramesside viceroy *R^c-mss-nht* is also provided by the presence of the *jdn.w-n-Kš Wsr-Mš^c.t-R^c-nht* (Docs. 69–70) on Sai, who can be dated to the time of Ramesses IX. Due to their jobs, both officials should have had close personal and professional contact on Sai itself or elsewhere, discussing administrative matters concerning Upper Nubia. Summing up, the presence of the faience plaque naming the viceroy *R^c-mss-nht* in Tomb 3 can be interpreted from several directions.¹²⁶⁷ It could, however, possibly also be seen as indication that *R^c-mss-nht* – may he date to Ramesses III or IX – was present on Sai for a certain period during his tenure.

6.4.2 Deputies of Kush

The so-called ‘deputy of Kush’ (*jdn.w-n-Kš*) stood under the direct authority of the viceroy together with his counterpart responsible for Lower Nubia, the *jdn.w-n-W3w3.t*.¹²⁶⁸ In creating this institution of the two distinct *jdn.w*,¹²⁶⁹ the territorial division of Nubia into Lower and Upper Nubia as the two provinces of the Pharaonic state as well as the territorial range of responsibilities of the respective *jdn.w*’s become apparent. Robert Morkot voiced the idea that these officials “appear to have been drawn from the hierarchy within Nubia and not appointed from Egypt.”¹²⁷⁰ Müller gives a list including 30 deputies, in which the attested *jdn.w-n-W3w3.t* outnumber their counterparts in Kush.¹²⁷¹ This ratio is, however, more an artefact of preservation than an actual fact. It is, however, striking, that all the attestations of these functionaries derive from Nubia, supporting the idea of Morkot, and that in those cases where the deputies’ tombs are known, they can be found in the necropoleis belonging to the respective administrative centres. Aniba and temporarily Faras served as seat of the deputies in Wawat, while Soleb and Amara West were their headquarters in Kush.¹²⁷² Based on the evidence from Sai, this town also played an important role for at least two Ramesside *jdn.w*.

6.4.2.1 *Hr-nht*

The first one of these deputies of Kush from Sai is *Hr-nht*, generally dated to the time of Ramesses II.¹²⁷³ During the AcrossBorders campaigns in SAC5, a new structure, Tomb 26, was discovered and excavated.¹²⁷⁴ At the bottom of its vertical tomb shaft an inscribed door lintel piece (Doc. 62) as well as a

¹²⁶⁵ Accepting this idea, one could also speculate that the burial of this viceroy *R^c-mss-nht* is indeed the one on Sai. In other instances, such rectangular faience plaques have been interpreted as providing the name of the buried; e.g. the rectangular steatite plaque Philadelphia E15563 from tomb 210 in Sedment of a *sh3.w-nsw jm.j-r⁷-mš^c Hrj* (Petrie and Brunton 1924, 32, pl. 58, no. 46; Franzmeier 2017, 379–380, 1575–1576, no. 2010/Sch/003). For Nubia, cf. also the rectangular plaque of the viceroy *Msswj* (date Merenptah) from tomb SA 23 in Aniba (Cairo JdE 41832: Steindorff 1937, 101, pl. 54, no. 32; Kitchen 1982, 96,2–4, no. 57.6; Keel 1995, 91, §222; Spieser 2000, 227, no. 135), whose place of burial is, however, still debated: Müller 2013, 138–139; Auenmüller 2013, 448–449.

¹²⁶⁶ Amer 1999; Müller 2013, 143–146.

¹²⁶⁷ Cf. Budka 2017d, 39.

¹²⁶⁸ Morkot 2013b, 936–937; Müller 2013, 44–46, 197–206.

¹²⁶⁹ Sometime during the reign of Amenhotep III: Klotz and Brown 2016, 296–297. In the earlier 18th Dynasty, *jdn.w* are attested, but without the territorial specification; cf. also Müller 2013, 44–46.

¹²⁷⁰ Morkot 2013b, 936.

¹²⁷¹ Müller 2013b, 197–198.

¹²⁷² Müller 2013, 44–45.

¹²⁷³ Kitchen 1980, 117–118; Budka 2001, 210–212; Müller 2013, 201, Tabelle 2.5.1, no. 14; Budka 2015a, 49–50.

¹²⁷⁴ Cf. Budka 2015a, 46–50; Budka 2015e, 58–64; Budka 2017k; Budka 2017l; Budka 2018e.

fragmentary pyramidion (Doc. 61) were found together with other archaeological material.¹²⁷⁵ The inscriptions on both objects identify their owner as *jdn.w-n-Kš* ‘deputy of Kush’ *Hr-nht*. He was already known from three door jamb fragments from secondary contexts on Sai Island (Docs. 58–59; 65). Further lower door jamb parts were found in Abri (Doc. 63) and a little further north in Amara East (Doc. 64). It has recently been argued that all these objects might originally have come from Amara West.¹²⁷⁶ However, until now, no evidence for an *jdn.w Hr-nht* could be discovered at this neighbouring site, where the deputies of Kush had their headquarters in Ramesside times.¹²⁷⁷ Finally, there is – next to the evidence from Tomb 26 – one additional architectural fragment in favour of Sai as the origin of all these inscribed blocks:¹²⁷⁸ the lintel showing *Hr-nht* together with his wife that was recently recovered in the modern local village Sai Sab (Doc. 60).

Considering this data, particularly in view of the provenance of several blocks from the cemetery, it becomes apparent that *Hr-nht* had a monumental Egyptian style tomb with a pyramid in SAC5.¹²⁷⁹ The other blocks, especially the many door jamb fragments, provide evidence for the existence of an official building somewhere within the town of Sai, be it a more formal *jdn.w*’s-residence¹²⁸⁰ or an administrative and/or magazine complex.¹²⁸¹ Both *Hr-nht*’s pyramid tomb and built structure(s) in the town put Sai on the map for a substantial administrative presence during Ramesside times, when a little further north at Amara West a new administrative seat of power was founded by Seti I and substantially redeveloped under Ramesses II. And indeed, one prosopographical connection can be drawn between the two sites. In the floor of magazine E12.4B at Amara West, a door lintel of the viceroy of Nubia *Hk3-nht* was found, on which the viceroy was shown in adoration of the cartouches of Ramesses II and was followed by an *jdn.w-n-nb-t3.wj* ‘deputy of the Lord of the Two Lands’ *Htj3y*.¹²⁸² Since this title is unparalleled in Nubia, Müller suggests understanding *jdn.w-n-Kš* here, *nb-t3.wj* being a wrong reading/writing of ‘Kš’.¹²⁸³ Whatever reading is favoured, this *Htj3y* can, according to Müller, be identified with the *jdn.w H3t[j3y]* that is named as *Hr-nht*’s father on one of the door jambs from Sai (Doc. 58). In accepting this identification, *Hr-nht* should, chronologically speaking, be dated slightly after or concomitant with his father *H3t[j3y]*, who was active in the earlier years (3–10/20) of Ramesses II during the tenure of the viceroy *Hk3-nht*.¹²⁸⁴

Besides his main deputy title, *Hr-nht* is characterised as *wpw.tj-nsw-r-h3s.t-nb(.t)* ‘royal messenger in/to every foreign country’ (Doc. 58). According to Michel Valloggia, officials with such a title are

¹²⁷⁵ Budka 2015a, 47–48. The three pieces of a door jamb found associated with the pyramidion (Doc. 61) and the inscribed door lintel fragment (Doc. 62) and registered as SAC5 122 bear no inscriptions.

¹²⁷⁶ Masquelier-Loorius 2017, 153–154.

¹²⁷⁷ Auenmüller 2018b, 249–254.

¹²⁷⁸ Cf. Budka 2015a, 49.

¹²⁷⁹ Cf. Budka 2015e, 63–64, fig. 20.

¹²⁸⁰ For such a building at neighbouring Amara West, attested from Seti I until later Ramesside times, cf. Spencer 1997, 161–186; Spencer 2017, 325–334.

¹²⁸¹ Budka 2015e, 63; Budka 2015a, 49.

¹²⁸² Spencer 1997, 170–171, pl. 150b; Budka 2001, 202–203, cat. no. 179; for *Hk3-nht*, see e.g. Müller 2013, 125–126, Tabelle 2.1 A, no. 17.

¹²⁸³ Müller 2013, 200; cf. Taylor 2001, §§703–726, and Al-Ayedi 2006, §§631–676, for the repertoire of New Kingdom *jdn.w*-titles. In the 18th Dynasty, under Thutmose III and Amenhotep II, the owner of Theban tomb TT 88, *Ph-sw-hr* called *Snw*, bears the title *jdn.w-n-nsw/hm=f* ‘deputy of the king/His Majesty’ (Eisermann 1995, 66; for the tomb, cf. also Gnirs et al. 1997, 74–83), indicating his representation of and proximity to the king as a military official. *Hr-m-h3b*, the future king, is also aptly characterised as *jdn.w-n-nsw/hm=f-(m-s.t-nb.t/m-t3-r-dr=f)* ‘deputy of the king/His Majesty (in every place/ in the entire land)’ in his tomb in Saqqara (Martin 1989, 163). These titles circumscribe his leading role in the government of Tutankhamun. Based on this evidence, the *jdn.w-n-nb-t3.wj*-title of *Htj3y* should be taken seriously. The epigraphical copy is clear and all the hieroglyphic elements of the *nb-t3.wj* writing are present. In addition, such a title is also attested on Ostrakon BM EA8494 for an *jdn.w-n-nb-t3.wj-m-S.t-M3.t Jmn-nht* (Demarée 2002, 21, pls. 46–47) and in graffito no. 1072 in the hills of Western Thebes identifying an *jdn.w-n-nb-t3.wj 3ny* (Kitchen 1980, 612,3). Both stood in relation with the administration of Deir el-Medine in Ramesside times, obviously acting as representatives of the king in a certain form.

¹²⁸⁴ Fouquet 1975, 135–136; Müller 2013, 125–126; cf. Müller 2013, 201 and 295, Tabelle 2.5.1, nos. 15 and 27, for two more *jdn.w*’s *H3tj3(y)*, which are, based on the find spots of their sources in the Wadi Allaqi and Quban, regarded as deputies of Wawat.

amongst the highest members of Pharaonic state administration in the New Kingdom, regularly recruited from a military background and active in many civil and military missions in Egypt and abroad.¹²⁸⁵ For Nubia in particular, these messengers were responsible for organising and carrying out the communication between the residence and the southern provinces. Thus, *Hr-nḥt* may have even been to Pi-Ramesse in the Eastern Delta on one of his official trips to Egypt. His epithet, *wr-m-j3.t=f* ‘great one in his office’ is an in-depth expression of his social status and of his professional importance. When also the door jamb Doc. 65 is added to *Hr-nḥt*’s dossier,¹²⁸⁶ another high-ranking title can be discussed for *Hr-nḥt*. On this piece, *Hr-nḥt*’s title sequence can be either read *t3.y-ḥw-[...] ḥsy-n-ḥm=f* ‘fan bearer [...] (and?) favoured one of His Majesty’,¹²⁸⁷ or – and this is based on a substantial number of sources – *t3.y-ḥw-[hr-wn]m.j-n-nsu* ‘fan bearer to the right of the king’.¹²⁸⁸ If this is indeed the correct reading, then the elevated rank and position of *Hr-nḥt* at the royal court in Egypt proper become even more substantiated.¹²⁸⁹

While all these titles indicate *Hr-nḥt*’s close relationship with the royal court and the administration at the residence in Egypt, the limited geographical distribution of his sources in the Amara-Abri-Sai region is noteworthy. While *Hr-nḥt*’s titles have been used to characterise his extraordinary career that might also have included training stays in Egypt, his father *jd.n.w Ḥ3t[j3y]* was maybe attested at Amara West and – above all – the provenance of *Hr-nḥt*’s monuments were interpreted as indicators of his local origin, possibly from Sai.¹²⁹⁰ His tomb on Sai is beyond all other considerations a quite substantial piece of evidence supporting the idea that Sai was his home town. Such a nexus of tomb location to the place of origin is particularly valid in the provincial milieus of New Kingdom Egypt and Nubia.¹²⁹¹ While his royal messenger-title circumscribes *Hr-nḥt*’s wide geographical range of activities in relation to Egypt, and his fan bearer-title is evidence for his high standing at the royal court, it is his function as *jd.n.w-n-Kš* that rather restricts his sphere of action in Nubia. As such, he is nevertheless the highest-ranking official buried on Sai.¹²⁹² Close contemporaries and, therefore, people that he should have been in contact with in the town on various occasions are, for example, the *w^cb*-Priest *Ky-jry* (Docs. 51–52), *sh3.w-(n-š^c.t) Hr-m-ḥ3b* (Doc. 53–54), *ḥ3.tj-^c Hr.jw=f* (Doc. 57) as well as the major-domo of the viceroy *St3w Hr-m-ḥ3b* (Doc. 66) and maybe also the viceroy *St3w* himself (Doc. 67).

6.4.2.2 *Wsr-M3^c.t-R^c-nḥt*

Hr-nḥt is not the only Ramesside deputy of Kush known from Sai. In 1843, Carl Richard Lepsius came across a door jamb belonging to an *jm.j-r²-ḥm.w-ntr-n-ntr.w-nb.w* ‘overseer of priests of all gods’ and *jd.n.w-n-Kš* ‘deputy of Kush’ called *Wsr-M3^c.t-R^c-nḥt* (Doc. 69). This might be the same jamb found by Jean Vercoutter in 1954 in an even more fragmented state and published subsequently (Doc. 70). Another architectural fragment found on Sai gives the deputy-title only and could thus also belong to *Hr-nḥt* (Doc. 73). Another attestation from Amara West helps in dating this official to late Ramesside times, particularly the reign of Ramesses IX and the tenure of the viceroy *Wn-t3-w3.t*.¹²⁹³ *Wsr-M3^c.t-R^c-*

¹²⁸⁵ Valloggia 1976, 239–271. For ‘royal messengers’ attested in Nubia, cf. also Müller 2013, 193–194, Tabelle 2.4.2, nos. 15–22.

¹²⁸⁶ Fouquet 1975, esp. 136–137; Kitchen 1980, 117–118; not added to his dossier by Müller 2013, 201, but put in the group of military officials without indication of their special unit, cf. Müller 2013, 168–169, Tabelle 2.2.2 A, no. 6.

¹²⁸⁷ Fouquet 1975, 136–137, favours to read *tp.j* and splits the sequence into “le flabellifère, le Premier de Sa Majesté”. Such a singular *tp.j-n-ḥm=f*-title is, however, not attested; cf. Taylor 2001, 233–234; Al-Ayedi 2006, 626–627. Maybe *ktm-tp.j-n-ḥm=f* ‘first charioteer of His Majesty’ was meant? For this title in Nubia cf. Müller 2013, 191–192, Tabelle 2.4.2, nos. 2–7.

¹²⁸⁸ Pomorska 1987. Such a reading is also suggested by Kitchen 1980, 118,2 with fn. a. Budka 2001, 211, offers another possible reading: *t3.y-ḥw-[hr-wnm.j-n-nsu] ḥsy-n-ḥm=f* ‘fan bearer [to the right of the king] and favoured one of His Majesty’. An autopsy of the piece should be carried out to determine the actual title.

¹²⁸⁹ See esp. Pomorska 1987, 39–40; on the royal court in Ramesside times: Raedler 2006; Raedler 2009a.

¹²⁹⁰ Budka 2015e, 63; Budka 2015a, 49–50.

¹²⁹¹ Auenmüller 2014; Auenmüller 2018b; Auenmüller in press.

¹²⁹² If not a viceroy *R^c-mss-nḥt* was buried in Tomb 3 (Doc. 68). Cf. the discussion above.

¹²⁹³ Müller 2013, 205, Tabelle 2.5.1, no. 26.

nht appears in the temple of the neighbouring site of Amara West with an *ex-voto*-tableau giving his title and name twice in close association with his superior viceroy.¹²⁹⁴ In both cases, the *jdn.w-n-Kš*-title is followed by his designation as ‘overseer of all priests of all gods’; this sequence is reversed on his Sai block(s) (Docs. 60–70). The latter title is rarely attested in Nubia,¹²⁹⁵ its meaning implies a superior position in relation to all the other religious officials.¹²⁹⁶

In 2018 another monument of the *jdn.w-n-Kš Wsr-M3^c.t-R^c-nht* could be re-discovered.¹²⁹⁷ During recent work at Amara West, one lintel found by Herbert Walter Fairman during the 1948–1949 campaign and deposited next to his local dig house was identified. Back then it had not been properly documented; only some photos had been taken, four of which were published in 1997.¹²⁹⁸ In the literature, this piece is generally associated with *B-sr*, deputy of Kush residing at Amara West under Ramesses III.¹²⁹⁹ Now the owner can be properly identified as *jdn.w-n-Kš Wsr-M3^c.t-R^c-nht*.¹³⁰⁰ As with *Hr-nht* and *Htj3y*, a liaison between Sai and Amara West can be discerned, represented in the person of the *jdn.w-n-Kš Wsr-M3^c.t-R^c-nht*. Thanks to his epigraphic presence in the Amara West temple, we know about his floruit under Ramesses IX. His door jamb(s) on Sai are thus also the latest known monumental prosopographical appearances of an official of the administration of Nubia on the island. Chronologically, it is rather isolated and can only be linked to the (plaque of the) viceroy *R^c-mss-nht* from Tomb 3 (Doc. 68).

6.4.3 Mayors

H3.tj-^c-mayors or city governors are officials that typically belong to New Kingdom towns and cities in Egypt and Nubia.¹³⁰¹ In New Kingdom Nubia mayors are known for Aniba, Faras, Buhen, Sai, Soleb and Kawa.¹³⁰² Interestingly, most of these sites appear in the records as *mnn.w*,¹³⁰³ in which the mayors acted as highest civil administrators,¹³⁰⁴ with more or less the same general duties as their counterparts in Egypt.¹³⁰⁵ In contrast to the settlements with mayors in the Egyptian Nile valley,¹³⁰⁶ the Pharaonic foundations in both Lower and Upper Nubia were, however, fortress- and ‘temple towns’ in a quite different physiographic setting and with a specific array of locally specific functions.¹³⁰⁷ As for Sai, its function has generally been characterised as an early 18th Dynasty military ‘bridgehead’, from where campaigns versus Kerma could be launched or supplied,¹³⁰⁸ but also as base for securing the region as well as the entries to the Western Desert routes to Selima and to Upper Egypt.¹³⁰⁹ The location of Sai within a gold-bearing geological region adds another facet to the role of this central place in Upper Nubia.¹³¹⁰

The identification of officials as mayors of towns based on the *h3.tj-^c*-title only is sometimes quite difficult particularly for the Egyptian city governors and depends on the individual data set and its context.¹³¹¹ For the mayors in New Kingdom Nubia, however, the locational and archaeological context of

¹²⁹⁴ Müller 2013, 453, Beleg 43.14 B; Spencer 2016, 16, pls. 59f, 64–65.

¹²⁹⁵ Müller 2013, Tabelle 2.5.3, H1–5.

¹²⁹⁶ For the religious landscape of New Kingdom Nubia, Török 2009, 209–262.

¹²⁹⁷ I am indebted to Neal Spencer for allowing me to present some information on this piece here.

¹²⁹⁸ Spencer 1997, pl. 167a–d.

¹²⁹⁹ Spencer 1997, 194, 220.

¹³⁰⁰ So the entry Table 6.19 in Auenmüller 2018b should be changed accordingly. This piece will be published in the context of a study of the Amara West epigraphy (re-)discovered in the course of the Amara West research project. On Amara West most recently Spencer 2017.

¹³⁰¹ Cf. Müller-Wollermann 1991; Morris 2005, *passim*; Auenmüller 2013, 681–698.

¹³⁰² Auenmüller 2013, 696–698.

¹³⁰³ Somaglino 2017, esp. 234–239.

¹³⁰⁴ Morris 2005, 811, 824.

¹³⁰⁵ Auenmüller 2013, 652–775; Müller 2013, 46–49; Morkot 2013b, 937.

¹³⁰⁶ Müller-Wollermann 1991; cf. Auenmüller 2013, 683–686.

¹³⁰⁷ Cf. Vieth 2018.

¹³⁰⁸ Budka 2017h, 15.

¹³⁰⁹ Morris 2005, 107–108.

¹³¹⁰ Klemm et al. 2001; Klemm and Klemm 2013, 568–579.

¹³¹¹ Cf. Auenmüller 2013, 700–703.

their attestations allows to identify the holders of a *ḥ3.tj-ḥ*-title as actual governors of a particular town even if the specifying addition ‘of town XY’ is missing.¹³¹² In general, four mayors of Sai can be identified for the New Kingdom.¹³¹³ Two of them, *Jḥ-ms* (Docs. 2–4) and *Ḥr:jw=f* (Doc. 57), are not attested on Sai Island itself, but with epigraphical monuments from other places. They also date to the earlier 18th and the 19th Dynasty respectively. In contrast, the two other mayors *Jpy* (Doc. 25) and *Nby* (Docs. 27–28) are evidenced by inscribed funerary equipment from the local elite cemetery SAC5 and represent the heyday of Sai as administrative centre in Upper Nubia in the mid-18th Dynasty. However, the relationship of *Nby* and Sai is currently – based on the discovery of new texts (cf. Doc. 28) – not entirely clear (see below). In the social and administrative hierarchy of the functionaries of the Pharaonic state in New Kingdom Nubia, the mayors seem to have occupied a position directly under or equal to the *ḥm-ntr-tp.j* ‘high priests’ of the local temple.¹³¹⁴ Their senior supervisors in higher-level and local administrative matters were, however, the *jd.n.w-n-Kš* and, in ultimate responsibility, the viceroy himself. Still, the mayors were the highest civic representatives of Pharaonic state agency on the local, i.e., urban level.

6.4.3.1 *Jḥ-ms*

Jḥ-ms is the first *ḥ3.tj-ḥ*-mayor known for Sai in the New Kingdom.¹³¹⁵ He is, however, not attested at Sai itself, but on one statuette from Karnak, now kept in Cairo (Doc. 2), and another statue, now in Bologna (Doc. 3).¹³¹⁶ On both pieces, he is explicitly identified as *ḥ3.tj-ḥ-n-Š3ḥ.t* ‘mayor of Sai’. While the provenance of the first statuette is archaeologically proven, the original location of the second one cannot be determined with certainty. The gods mentioned in the offering formulae inscribed on the Bologna statue – ‘Amun-Ra, Lord of Karnak’ as well as Khnum and Satet – point either again to Karnak or to the First Cataract area, especially Elephantine, as its set-up location. A third statue of *Jḥ-ms* is known from Buhen, now kept in Khartoum (Doc. 4). On this piece he is only entitled *sh3.w* ‘scribe’, a title that he also bears on the Bologna statue. The identity of the mayor of Sai *Jḥ-ms* and the scribe *Jḥ-ms* from Buhen is confirmed by the filiation given on both the Buhen and the Bologna statues, designating his father as a certain *s3b Jḥ-ms* and his mother as (*nb.t-pr* [Bologna only]) *Ttj*. Thus, the Buhen statue seems to represent an earlier stage in *Jḥ-ms*’s career, sometime before he became mayor of Sai.

Jḥ-ms is generally dated to the time of Thutmose III, particularly in view of the intensive building activities attested on Sai during the reign of this king.¹³¹⁷ The fact that one, maybe two statues were installed at Karnak (Docs. 2–3) gives rise to the idea that he is one of the Egyptian officials sent to Nubia under Thutmose III, who after finishing their administrative duties in the ‘temple towns’ in the Nubian provinces returned to their home town in Egypt, at least for their burial.¹³¹⁸ Based on this assessment, *Jḥ-ms* can be identified as of Theban origin. He should have had close professional contact to the viceroy *Nḥy* (Docs. 5–23), on Sai in particular. Since no traces of his burial have come to light on Sai until now, it is quite safe to assume that his tomb should be located somewhere in the Theban necropolis, the elite cemetery of his home town. His affiliation to the social fabric of Sai was, therefore, limited to his actual period of duty there, which cannot be rendered more precisely based on the available evidence. His temple statues from Karnak (Doc. 2), Thebes or Elephantine (Doc. 3) and Buhen (Doc. 4) and his posting on Sai not only display his quite large territorial radius of action and presence, but also his per-

¹³¹² Auenmüller 2013, 700–703.

¹³¹³ For New Kingdom mayors in Nubia, see Morkot 2013b, 925, 937; Müller 2013, 46–49, 206–212, Tabelle 2.5.2; Auenmüller 2013, 696–689, 926–932, 936–938; for Sai in particular also Auenmüller 2013, 931–932; Budka 2015b, 74–75; Auenmüller 2018b, 255.

¹³¹⁴ Müller 2013, 47–48, 206–212, esp. 211, Tabelle 2.5.2; cf. Auenmüller 2013, 704–711, 718–720.

¹³¹⁵ Posener 1958, 58; Devauchelle and Doyen 2009, 34–35, nos. 4 & 5.

¹³¹⁶ Posener 1958, 58, fn. 167, refers to an unpublished ostrakon MMA 23001.56 from Deir el-Bahri as another attestation of the *ḥ3.tj-ḥ-n-Š3ḥ.t Jḥ-ms*. This piece could however not be re-identified as yet.

¹³¹⁷ Müller 2013, 209; Budka 2015b, 74.

¹³¹⁸ Müller 2013, 209.

sonal belonging to a number of social and/or ritual spaces, quite far away from his proper place of work for at least a certain amount of time: Sai.

6.4.3.2 *Jpy and Nby*

Tomb 5 in the elite necropolis SAC5 is of special importance for the upper end of the local social fabric of Sai. A first mayor *Jpy* is attested with a heart scarab (Doc. 25), while another *ḥ3.tj-ꜥ* called *Nby* is both evidenced by a shabti (Doc. 27) and a set of copper-alloy vessels recently studied and published (Doc. 28). On a faience vase, also a *šmꜥ.yt Ḥn.wt-ꜥ3.t* is named (Doc. 26). Given the well-attested Egyptian idea of the family tomb and considering all the names and titles inscribed on the funerary goods, it is likely that Tomb 5 was the final resting place of a family of local *ḥ3.tj-ꜥ* mayors. Based on an assessment of the accompanying pottery and typological studies of the funerary goods, this family, as represented by its prosopographically attested members, flourished on Sai roughly in the time between Thutmose III and Amenhotep III. Accordingly, the two mayors *Jpy* and *Nby* can be tentatively dated to Thutmose III–IV and Thutmose IV–Amenhotep III. Thus, it seems feasible to identify them as father and son, since it is widely provable that the mayoral office was regularly transmitted from father to son in the New Kingdom.¹³¹⁹ The exact familial relation of the songstress *Ḥn.wt-ꜥ3.t* to both *Jpy* and *Nby* is not determinable, she might have been either the wife or mother of one of the mayors. Her role as female temple singer of an unnamed deity put her in a rather high local female elite sphere, appropriate for a wife or mother of a *ḥ3.tj-ꜥ*.¹³²⁰ The fact that the evidence of the mayors *Jpy* and *Nby* derives from a local elite funerary context,¹³²¹ is significant for understanding their relationship with Sai and its New Kingdom community.

A recent assessment of the distribution of mayoral tombs in New Kingdom Egypt and Nubia has confirmed that such *ḥ3.tjw-ꜥ*-mayors are regularly buried in the elite necropoleis of the towns they administered.¹³²² This typological trait can also be seen with *Jpy* and *Nby* and their interment in Tomb 5 in cemetery SAC5. In contrast to *Jꜥh-ms* (Docs. 2–4), *Jpy* and *Nby* seem to represent the second generation of local city governors posted on Sai who continued to live there, identified themselves with the town and, therefore, chose to be buried in the appropriate local funerary realm together with members of their family.

While the local mayoral attachments are portrayed in the funerary sphere, there is another type of evidence that refers to a different spatial setting for mayoral activities beyond Sai. A *ḥ3.tj-ꜥ ḥrp Nby* is attested further north at the Tangur rapids in the Batn el-Haggar with three rock inscriptions (Docs. 29–31). This *Nby* seems to be identical with the *Nby* from Sai.¹³²³ The three rock inscriptions give a clear *ḥ3.tj-ꜥ* title followed by a vertical sign that can be either read as *šhm* or *ḥrp*.¹³²⁴ In their original publication of these texts, Fritz Hintze and Walter-Friedrich Reineke opted for the reading *ḥrp* and read it as a second title of *Nby* meaning ‘chief, director’.¹³²⁵ Thanks to the recent conservation treatment of the copper alloy vessels from Tomb 5 (Doc. 28) that revealed new hieroglyphic inscriptions on five of the seven restored vessels,¹³²⁶ the reading of this title can be challenged. Although the texts on the copper alloy vessels are also rather fragmentary, they allow to discern an addition to the *ḥ3.tj-ꜥ*-title introduced with a genitive ‘n’¹³²⁷ and concluded by the ‘town’ classifier.¹³²⁸ Here, one should expect a toponym with the name of the town where *Nby* acted as mayor. This name, however, is not securely readable at all. The shabti of

¹³¹⁹ Auenmüller 2013, 731–736.

¹³²⁰ Cf. Onstine 2005, 35–36.

¹³²¹ The status of SAC5 as elite cemetery is not only indicated by the prosopographical record, but also by high quality funerary goods; cf. Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, *passim*.

¹³²² Auenmüller 2013, 742–751; cf. also Auenmüller 2012.

¹³²³ Cf. also Cressent and Raimon 2016, 33–34.

¹³²⁴ Gardiner sign-list S 42.

¹³²⁵ Hintze and Reineke 1989, 170, 174; for *ḥrp*-titles in the New Kingdom, see Taylor 2001, §§1785–1823; El-Ayedi 2006, §§1517–1559.

¹³²⁶ Cressent and Raimon 2016.

¹³²⁷ Gardiner sign-list N 35.

¹³²⁸ Gardiner sign-list O 49.

Nby (Doc. 27) also presents a challenging addition to the *ḥ3.tj-ḥ*-title two times. Anne Minault-Gout and Florence Thill read the whole title signature as *ḥ3.tj-ḥ hrp-n-ḥ3s.t* and *ḥ3.tj-ḥ shm-n-ḥ3s.t*,¹³²⁹ identifying the general toponym *ḥ3s.t* ‘foreign country’ as the region over which *Nby* presided as mayor. Davies proposed yet another reading of this title as *ḥ3.tj-ḥ-n-Shm* ‘mayor of Sekhem’, while understanding *Shm* as locality in Nubia which can possibly be identified with Semna.¹³³⁰ In accepting this understanding also for the reading of *Nby*’s title on his shabti (Doc. 27) and the copper alloy vessels (Doc. 28), then also the *hrp* or *shm*-sign in the Tangur rock inscriptions (Docs. 29–31) has to be interpreted differently. Mélanie Cressent and Aymeric Raimon thus propose to understand this sign as a reduced writing of the *ḥ3.tj-ḥ*-title with the mention of the possible toponym.¹³³¹

While this explanation is satisfactory in regard to the reading of *Nby*’s title(s),¹³³² it poses another problem. Now it has to be explained, why *Nby*, who was identified as mayor of Sai based on the existence of his tomb in SAC5 and his simple *ḥ3.tj-ḥ*-title, is called ‘mayor of Sekhem’ on the elite funerary equipment in his tomb. As for now, only conjectural and anecdotic interpretations can be given that are not wholly satisfactory: *Nby* was a mayor of Sekhem (Semna?) and was at one point sent to Sai to act as a local mayor there. With such a reading, the status and dating of the *ḥ3.tj-ḥ Jpy*, who is considered as predecessor and possible father of *Nby*, becomes problematic. On the other hand, one can maybe speculate with more reason that *Nby* was an official from Sai who was installed as mayor of Sekhem – wherever this place is to be located – who, thanks to his origin from Sai and his attachments to this social community, also decided to be buried there. For the moment, pending further discoveries or studies, this case cannot be discussed any further. There is, however, no doubt that the Tangur rock inscriptions (Docs. 29–31) belong to the *Nby* from Sai (Docs. 27–28). Since he is buried on Sai, these three texts constitute further important markers of his territoriality, i.e., his geographical radius of action. This obviously went well beyond the confines of the town or region of Sai (and might even link Sai with Sekhem [Semna?]). Tangur is well known for its cluster of rock inscriptions recording the presence of officials supervising the safe passage of the ships through the dangerous rapids and shoals.¹³³³ *Nby* can be envisaged as one of the high-ranking members of the Nubian administration who participated in these undertakings there.

6.4.3.3 *Hr:jw=f*

The *ḥ3.tj-ḥ-n-ḥwt-Š3ḥ.t Hr:jw=f* has already been mentioned by Georges Posener in discussing the location of Kush and *Š3ḥ.t* in particular.¹³³⁴ This mayor is attested on a stela now in the Louvre (Doc. 57) which has only been inadequately published. While Posener placed *Hr:jw=f* rather vaguely “[q]uelques temps après Ahmès”¹³³⁵ (i.e. the *ḥ3.tj-ḥ Jḥ-ms* [Docs. 2–4]), one can add more prosopographical data to pinpoint his general date. The stela in the Louvre (Doc. 57) belongs to his son, a *ḫ.y-sr:yt P3-wr*, who is also attested on another stela now in Berlin.¹³³⁶ Pierre-Marie Chevereau dates both to the 19th Dynasty,¹³³⁷ so a Ramesside date for the *ḥ3.tj-ḥ-n-ḥwt-Š3ḥ.t Hr:jw=f* seems likely. Taking the title of *Hr:jw=f* and his chronology at face value and identifying *ḥwt-n-Š3ḥ.t* as designation of the ‘estate of Sai’

¹³²⁹ Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 181, translate both as “le gouverneur chef de la région” interpreting *hrp* not as independent title but as adjective attribute to *ḥ3.tj-ḥ*.

¹³³⁰ Cressent and Raimon 2016, 33, with fn. 9; Davies 2018, 350, with fn. 12. Cf. also Davies 2009, 27, with fn. 14 and Dunham and Janssen 1960, 47, no. 28-1-69, fig. 3 with a stela from Semna mentioning two actual *ḥ3.tjw-ḥ-n-Shm*.

¹³³¹ Cressent and Raimon 2016, 33–34.

¹³³² Cressent and Raimon 2016, 33, also propose the reading as *ḥ3.tj-ḥ-n-w* ‘mayor/governor of the district/region’.

¹³³³ Hintze and Reineke 1989, 170–177.

¹³³⁴ Posener 1958, 58, with fn. 172; cf. also Devauchelle and Doyen 2009, 35, no. 6; Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 182, with fns. 54–55.

¹³³⁵ Posener 1958, 58.

¹³³⁶ Roeder 1924, 224–225, ÄM 7310.

¹³³⁷ Chevereau 1994, 103, no. 15.15; Devauchelle and Doyen 2009, 35, have tentatively written “*fin de la XVIIIe dyn. ?*”.

means in consequence that he was mayor of Sai sometime in the 19th Dynasty and that *Š3^c.t* was in this time referred to as *ḥw.t*-installation.¹³³⁸

Provided this understanding is correct, it is most likely that *Hr:jw=f* acted as mayor on Sai during a time when also other Ramesside activity is evidenced. He may, therefore, be a close contemporary of the *jd.n.w-n-Kš Hr-nḥt* (Docs. 58–65) and may also have conversed and worked with *Hr-m-ḥ3b* (Doc. 66) and the viceroy *St3w* (Doc. 67). Interestingly, the son of *Hr:jw=f* is identified with a military title (*B.y-sr.yt* ‘standard bearer’) which is only very rarely attested in New Kingdom Nubia and whose bearers all date to the earlier 19th Dynasty (Seti I – Ramesses II).¹³³⁹ The genealogical relationship (fatherhood) of a municipal mayor of a New Kingdom Pharaonic foundation in Nubia with a standard bearer is anyhow exceptional. If *Hr:jw=f* was indeed a local mayor of and from Sai, his tomb should also be located there. Since the archaeological provenance of the two stelae of his son *B3-wr* is unknown, one cannot engage in any further considerations.

6.4.4 Goldworker

One goldworker is attested on Sai for the New Kingdom, more specifically the mid-18th Dynasty (Amenhotep II – Thutmose IV): *Hnm.w-ms*. His burial, accompanied by a shabti and at least two faience vessels giving his name and titles (Docs. 40–41; 43),¹³⁴⁰ was found in Tomb 26 in the elite cemetery SAC5 together with the interment of his presumed wife, a *nb.t-pr Hnn=f*, who is herself identified on a heart scarab (Doc. 44).¹³⁴¹ *Hnm.w-ms* is characterised by two occupational titles that position him at two different levels of the hierarchy of goldsmiths: *nb.y* ‘goldworker’ (Docs. 40–41) and *jm.j-r^c-nb.yw* ‘overseer of goldworkers’ (Doc. 43).¹³⁴² Thanks to textual and iconographic sources as well as actual gold artefacts from a wide variety of archaeological contexts, we are well informed about this craft and its methods and technologies, particularly with regard to the New Kingdom.¹³⁴³ The economic role of gold, of Nubian Desert and Nile valley gold in particular, and its mining and production during the New Kingdom in both Egypt and Nubia is also well understood thanks to a number of dedicated studies.¹³⁴⁴

Based on the available prosopographical record for New Kingdom Nubia, *Hnm.w-ms* is the only ‘overseer of goldworkers’ (Doc. 43) known so far in this region.¹³⁴⁵ He, however, shares his *nb.y* ‘goldworker’-occupation (Docs. 40–41) with a number of other people attested in Nubia (cf. Tabs. 39, 40). In the region of Upper Nubia (cf. Tab. 39), only one other *nb.y* is known. The goldworker *B3k* is evidenced by a fragmentary door lintel found in tomb T 38 at Soleb (Doc. 76), dating to the reign of Amenhotep III,

Doc.	Title	Name	Attestation	Provenance and Reference	Date
75	<i>hr.j-nb.yw</i>	<i>Kf(3)-jb</i>	Rock inscription in scene No. 5	Gebel Doshe (Müller 2013, 186, 2.3.2, No. 38; 458, Beleg 46.3; Davies 2017c, 61, pl. 5.)	late Thutmose III
76	<i>nb.y</i>	<i>B3k</i>	Door lintel fragment T 38 pl	Soleb, Tomb T38 (Schiff Giorgini 1971, 319–320, fig. 629)	Amenhotep III

Tab. 39 New Kingdom goldworkers attested in Upper Nubia

¹³³⁸ Pace Posener 1958, 58; Devauchelle and Doyen 2009, 37. For *ḥw.t* in relation to a temple domain, e.g., Spencer 1984, 21–27.

¹³³⁹ Müller 2013, 168–169, Tabelle 2.2.2 A. For a stela of Seti I on Sai, Vercoutter 1972.

¹³⁴⁰ For more shabtis from the same workshop as the one of *Hnm.w-ms*, cf. Minault-Gout 2012; Budka 2017c, 77–78; Budka 2017k, 121–123.

¹³⁴¹ Budka 2017l, esp. 56–59; Budka 2017c, 75–78; Budka 2017k, esp. 119–123; Budka 2018e.

¹³⁴² Cf. Steinmann 1980; Steinmann 1982.

¹³⁴³ Wilkinson 1971, 1–10, 91–163; Drenkhahn 1976, 18–42, 164–165; Bultink 2015, 29–39.

¹³⁴⁴ Vercoutter 1959; Castiglioni, Castiglioni and Vercoutter 1998, 11–44; Klemm and Klemm 2013, 21–27; cf. Müller 2013, 75–79.

¹³⁴⁵ For Egypt proper, a prosopographical compilation of goldworkers including *jm.jw-r^c-nb.yw*, *hr:jw-nb.yw* and *nb.yw* is in preparation by the present author.

Doc.	Title	Name	Attestation	Provenance and Reference	Date
77	<i>nb.y</i>	<i>Hꜥy</i>	Shabti S 91,57	Aniba, tomb S 91 (Steindorff 1937, 79, 200, pl. 42,3; Müller 2013, 183, Tabelle 2.3.2, no. 33, 417, Beleg 30.33)	18 th Dynasty, 2 nd half
78	<i>nb.y</i>	<i>Š3ꜥm</i>	Heart scarab S 7,2	Aniba, tomb S 7 (Steindorff 1937, 87, no. 11, 157, pl. 48,11; Müller 2013, 185, Tabelle 2.3.2, no. 35, 417, Beleg 30.36)	18 th Dynasty
79	<i>nb.y</i>	<i>Nb-sn</i>	Votive stela	Aniba, temple (Steindorff 1937, 24–25, no. 44a, pl. 11,42; Müller 2013, 185, Tabelle 2.3.2, no. 34, 417, Beleg 30.35)	18 th Dynasty
80	<i>ḥr.j-nb.yw</i>	<i>Rꜥ-k3</i>	Heart scarab SA 31,4 (Kairo 41825)	Aniba, tomb SA 31 (Steindorff 1937, 88, Nr. 13, 232–233, pl. 47,13; Kitchen 1980, 128,15; Müller 2013, 182, Tabelle 2.3.2, no. 9, 417, Beleg 30.31)	Ramesses II
81	<i>ḥr.j-nb.yw</i>	<i>B3k-n-wrl</i>	Mentioned on naos of his father BM EA476	Aniba (from internal evidence) (Kitchen 1980, 127,12; Bierbrier 1982, 25, pls. 58–60; Müller 2013, 182, Tabelle 2.3.2, no. 10, 416, Beleg 30.26)	Ramesses II
82	<i>nb.y / ḥr.j-nb.yw</i>	<i>Hnm.w-ms</i>	Mentioned twice on votive stela BM EA1188	Buhen, South or North temple (Kitchen 1980, 132,14 & 133,9; Bierbrier 1982, 23–24, pls. 54–55; Müller 2013, 185, Tabelle 2.3.2, no. 32, Beleg 38.80)	Ramesses II

Tab. 40 New Kingdom goldworkers attested in Lower Nubia

the floruit of the Soleb complex. The burials of both *Hnm.w-ms* and *B3k* in the elite cemeteries belonging to their respective places of work reflect their close professional and personal relationship to these Pharaonic foundations in Upper Nubia.

An earlier close contemporary to *Hnm.w-ms* perpetuated himself at Gebel Doshe with a rock inscription (Doc. 75) that attests to his professional participation in creating and activating the rock-cut chapel of Thutmose III there.¹³⁴⁶ This *Kf(3)-jb* bears, in contrast to *Hnm.w-ms* from Sai, the title *ḥr.j-nb.yw* ‘chief of goldworkers’, which indicates his higher position in the hierarchy of this group of craftsmen, headed by the *jm.j-rꜥ-nb.yw* ‘overseer of goldworkers’.¹³⁴⁷ As has already been discussed above, *Hnm.w-ms* from Sai is not only characterised as a *nb.y* (Docs. 40–41), but also as such a higher-ranking ‘overseer of goldworkers’ (Doc. 43).¹³⁴⁸ Thus, he certainly belonged to the upper echelon of this craft in Upper Nubia, which seems to have had a heyday and central base on Sai Island at least under Amenhotep II and Thutmose IV, given the presence of an ‘overseer of goldworkers’ in the prosopographical – and funerary – record of the Pharaonic town. For Upper Nubia, three locations with a short-term or permanent presence of goldworkers, which also represent the entire hierarchy of this particular craft, can thus be identified in the New Kingdom, especially the mid-18th Dynasty from Thutmose III to Amenhotep III: Gebel Doshe, Sai and Soleb. In later Ramesside times, no goldworker is attested in Upper Nubia by epigraphical evidence.

In Lower Nubia, the prosopographical record for goldworkers looks somewhat different (Tab. 40). Interestingly, it is especially Aniba, the central seat of Egyptian power in Wawat during the New King-

¹³⁴⁶ Davies 2017c, 64.

¹³⁴⁷ In the literature, the titles *jm.j-rꜥ-nb.yw* ‘overseer of (goldworkers)’ and *ḥr.j-nb.yw* ‘chief of (goldworkers)’ are – based on a certain set of evidence – often seen as interchangeable, cf. e.g. Caminos 1954, 405; Grajetzki 2001–2002, 125, and Ockinga 2004, 20. Following Eichler 2000, 145–149, the present contribution, however, takes these different titles at face value, assuming a three-tiered hierarchy within the group of goldworking craftsmen; cf. also Steinmann 1980.

¹³⁴⁸ For the hierarchy, cf. Steinmann 1982, 66–72; Eichler 2000, 141–161, esp. 145–149.

dom, from where the greater part of prosopographical data derives. Five people belonging to the local workforce of goldsmiths are attested at Aniba either with inscribed funerary equipment from their tombs (Docs. 77–78; 80–81)¹³⁴⁹ or a temple votive (Doc. 79). While *Hꜥy* (Doc. 77), *Šꜥm* (Doc. 78) and *Nb-sn* (Doc. 79) all roughly date to the 18th Dynasty and are only known from single monuments such as shabtis or a temple votive stela with the *nb.y*-title,¹³⁵⁰ it is their two Ramesside counterparts *R'-k3* and *B3k-n-wrl* for which not only the higher *hr.j-nb.yw* title is attested, but also titles that connect them to both the local temple and its entire workforce of craftsmen.¹³⁵¹ While only his heart scarab identifies *R'-k3* as *hr.j-nb.yw* (Doc. 80), he is called *jm.j-r'-ḥmw.t* ‘overseer of craftsmen’¹³⁵² (also with the additions *n-nb-t3.wj* ‘of the Lord of the Two Lands’ and *n-pr-Ḥr-nb-Mjꜥm* ‘of the temple of Horus, Lord of Aniba’)¹³⁵³ or *wꜥb-ꜥk-m-ḥw.t-sr* ‘wꜥb-priest who enters into the *ḥw.t-sr*’ in all his other epigraphical attestations.¹³⁵⁴ *R'-k3*’s son *B3k-n-wrl* obviously followed in the professional footsteps of his father, as he is identified both as *hr.j-nb.yw* on the family funerary naos (Doc. 81) and *jm.j-r'-ḥmw.t* on his Aniba shabtis and a graffito at Ellessiya.¹³⁵⁵ In the latter inscription he additionally characterises himself as *wꜥb jm.j-r'-ḥm.w-ntr* ‘wꜥb-priest and overseer of priests’, a religious office he most likely held at the Horus-temple at Aniba. For both *R'-k3* and *B3k-n-wrl*, two steps in their professional career as goldworkers and senior craftsmen can thus be identified, starting with *hr.j-nb.yw* and culminating in the *jm.j-r'-ḥmw.t*-office, in which they acted as the functionaries being responsible for the entire artisan workforce of Aniba and the local Horus temple under Ramesses II.¹³⁵⁶

From Buhen a last ‘goldworker’ and ‘chief of goldworkers’ in New Kingdom Lower Nubia is known: *Hnm.w-ms* is mentioned twice on the votive stela of his son, the *jm.j-r'-ḥm.w-ntr* ‘overseer of priests’ and *jm.j-r'-ḥmw.t* ‘overseer of craftsmen’ *Mr-ndm* (Doc. 82) that was once installed in one of the two temples of the fortress. Next to getting to know some members of this presumably Buhen based family, we first learn that *Hnm.w-ms* rose in rank among the goldworkers and that his son *Mr-ndm* took over two locally important and intertwining posts as ‘overseer of craftsmen’ and ‘priests’. This particular combination is also attested with *B3k-n-wrl* at Aniba, whose father *R'-k3* was, tellingly, also a *hr.j-nb.yw*. For both locations, Aniba and Buhen, a certain structural pattern emerges for the individual’s social and functional embeddedness in particular professional groups. While more genealogical data for *Hnm.w-ms* from Sai (Docs. 40–43) and all other 18th Dynasty *nb.yw* (Docs. 75–76; 77–79) is lacking, one can – based on the later Ramesside evidence – at least speculate that they were also members of larger professional groups and families and individually represent their craft prosopographically at their places of work. The fact that *Hnm.w-ms* from Sai (Docs. 40–43) dating to the mid-18th Dynasty is uniquely identified as an ‘overseer of goldworkers’ may lead to different conclusion. Either he was the most important representative of his craft in Nubia, or Sai, at least during Amenhotep II and Thutmose IV, was the most

¹³⁴⁹ On Aniba cemetery S/SA in the New Kingdom, see Näser 2017.

¹³⁵⁰ *Nb-sn* (Doc. 78) may be identical with the *Nb-s(n)y* known from the Gebel Agg rock inscription tableau when accepting the proposal of Van Siclen 1997, 411, notes c and d, to read *Nb-s(n)y*’s title as *nb.y* and to add a medial *n* to his name, that is written *Nb-sy*; cf. also Van Siclen 1997, 414, with further, also iconographical, considerations about the presumed identity. Müller 2013, 185, Tabelle 2.3.2, no. 34, 188, Tabelle 2.4.1, no. 11, 424, Beleg 31.6, follows Van Siclen’s suggestions.

¹³⁵¹ For such a connection, cf. Eichler 2000, 141–149.

¹³⁵² On a) 16 shabtis from tomb SA 31 (Philadelphia E.11169 D–G, I–K): Steindorff 1937, 83, 232–233; Kitchen 1980, 128,8–9; Müller 2013, 416, Beleg 30.27; b) on the amulet SA 31,7 from the same tomb (Philadelphia E.11166): Steindorff 1937, 125, 232; Kitchen 1980, 128,11; Müller 2013, 417, Beleg 30.28; c) on the naos London BM EA476: Kitchen 1980, 126,11–128,6; Bierbrier 1982, 25, pls. 58–60; Müller 2013, 416, Beleg 30.26; d) appearance in shrine of Viceroy of Nubia *Šꜥw* (date: Ramesses II) at Qasr Ibrim: Caminos 1968, 46, pl. 14; Kitchen 1980, 104,8; Müller 2013, 413, Beleg 29.4; e) mention in graffito of his son *wꜥb Ḥwy* in speos of Thutmose III at Ellessiya: Desroches-Noblecourt et al. 1968, pl. 40, figs. 48–49; Kitchen 1980, 129,8–9; Müller 2013, 412, Beleg 28.9.

¹³⁵³ For such additions and their meaning Steinmann 1982, 152–153.

¹³⁵⁴ All these titles are attested on the naos London BM EA476: Kitchen 1980, 126,11–128,6; Bierbrier 1982, 25, pls. 58–60; Müller 2013, 416, Beleg 30.26. On the *jm.j-r'-ḥmw.t*-title and its implications Steinmann 1980, 142–144.

¹³⁵⁵ Four shabtis SA 31,2 from tomb SA 31 (Philadelphia E.11169 A–C, H): Steindorff 1937, 83, 232–233; Kitchen 1980, 129,1–2; Müller 2013, 417, Beleg 30.3; graffito on north side of façade of speos of Thutmose III: Curto 1970, fig. 27bis; Kitchen 1980, 129,5–6; Müller 2013, 411, Beleg 28.3.

¹³⁵⁶ On *R'-k3* and his social position, see also Morkot 2013b, 941.

important gold working place in Upper Nubia. In the end, both conclusions taken together allow to characterise Sai’s role in this context in the most reasonable way (see below).

One significant phenomenon has already been touched upon in the preceding paragraphs: as at Sai with *Hnm.w-ms* and Soleb with *B3k*, all goldworkers or craftsmen attested for Aniba (except *Nb-sn*) are buried in the elite necropolis of their place of work, regardless of their 18th or 19th Dynasty date. This once more underlines their close-knit social and functional relationship to these places, where they led their private and professional lives and where in the end also their funerary rites and burials took place. Considering this as a typological trait for people belonging to such a social and functional milieu, *Hnm.w-ms* and his son *Mr-ndm* should also have had chosen Buhen for their final resting place.

When we finally compare both form and dimension of the tombs of the attested goldworkers at Sai,¹³⁵⁷ Soleb¹³⁵⁸ and Aniba,¹³⁵⁹ a more or less typical format emerges. While the superstructure is not preserved in all five cases, the vertical shaft and the burial apartments conform to the well-known New Kingdom type, with noticeable differences in the number of subterranean chambers. These differences, however, bear witness to the continuous use of especially the tombs Aniba S 91 and SA 31 for new burials during their use-life only and do not represent the initial conception of the tombs for their original owners. It thus seems that *Hnm.w-ms* on Sai, *B3k* at Soleb and *Š3m* at Aniba can be considered as original tomb owners, while their Ramesside successors re-used and enlarged already existing funerary structures. Nevertheless, none of these tombs falls out of the format considered appropriate for such a kind of craftspeople at Sai, Soleb and Aniba.

As indicated by the archaeological and epigraphical evidence, ‘goldworkers’ as representatives of local specialist craftsmen concentrate at the well-known administrative hot spots in New Kingdom Nubia: Aniba, Buhen, Sai and Soleb. All these were centres of Pharaonic power and state agency in Lower and Upper Nubia. Gold was one of the most important metallic resources much sought after by the Pharaonic state so that successful gold mining was one of the tasks of the administration of Nubia in the New Kingdom.¹³⁶⁰ It is, therefore, of particular interest that the towns of Buhen, Sai and Soleb are located in close proximity or within a gold-bearing geological zone between Wadi Halfa and Tondi along the Nile which also extended further into the Nubian Desert¹³⁶¹ and which produced the so-called ‘Gold of Kush’.¹³⁶² The importance of gold on Sai is also reflected in a number of titles in the prosopographical record, particularly of the 19th Dynasty. Next to *Hnm.w-ms*, there is *Hr-m-h3b* (Doc. 66) as *sh3.w-hsb-nbw jm.j-r’-h3s.wt-nbw-Kš-n-[s3]-nsw* ‘gold-counting scribe and overseer of the foreign gold-countries of Amun of/for the king’s [son]’, and his superior, the viceroy *St3w*, who is designated as *[jm.j-r’-h3s.] wt-nbw-[n]-Jmn* ‘[overseer of the] gold-[countri]es [of] Amun’ (Doc. 67).

While the spatial relationship of Buhen, Sai and Soleb to gold mines in this area provides another significant reason for the presence of goldworkers at these three sites, this nexus is less clear for Aniba. The ‘Gold of Wawat’ is known to derive mainly from the Wadi Allaqi region, but also from other larger or smaller areas in the Nubian Desert.¹³⁶³ Some of these, especially the mines and desert tracks between the Nile river and the Umm Nabari Massif, were part of the spatial activity range of officials from Aniba, as is evidenced by rock inscriptions in the Nubian Desert.¹³⁶⁴ Among those people from Aniba venturing into the desert are also two New Kingdom mayors of the 18th and 19th Dynasties.¹³⁶⁵ They left their identity signatures at the Umm Nabari Massif along the Korosko road, presumably as members

¹³⁵⁷ Budka 2017k; Budka 2017l.

¹³⁵⁸ Schiff Giorgini 1971, 311–321, figs. 614–615.

¹³⁵⁹ Steindorff 1937, 157, sheet 12 (S 7), 198–200, sheet 33 (S 91) and 232–233 (SA 31).

¹³⁶⁰ Müller 2013, 75–79.

¹³⁶¹ Klemm et al. 2001, 649–654, fig. 10; Klemm and Klemm 2013, 556–579, 606–611, fig. 7.4; Klemm and Klemm 2017.

¹³⁶² Vercoutter 1959; Müller 2013, 75; Budka 2015d, 59; For the locational relationship, cf. Vieth 2018.

¹³⁶³ Vercoutter 1958; Klemm et al. 2001, Klemm and Klemm 2013, 294–339, 341–555; Müller 2013, 75–76; Klemm and Klemm 2017.

¹³⁶⁴ Castiglioni, Castiglioni and Vercoutter 1998, 26, 105–122, and map on 112; Castiglioni and Castiglioni 2003, 48–49, pls. 3 and 7, 50, pl. 9; Davies 2014b, 32–34, 36–39, with full references.

¹³⁶⁵ Auenmüller 2013, 927, BMAAniba_02 (*Ms*), 928, BMAAniba_05 (*Hr-nht*).

of expeditions prospecting for gold coming from Aniba. They attest to the integration of Aniba into the gold-mining and goldworking industries of Lower Nubia, in which context craftsmen like *R³-k3* and *B3k-n-wrl* would manufacture elite goods. As such, both *R³-k3* and *B3k-n-wrl* bear witness to the further cultural and economic importance of Aniba as major central place in Lower Nubia under Ramesses II, which finds significant parallels on Sai.

6.4.5 Priests

Some personnel of the religious sphere of Sai is attested in Tomb 2 of SAC5. Five shabtis, three heart scarabs, one heart scarab pectoral and one *tjt*-amulet bearing personal names and titles were found. Regarding onomastics and prosopography, five male members of the New Kingdom Sai society appear. Two of them – the *hm-ntr* ‘priest’ *Mr-ms* (Doc. 49) and the *w^cb*-priest *Ky-jry* (Doc. 51–52) – can be understood as cult officiants of different ranks and functions.¹³⁶⁶ An indication of the specific local cult they were attached to is lacking. For the *hm-ntr*-?...? *Hn-sb3* (Doc. 24) from Tomb 8, such a reference seems to have had existed, however, the part that would give the name of the god or the sanctuary at which *Hn-sb3* acted as *hm-ntr* is partly destroyed and therefore difficult to read.¹³⁶⁷ In a recent assessment of the title, Thill proposed a number of possible readings that include either Ra and/or Horus and related this title to a particular cult of Ra-(Horakhti) on Sai, possibly located at the enigmatic ‘pyramid’ at SAC5.¹³⁶⁸ The case of the *hm-ntr*-[(*m*)-*r*’-*pr*?] *Sj* (Doc. 48) also attested in Tomb 8 may provide us with more information as to which temple or sanctuary he was related. The addition to his *hm-ntr*-title is, however, also rather difficult to read. With Minault-Gout and Thill, it can be interpreted as (*m*)-*r*’-*pr* ‘(in) a temple/chapel’,¹³⁶⁹ while the option should not be ruled out that the entire phrase might be a personal name such as *Sj-m*-?(*w*)*sh*(.t)? If the interpretation of Minault-Gout and Thill is accepted, the *r*’-*pr* should designate a temple or chapel on Sai, for which Temple A is the most likely candidate.

A last possible (?) religious official, a *hr:j-w3d.tj Hwy*, is known from Tomb 2 from his heart scarab pectoral (Doc. 50). His title, however, also poses some difficulties. Considering the general context, either a religious or an administrative title could be expected. It has, therefore, been first interpreted as “superior des deux Ouadjyt”,¹³⁷⁰ i.e., ‘chief of the two *w3d.yt*’s’. The term *w3d.yt* designates a hall with papyriform columns in Egyptian temples,¹³⁷¹ so such an architectural structure should have had existed twice in Temple A on Sai in the New Kingdom if we take this title literally.¹³⁷² Another option would be to read a more mundane title here, understanding *w3d.tj* as ‘vegetable gardener’,¹³⁷³ so that *hr:j-w3d.tj* could be determined as a ‘chief of vegetable gardeners’. Although no such officials are attested, at least vegetable and fruit cultivation in Nubia is documented in the textual record.¹³⁷⁴ In this case, *Hwy* would belong to a completely different professional sphere than the religious. Be that as it may, it is apparent that those people which can be connected to the religious milieu of Sai with certainty were all buried in SAC5, particularly in Tombs 2 and 8, which can be interpreted as family tombs of local priests. The spatial relationship of the burials of religious officials to their place of work is particularly close-knit. When

¹³⁶⁶ Cf. Gee 2004, for the difference between *hm-ntr* ‘priest/prophet’, lit. ‘god’s servant’ and *w^cb* ‘priest’, lit. ‘pure one’. On priests in general, see also Kees 1953; Sauneron 1960. Particularly on *Ky-jry*, see Minault-Gout 1979, 37–39.

¹³⁶⁷ Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 184, who also raise the hypothesis, that *Hn-sb3*’s mother was mentioned here together with her son, allowing for the dedication of this shabti for actually two people, since the *hm*(.w)-*ntr*-title seems to be written in a rather particular way with plural strokes.

¹³⁶⁸ Thill 2017, esp. 207–208

¹³⁶⁹ Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 223–224; for *r*’-*pr* ‘temple/chapel’, see Spencer 1984, 37–42.

¹³⁷⁰ Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 213–214.

¹³⁷¹ Spencer 1984, 68–71.

¹³⁷² For more arguments in favour of the reading *hr:j-w3d.tj* and some other religious titles containing this element, such as *wr-w3d.tj*, see Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, 214, fn. 171. *W3d.tj* also designates a greater area in the Western Desert including the oases of Bahariya, Kharga and/or Dakhla (Osing 1998, 1444–1447) or is the dual of *w3d.t*, meaning ‘the two uraei, i.e. the two crowns’.

¹³⁷³ Gardiner 1947, 97* [227].

¹³⁷⁴ Müller 2013, 81–82.

even New Kingdom high-priests are regularly buried in the elite necropoleis of their place of office,¹³⁷⁵ it is safe to assume that this nexus is even more valid for the lower ranking members of the particular local religious institutions.

6.4.6 Scribes

The record of people at Sai identified as *sh3.w* ‘scribes’ is rather small. The first is the earlier 18th Dynasty mayor *Jh-ms*, who bears this designation on the Buhen statue (Doc. 4) singly and on the statue now in Bologna (Doc. 3) in addition to his mayoral title. The next representative of scribes from Sai is *Hr-m-h3b*, dating to the earlier 19th Dynasty. Besides the simple *sh3.w*-title attested on his heart scarab (Doc. 54), he is more specifically characterised as *sh3.w-n-s(.t)* ‘letter-scribe’ on his inscribed shabti (Doc. 53). A third scribe, who also bears the ranking-title *sh3.w-nsw* like the viceroy *St3w* (Doc. 67),¹³⁷⁶ is further identified with two occupational scribal titles: *sh3.w-m3-m-[Kš?]* ‘true scribe in [Kush?] and *sh3.w-hsb-nbw* ‘scribe of gold-reckoning’ (Doc. 66). These are part of his biographical inscription, in which he outlines several professional stages in his career under a number of viceroys of Nubia.¹³⁷⁷ While the *sh3.w*-title of the mayor *Jh-ms* can be either seen as description of his actual professional duties or as marker that he belonged to the social group of literate officials,¹³⁷⁸ it is the two *Hr-m-h3b*’s that indeed acted as true professional scribes.

Amongst the current record of scribes responsible for Nubia,¹³⁷⁹ *Hr-m-h3b* (Doc. 53) is one of a few officials identified as letter-scribes.¹³⁸⁰ Interestingly, all of his counterparts are designated as letter-scribe of a specific king’s son. For *Hr-m-h3b*, such a close professional relationship to the viceroy(s) of his time can also be presumed.¹³⁸¹ Based on the fact that he is buried on Sai, it is safe to assume that he was part of the local administrative sphere, acting from and at Sai as his home base. Among those people laid to rest in SAC5, *Hr-m-h3b* is, in addition, the only scribe identified by a title and name. Several non-epigraphical scribal palettes were found amongst the funerary equipment in the SAC5 tombs which bear witness to some more scribes on Sai,¹³⁸² if one interprets these palettes as indications of the actual profession of those people who were provided with such objects in their tombs.

The second *Hr-m-h3b* (Doc. 66) is neither attested in the local funerary record nor with any other epigraphical document.¹³⁸³ His biographical stela from Sai, however, provides evidence for his quite close personal relationship to Sai and to several viceroys under Ramesses II, under whom he acted in different functions. The record of titles shows his responsibilities as ‘overseer of the gold-lands of Kush of the king’s [son]’ (*jm.j-r’-h3s.wt-nbw-Kš-n-[s3]-nsw*) and for the scribal gold-reckoning (*sh3.w-hsb-nbw*) as well as possibly the herds of Amun in Upper Nubia (*jm.j-r’-jhw-n-Jmn-m-[Kš?]*), amongst others. And it seems to be *St3w*, under whom *Hr-m-h3b* reached his administrative floruit as *jm.j-r’-pr-n-s3-nsw-St3w* ‘steward of the viceroy *St3w*’.¹³⁸⁴ Based on his titles, *Hr-m-h3b* was one of the top officials in Upper Nubia during the late reign of Ramesses II, responsible for both gold and cattle. In this context, *Hr-m-h3b*’s and *St3w*’s presence on Sai could be connected (cf. Doc. 67) and linked to a joint visit and stay on Sai in the framework of an inspection of the town and/or the gold mines in the vicinity. In addition, *Hr-m-h3b*

¹³⁷⁵ Auenmüller 2016.

¹³⁷⁶ For *sh3.w-nsw* as ranking title, Onasch 1998.

¹³⁷⁷ Cf. Habachi 1981, 139–144; Müller 2013, 257–259.

¹³⁷⁸ Allon and Navratilova 2017.

¹³⁷⁹ Cf. Müller 2013, 270–279.

¹³⁸⁰ Müller 2013, 153–154, Tabelle 2.1 C. There are several other scribes with the name of *Hr-m-h3b* attested with rock inscriptions, e.g. at Abu Simbel (Müller 2013, 429, Beleg 32.38) or at Dorintawwo (Müller 2013, 446, Beleg 39.23), which can, however, not be identified with certainty with the *Hr-m-h3b* from Sai. Cf. also Müller 2013, 276, Tabelle 2.7.6, nos. 54–56. On the Sai *Hr-m-h3b* also Minault-Gout 1979, 34–37, where he is described as “un fonctionnaire des Affaires Étrangères en poste à Sai. Un parmi cette poignée d’Égyptiens qui restait en Nubie dans le but de ‘showing the flag’ [...]”.

¹³⁸¹ For the viceroys dating to the earlier 19th Dynasty, see Müller 2013, 97–100, with tab. 2.1.

¹³⁸² Minault-Gout and Thill 2012, pl. 114, T1Ca21 and 22, T14Ca58.

¹³⁸³ Based on the available sources, one can currently only speculate whether the two *Hr-m-h3b*’s are identical or not.

¹³⁸⁴ His title *3-n-pr* ‘major-domo’ also seems to describe his work in the service of the viceroy.

is a close contemporary to the deputy *Hr-nht*, thus one could speculate that these two officials stood in close professional contact to each other as well.

6.4.7 Women

At this point, all male members of the Sai community have been discussed.¹³⁸⁵ Out of 28 individually identifiable people, only five can be identified as female, based on their names and titles. This 17.8%-ratio is not unexpected, it rather underlines the pervading male bias of the monumental discourse in Pharaonic Egypt, which is reflected even in small inscribed elite objects of the funerary equipment repertoire.¹³⁸⁶ Two of the females are, in addition, only known from objects belonging to their respective son (Doc. 24) or husband (Doc. 60). In view of the titles, the two typical and almost exclusive designations for elite women in the New Kingdom are present.¹³⁸⁷ While *Nn3* (Doc. 24), the mother of *Hn-sb3*, bears no title, *Hn.wt-3.t* (Doc. 26), the presumed wife of either the mayors *Jpy* or *Nby*, is characterised as *šmꜥ.yt* ‘songstress’. *Hnn=f(?)* (Doc. 44), the potential wife of *nb.y Hnm.w-ms, 3s.t* (Doc. 47) and *T3-?...?* (Doc. 60), wife of the deputy *Hr-nht* are all designated as *nb.t-pr* ‘mistress of the house’. This title is generally used to refer to the status and role of women in more monumental contexts, such as tombs, stelae, offering tables and shabtis.¹³⁸⁸ It has thus been interpreted as “a honorific title for (married) women in monumental and funerary contexts.”¹³⁸⁹ Its basic meaning is commonly understood as indicating the married status, a specific senior role in an independent household and the social position of its female bearers.¹³⁹⁰

Since the sources for women from Sai with this title derive from funerary or monumental contexts and since *nb.t-pr* characterises the (potential) wives of sub-elite (*Hnm.w-ms*, Docs. 40–43) and elite officials (*Hr-nht*, Docs. 58–65), it most probably signals a certain social status and/or economic role. The *šmꜥ.yt*-title of *Hn.wt-3.t* (Doc. 26) can be understood as indicator of her actual duties and her place in the local religious hierarchy as a female temple vocalist serving at the cult place of the local deity,¹³⁹¹ which for Sai would certainly be Temple A. Thus, all females attested on Sai Island can be tied into the local sphere of (elite) household supervision as well as ritual and musical support of the temple cult(s). Of course, many more women lived on Sai during the heydays of the Pharaonic town in the New Kingdom, of which only five appear individually with their names, titles and sometimes also family relationships. At least two of them were – as shown by their funerary goods from SAC5 (Docs. 26, 44) – buried on Sai. For the other three (*Nn3* [Doc. 24], *3s.t* [Doc. 47] and *T3-?...?* [Doc. 60]), this is more than likely, given their presence and integration into the local community.

6.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The New Kingdom town of Sai was populated and visited by a number of people from different social, regional and professional contexts. Very few of them are attested in the prosopographical record from the site and can be identified on a more individual level. Based on the administrative titles that characterise those people, the entire social and professional scale of members of the administration of New

¹³⁸⁵ Except for Docs. 71 and 74, concerning which no further considerations are possible due to the lack of titles and the fragmented state of the names.

¹³⁸⁶ In fact, this ratio of 17.8% is quite high. Without the evidence from cemetery SAC5, the number of females in the context ‘town’ would, however, be zero, provided that the lintel of *Hr-nht* (Doc. 60) comes from his tomb in SAC5. Otherwise, only one female would appear in the epigraphical record of the town itself.

¹³⁸⁷ Cf. Toivari-Viitala 2001, esp. 15–18; Onstine 2005.

¹³⁸⁸ Toivari-Viitala 2001, 17–18.

¹³⁸⁹ Toivari-Viitala 2001, 18.

¹³⁹⁰ Toivari-Viitala 2001, 18.

¹³⁹¹ Cf. Onstine 2005, 19, 24, 75–77; see Onstine 2005, 68–69, for the positioning of the *šmꜥ.yt* in the New Kingdom temple hierarchy.

Kingdom Nubia is present, from the highest-ranking representatives, the viceroys, to the local agents of the state such as the mayors, priests and scribes and specialised craftsmen, such as goldworkers. Next to this male dominated group of people, a small number of females come to the fore, whose attestations are concentrated on Sai only and allow describing their particularly close-knit relationship to the local milieu. Each high-ranking elite individual who is attested on Sai during a certain time, e.g. the joint reign of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III or the era of Ramesses II, can be understood as evidence for the role of Sai as an either earlier 18th Dynasty seat of power in Upper Nubia or for its continuous importance during the Ramesside period.¹³⁹² The role of Sai as central place in New Kingdom Upper Nubia is also mirrored in the archaeology and use-life of the elite necropolis SAC5. Inaugurated under Thutmose III, it is used until late Ramesside times and beyond.¹³⁹³ Its main phases are in accordance with the heydays of the Pharaonic town.¹³⁹⁴

However, not all people attested on Sai are also buried there. In general, two different sets of people can, therefore, be identified. On the one hand, there are the high functionaries of the state, such as particularly the viceroys, whose relationship to Sai was predominantly a professional one, manifest in their temporary presence on Sai Island. They were active here in the framework of their various administrative duties. They left, however, the most monumental epigraphical-prosopographical traces on the island, such as statues, stelae and door frames as representatives of the state personified by the king and thanks to their access to all forms of economic, social, cultural and religious capital.¹³⁹⁵

The other set of people are the genuine local members of Sai’s social fabric, whose attestations are part of the funerary record of SAC5. Although the prosopographical data is – certainly also due to reasons of preservation – clearly incomplete, it displays the artisanal, religious and administrative personnel of the town. *Hnm.w-ms*’s job as overseer of goldworkers (and also goldworker itself) fits well with the emerging relationship of the New Kingdom temple towns in Upper Nubia with gold exploitation in the region.¹³⁹⁶ Urban governance is represented by the two mid-18th Dynasty mayors *Jpy* and *Nby*, while the local religious personnel appears for example in the persons of *Mr-ms*, *Ky-jry* and *Hn-sb3*. The scribal milieu is prosopographically displayed by *Hr-m-h3b*. Amongst those people who chose to have their final resting place be made on Sai, the deputy of Kush *Hr-nht* stands out in functional and sociological terms. He was buried on Sai in SAC5 in a typical private New Kingdom pyramid tomb, attesting to his attachment to the New Kingdom town and the local social fabric. Since the known burials of the *jd.n.w*’s of both Upper and Lower Nubia are typically to be found in the elite necropoleis of the respective seats of power in Kush and Wawat during the New Kingdom, his burial on Sai is by all means exceptional, given the fact that Amara West can be considered as the headquarters of the deputies of Kush in Ramesside Nubia. It is, therefore, quite plausible that *Hr-nht*’s tomb and burial on Sai provide firm evidence for the status of Sai as his home town. His epigraphical traces as well as the presence of one of his late Ramesside successors in the town are, in addition, telling for the continuous social and political importance of the town in the region also in the 19th and 20th Dynasties.

Finally, there is a third group between those supra-regionally active administrators and the local people. One representative is, e.g., the mayor *Jh-ms*. As is apparent in his mayoral title and his chronological position, he is the first local agent of the Pharaonic state on Sai in the 18th Dynasty. While his office links him tightly to the urban sphere of Sai, his temple statues from Karnak, Thebes (or Elephantine?) and Buhen indicate other individual attachments to these places beyond Sai. *Jh-ms* can, therefore, be identified as one of the Egyptian officials that came to Sai in the context of the final establishment of Egyptian political dominance and territorial appropriation of Upper Nubia under Thutmose III. He seems to, after finishing his administrative duties, have returned to Egypt, at least for his burial that could be expected in his presumed home town Thebes.¹³⁹⁷ Other people of this third group are, e.g., the

¹³⁹² Cf. Budka 2015a, 51.

¹³⁹³ Thill 2007; Minault-Gout and Thill 2012; for the dating of SAC5, see e.g. Budka 2017c; Budka 2017k; Budka 2018e.

¹³⁹⁴ Cf. Budka 2015a; Budka 2015d; Budka 2017g; Budka 2018b.

¹³⁹⁵ Cf. Budka 2017d.

¹³⁹⁶ See most recently Vieth 2018.

¹³⁹⁷ Müller 2013, 9.

mayor *Hr.jw=f* and the steward of the viceroy *St3w* called *Hr-m-ḥ3b*. There is, on the one hand, no direct epigraphical evidence for *Hr.jw=f* from the town itself, but the title itself is reflecting local competence. On the other hand, there is epigraphical evidence for *Hr-m-ḥ3b* from Sai only (noteworthy, an [auto-]biographical text), which could well be interpreted as signalling not only his presence, but also his local belonging.

After positively characterising the people that are represented on Sai, one might also ask which groups of people are not to be found in the prosopographical record. Interestingly, genuine military officials are lacking. This is, on the one hand, interesting in view of the strategic and military role of Sai during the ‘re-conquest’ of Nubia.¹³⁹⁸ On the other hand, it is not entirely surprising. We may envisage only certain social and functional groups of people as inhabitants and frequent visitors of Sai after its foundation. Sai was conceptualised as ‘temple town’, as urban settlement in Upper Nubia, so in turn an urban social fabric is to be expected. And once Upper Nubia was fully integrated into the Egyptian administrative framework as the province of ‘Kush’, SAC5 was inaugurated as necropolis for those people of the local elite milieu who decided – or had? – to stay in the newly established fortified town of Sai Island with their families. Whether some of those people who later appear in the epigraphical record on Sai were ‘Nubians’ or ‘Egyptians’ is not visible based on the available prosopographical evidence. It may also be asked whether such a modern division really played an important role in the daily life decisions and experiences of the inhabitants of Sai. What would finally be of immense interest is the demography of Sai in terms of the actual amount of people living in the town in certain periods. The number of prosopographically attested people could then be put in relation with the entire number of inhabitants in order to better understand whether we really see an exclusive group of people only (cf. Tab. 38) or whether also the elite of Sai was more numerous and manifold. Thanks to the ongoing archaeological work in a number of Upper Nubian New Kingdom temple towns, an assessment of such demographic questions based on sound methodological reasoning might be feasible in the near future.

¹³⁹⁸ Cf. Budka 2015b.